

Alan Watts
ORGANIZATION

Celebrating the Life & Works of Alan Watts



Table Of Contents

1. [- Table Of Contents -](#)
2. [Tao of Philosophy](#)
3. [Philosophies of Asia](#)
4. [Myth and Religion](#)
5. [Philosophy and Society](#)
6. [Comparative Philosophy](#)
7. [Ways of Liberation](#)
8. [Zen and Meditation](#)
9. [The Self](#)
10. [Religion of No Religion](#)
11. [Eastern and Western Zen](#)
12. [Taoism](#)
13. [Comparative Religion](#)
14. [The Arts](#)
15. [Buddhism](#)
16. [Psychedelics](#)
17. [Human Consciousness](#)
18. [The Universe](#)
19. [The Future](#)
20. [Unknown Tag](#)

Tao of Philosophy

Not What Should Be

I wonder what you mean, when you use the word 'I?' I've been very interested in this problem for a long long time, and I've come to the conclusion, that what most civilized people mean by that word, is a hallucination. That is to say, a false sense of personal identity, that is at complete variance with the facts of nature. And as a result of having a false sense of identity we act in a way that is inappropriate to our natural environment. And when that inappropriate way of action is magnified by a very powerful technology, we swiftly begin to see the results of a profound discord between man and nature. As is well known we are now in the process of destroying our environment, as a result, of an attempt to conquer it and master it. And we have not realized, therefore, that our environment is not something other than ourselves. In assuming that it is we have made a great mistake. And are now paying the price for it.

But most people would agree with the lines of the poet who said "I, a stranger and afraid, in a world I never made," because we have the strong sensation that our own being inside our skin is extremely different from the world outside our skin. That while there may be intelligence inside human skins. And while there may be values and loving feelings. Outside the skin is a world of mechanical process which does not give a damn about any individual, and which is basically unintelligent. Being gyrations of blind force, and so far as the merely biological world is concerned gyrations of libido, which is Freud's word for blind lust. It should be obvious, that the human being goes with the rest of the universe. Even though we say in popular speech "I came into this world."

Now it is not true that you came into this world. You came out of it. In the same way as a flower comes out of a plant or fruit comes out of a tree. And as an apple tree apples. The solar system in which we live and therefore the galaxy in which we live and therefore the system of galaxies in which we

live. That system peoples. And therefore people are an expression of its energy and of its nature. If people are intelligent. And I suppose we have to grant that. If. Then the energy which people express must also be intelligent because one does not gather. Figs from thistles and grapes from thorns. But it does not occur you see to the ordinary civilized person to regard himself or herself. As an expression of the whole universe. It should be obvious that we cannot exist except in an environment of Earth, Air, Water, and solar temperature. That all these things go with us. And are as important to us albeit outside our skins as our internal or organs heart stomach brain and so forth.

Now if then we cannot describe the behavior of organisms without at the same time describing the behavior of their environments we should realize that we have a new entity of description. Not the individual organism alone but what would now be called a field of behavior which we must call rather clumsily the organism environment. You go with your environment in the same way as your head goes with the rest of your body. You do not find in nature faces arriving in the world sui generis. They go with a body that also bodies do not arrive in a world. Which would be for example a plain ball of scrubbed rock floating without an atmosphere far away from a star. That will not grow bodies there is no soil for bodies. There is no complexity of environment which is body producing.

So bodies go with a very complicated natural environment and if the head goes with the body and the body goes with the environment the body is as much an integral part of the environment as the head is part of the body. It is deceptive of course because the human being is not rooted to the ground like a tree. A human being moves about and therefore can shift from one environment to another but the shifts are superficial the basic environment of the planet remains a constant and if the human being leaves the planet he has to take with him and a canned version of the planetary environment. Now we are not really aware of this upon taking thought and due consideration it does occur to us, yes indeed, we do need that environment but in the ordinary way we don't feel it. That is to say we don't have a vivid sensation of belonging to our environment in the same way that we have a vivid sensation of being an ego inside a bag of skin located mostly in the skull about halfway between the ears and a little way behind the eyes. And

it issues in these disastrous results of the ego which according to one thousand century commonsense feels that it is a fluke in nature. And that if it does not fight nature it will not be able to maintain its status as intelligent fluke.

So the geneticists are now saying and many others are now saying that man must take the course of his evolution into his own hands. He can no longer trust the wiggly random and unintelligible processes of nature to develop him any further but he must interfere with his own intelligence. And through genetic alterations breed the kind of people who will be viable for human society and that sort of thing. Now this I submit is a ghastly era. Because human intelligence has a very serious limitation. That limitation is. That it is a scanning system, of conscious attention, which is linear. That is to say, it examines the world, in lines. Rather as you would pass the beam of a flashlight across a room or a spotlight. That's why our education takes so long. It takes so long because we have to scan miles of lines of print. And we regard that you see as basic information.

Now the universe does not come at us in lines. It comes at us. In a multidimensional continuum in which everything is happening all together everywhere at once. And it comes at us much too quickly, to be translated into lines of print. Or of other information, however fast they may be scanned. And that is our limitation so far as the intellectual life and the scientific life is concerned. The computer will greatly speed up the linear scanning. But it's still linear scanning. And so long as we are stuck with that form of wisdom we cannot deal with more than a few variables at once. Now what do I mean by that. What is a variable? A variable is any one linear process let's take music when you play a bar few. And there are four parts to it you have four variables you have four moving lines and you can take care of that with two hands. An organist using two feet can put into more variables and have six going and you may realize if you've ever tried to play the organ that it's quite difficult to make six independent motions go at once. The average person cannot do that without training the average person cannot deal with more than three variables at once without using a pencil. Now when we study physics we are dealing with processes in which there are millions of variables. This however we handle by statistics in the same way as insurance companies use actuarial tables to predict when most

people will die. If the average age of death is sixty five however, this prediction does not apply to any given individual. Any given individual will live to plus or minus sixty five years. And the range of difference may be very wide indeed of course. But this is all right the sixty five guesses all right when you're doing large scale gambling. And that's the way the physicist works in predicting the behavior of nuclear wavicles. But the practical problems of human life deal with variables in the hundreds of thousands. Here statistical methods are very poor. And thinking it out by linear consideration is impossible. With that equipment then we are proposing to interfere with our genes. And with that equipment also be it said we are trying to solve our political economic and social problems. And naturally everybody has the sense of total frustration. And the individual feels 'what what on earth can I do? '

We do not seem to know a way of calling upon our brains. Because our brains can handle an enormous number of variables that are not accessible to the process of conscious attention your brain is now handling your total nervous system to be more accurate. Your blood chemistry; the secretions from your glands. The behavior of millions of cells. It is doing all that without thinking about it. That is to say, without translating the processes it is handling into consciously reviewed words, symbols or numbers. Now when I use the word thinking I mean precisely that process: translating. What is going on in nature in two words symbols. Or numbers because both words and numbers are kinds of symbols. Symbols bear the same relation to the real world that money bears to wealth. You cannot quench anybody's thirst with the word water, just as you cannot eat a dollar bill and derive nutrition from it. But using symbols and using conscious intelligence; scanning, has proved very useful to us. It has given us such technology as we have. But at the same time it has proved too much of a good thing. At the same time, we've become so fascinated with it that we confuse the world as it is with the world as it is thought about talked about and figured about. That is to say, with the world as it is described.

And the difference between these two is vast. And when we are not aware of ourselves except in a symbolic way. We are not related to ourselves at all we are like people eating menus instead of dinners. And that's why we all feel psychologically frustrated. So then we get back to the question of,

“What do we mean by I? ” Well first of all obviously we mean our symbol of ourselves. Now ourselves in this case is the whole psycho physical organism conscious and unconscious, plus its environment. That’s your real self. Your real self. In other words, is the universe as centered on your organism. That’s you.

Let me just clarify that a little for one reason. What you do is also a doing of your environment. Your behavior is its behavior as much as it’s behavior is your behavior. It’s mutual. We could say it is transactional. You are not a puppet which your environment pushes around. Nor is the environment a puppet which you push around. They go together they act together. In the same way for example if I have a wheel one side of it going down is the same as the other side of it going up. When you handle the steering wheel of a car, are you pulling it or are you pushing it? No, you’re doing both, aren’t you? When you pull it down the side you are pushing it up that side. It’s all one so there’s a push pull between organism and environment. We are only rarely aware of this as when in curious alterations of consciousness which we call mystical experience, cosmic consciousness, an individual gets the feeling that everything that is happening is his own doing. Or the opposite of that feeling that he isn’t doing anything, but that all his doings his decisions and so forth are happenings of nature. You can feel it either way. You can describe it in these two completely opposite ways but you’re talking about the same experience you’re talking about experiencing your own activity and the activity of nature as one single process. And you can describe it as if you were omnipotent like God or as if it were completely deterministic and you hardly existed at all. But remember both points of view are right. And we’ll see where that gets us.

But we don’t feel that do we, ordinarily? What we feel instead is an identification of ourselves with our idea of ourselves or I would rather say with our image of ourselves? And that’s the person. Or the ego. You play a role, you identify with that role. I play a role, it’s called Alan Watts and I know very well that that’s a big act. I can play some other roles besides Alan Watts, if necessary. But I find this one is better for making a living. But I assure you it’s a mask and I don’t take it seriously. The idea of my being a kind of messiah or guru or savior of the world just breaks me up. Because I know me. You know it’s very difficult to be holy. In the ordinary

sense. So I know I'm not that but most of us are taught to think that we are whom we are called. And, when you are a little child and you begin to learn a role and your parents and your peers approve of your be. In that they know who you are. You're predictable, so you can be controlled. But when you act out of role and you imitate some other child's behavior everybody points the finger and says you're not being true to yourself. "Johnny, that's not you, that's Peter." And so you learn to stay Peter. Or to stay Johnny. But of course you're not either. Because this is just the image of you it's as much of you as you can get into your conscious attention, which is precious little. Your image of yourself contains no information about how you structure your nervous system. It contains no information about your blood chemistry it contains almost no information about the subtle influences of society upon your behavior. It does not include the basic assumptions of your culture which are all taken for granted and unconscious. And you can't find them out unless you study other cultures to see how their basic assumptions differ. It includes all kinds of illusions that you're completely unaware of as for example that time is real.

And that there is such a thing as a past. Which is pure hokum. But there are nevertheless all these things that are unconscious in us and they are not included in our image of ourselves, nor of course included in our image of ourselves is there any information about our inseparable relationships with the whole natural universe. So this is a very impoverished image. When you ask a person "what did you do yesterday?" They'll give you a historical account of a certain number of events in which they participated in, the certain number of things which they saw, used or were clubbed by. But realize at once that this history leaves out most of what happened. I in trying to describe what happens to me this evening will never be able to describe because there are so many people here that if I were to talk about everyone whom I've seen what they were wearing what color there was what sort of expressions they had on their faces I would have to talk to doomsday. So instead of this rich physical experience, which is very rich indeed I have to attenuate it in memory and description to saying "Oh I met a lot of people in Philadelphia. And they were men and the women a lot of them were young and some of them were old." You know, it's an utterly impoverished account of what went on. So therefore in thinking of ourselves in this way what I did yesterday what I did the day before in

terms of this stringing mangy account all I have is a caricature of myself. And you know the caricaturist doesn't draw you all in he just put certain salient features whereby people will recognize you. As sort of a skeleton. So we can see we are as it were conceiving ourselves as a bunch of skeletons and they've got no flesh on, just a bunch of bones. And no wonder we all feel inadequate. We're all looking for something, to the future, to bring us the goodie. We know we ought to have. There's a golden goodie at the end of the line somewhere there's a good time coming. Be it ever so way far away that one far off divine event which all creation moves we hope. And therefore we say of something that's no good it has no future. I would say it has no present. But everybody says it has no future.

Now, here we are, as it were, psychically starved. And always there for looking for looking seeking seeking seeking. And this confused seeking is going on everywhere we don't know what we want. Nobody knows what they want. We say yes we think we think of what we want in vague terms: pleasure, money, wealth, love. Fulfillment personal development. But we don't know what we mean by all that. The person really sits down to figure out write out, I say twenty pages, on your idea of heaven. It will be a sorry production. You can see it already in Medieval art whether it'd pictures of heaven and hell. Hell is always much better than Heaven. Although it's uncomfortable it's a sadomasochistic orgy. Wowie, you know hell is really a rip roaring, whereas all the saints in heaven are sitting, of the with you know, very very smug and demure like they were in church. And you see also the multitudes of the saved instead of this writhing wormy thing you can see all their heads which the artist is drawn to abbreviate them just the tops of their heads in masses they look like cobblestone street. Flattened out. So what has happened then is this. That I. Is an illusion it's an image and it is no more ourself than an idol is the god. But we say it can't be so, because I feel I really exist, it isn't just an idea in my head, it's a feeling, I feel me! Well what is it that you feel when you feel I?

What is it that you feel when you feel I? I'll tell you. What do you do when somebody says "Pay attention!" What is the difference between looking at something and taking a hard look at it? And between hearing something and listening intently? What's the difference? What's the difference between waiting while something goes on and enduring it. Why? The difference is this that when you pay attention instead of just looking you screw up your

face you frown. And stare that is a muscular activity around here. When you will, you grit your teeth or clench or this when you endure or control yourself you pull yourself together, physically, and therefore you get uptight. You hold your breath, you do all kinds of muscular things to control the functioning of your nervous system and none of them have the slightest effect on the proper operation of the nervous system. If you stare at things, you will rather fuzz the image than see them clearly if you listen intently by concentrating on muscles around the ears you will be so much attending to muscles here that you won't hear things properly and you may get singing in the ears. If you tighten up with your body to pull yourself together, all you do is constrict yourself. I remember in school I sat next to a boy who had great difficulty in learning to read. And what they always say to children is "try!" If you can do something as tries so the boy tries to muddy done when he's trying to get out words he grunts and groans as if he were lifting weights. And the teachers impress the boys really trying gives him B for effort. Has nothing to do with it.

Now we all make this muscular strain, with the thought that it's achieving psychological results. The sort of psychological results it's intended to achieve and all this amounts to is this like you're taking off on a jet plane you've gone a mile down the runway and the thing is not in the air yet, and you get nervous, so you start pulling at your seatbelt. That's what it is. Now that is a chronic feeling we have it us all the time and it corresponds to the word I. That's what you feel when you say I. You feel that chronic tension because when an organ is working properly you don't feel it. If you see your eye you've got cataract. If you hear your ears, you've got singing in the areas you know getting in the way of hearing. When you of fully functioning, you are unaware of the organ. When you are thinking clearly your brain isn't getting in your way. Actually of course you are seeing your eyes in the sense that everything you see out in front of you is a condition in the optic nerves at the back of the skull. That's where you're aware of all this, but you're not aware of the I as the I. I'm talking about the optical eye.

So when we are aware of the ego I we are aware of this chronic tension inside ourselves and that's not us, it's a futile tension. So when we get the illusion the image of ourselves married to a futile tension you've got an illusion married to a futility. And then you wonder why I can't do anything.

Why I feel in the face of all the problems of the world impotent, and why I somehow cannot manage to transform I? Now here we get to the real problem, because we're always telling each other that we should be different. I'm not going to tell you that tonight. Why not, because I know you can't be. Nor can I. That may sound depressing but I'll show you it isn't, it's very heartening. But everybody you see who is at all sensitive, and awake to their own problems and human problems is trying to change himself. We know we can change the world unless we change ourselves if we are all individually selfish we're going to be collectively selfish. If we don't really love people and only pretend to, somehow we've got to find a way to love. After all it's said in the Bible that our shalt love the Lord thy God. And your neighbor as yourself. You must love. We all agree sure. But we don't. In fact one psychologist very smartly asked the patient with whom are you in love against.

And this is particularly becomes appalling when we enter into the realm of higher things by which I mean spiritual development. Everybody these days is interested in spiritual development. And wisely because we want to change our consciousness. Many people are well aware that this egocentric consciousness is a hallucination. And that they presume it's the function of religion to change it because that's what the Zen Buddhists and yogis and all these people in the Orient to doing. They're changing their state of consciousness to get something called Satori, all mystical experience or Nirvana or moksha or what have you and everybody around here has a really enthused about that because you don't get that in church. I mean that has been Christian mystics but the church has been very quiet about them.

Then the average church all you get is talk. There's no meditation, no spiritual discipline, they tell God what to do interminably as if he didn't know. And then they tell the people what to do as if they could or even wanted to. And then they sing religious nursery rhymes. And then to cap it all the Roman Catholic Church, which did at least have an unintelligible service which was... Which was you know it was real mysterious and suggested bad magic was going on there when put the thing into bad English. And they took away incense and they took away they became a bunch of Protestants and there was a terrible So now all these Catholics are at loose ends it's clear booth loosed put it up to be a pun but she said you

know. It's no longer possible to practise contemplative prayer mats. As you're being advised, exhausted, edified all the time.

And it becomes a bore. Think of God listening to all those prayers. We do have I mean talking about grieving the Holy Spirit. It's just awful. People have no consideration for God at all. So. But in pursuing these spiritual disciplines yoga and Zen and so forth and also psychotherapy there comes up a big difficulty. And the big difficulty is this. I want to find a method whereby I can change my consciousness. But the, therefore to improve myself, but then the self that needs to be improved is the one that is doing the improving.

And so I'm rather stuck. I found out the reason that I think I believe say in god, is that I sure hope that somehow God will rescue me. In other words, I want to hang on to my own existence and I feel rather shaky about doing that for myself but I just hope there's a God who'll take care of it. Or if I could be loving. I would have a better opinion of myself. I feel better about it I could face myself as people say. If I were more loving so the unloving me somehow by some gimmickry has to turn itself into a loving me and this is just like trying to lift yourself off the ground with your own bootstraps. It can't be done. And that's why religion in practice mainly produces hypocrisy. And guilt. Because of the constant failure of these enterprises. People go and study Zen. And they come back and say wow getting rid of your ego is a superhuman task. I assure you it's going to be very very difficult to get rid of your ego you have to sit for a long time and you're going to get the sorest legs. It's hard work and all you wretched kids you think you're getting rid of your ego on part or something or other and easy yoga you don't know what you're in for when it really comes down to the nitty gritty.

But you know the biggest ego trip going is getting rid of your ego. And the joke of it all is your ego doesn't exist. There's nothing to get rid of. It's an illusion as I tried to explain. But you still want to ask how to stop the illusion. And who's asking? I mean, do you think in the ordinary sense in which you use the word 'I', how can I stop identify myself with the wrong me? But the answer is simply you can't. The Christians put this in their way when they say that mystical experience is a Gift of Divine Grace. Man as

such cannot achieve this experience it is a gift of God and if God doesn't give it to you there's no way of getting it. Now that is solidly true. You can't do anything about it because you don't exist. Well you say that's pretty depressing news.

But the whole point is it isn't depressing news, it is the joyous news! There's a Zen poem which puts it like this talking about it, it means the mystical experience the Satori, the realisation that you are the eternal energy of the universe like Jesus did. It says like this you cannot catch hold of it nor can you get rid of it. In not being able to get it you get it. When you speak, it is silent, when you are silent it speaks. Now in not being able to get it you get it because this whole feeling what Krishnamurthi is trying to explain to people, for example, when he says why do you ask for a method there is no method all methods are simply gimmicks for strengthening your ego.

So how do we not do that this is you're still asking for a method there is no method if you really understand what your 'I' is you will see there is no method. This is so so sad. But it's not this is the gospel the good news. Because if you cannot achieve it if you cannot transform yourself. That means that the main obstacle to mystical vision has collapsed. That was you. What happens you can't do anything about. You're at your wit's end. What are you going to do, commit suicide? But supposing you just put that off for a little while. Wait and see what happens. You can't control your thoughts, you can't control your feelings. Because there is no control. You are your thoughts and your feelings and they're running along running along running along to sit and watch them. There they go you're still breathing aren't you. Still growing your hair. Still seeing and hearing. Are you doing that? I mean is breathing something that you do? Do you see I mean do you organize the operations of your eyes and know exactly how to work those rods and cones in the retina? Do you do that? It's a happening. It happens so you can feel all this happening. You are breathing it's happening, your thinking is happening, you're feeling is happening you're hearing you're seeing the clouds are happening across the sky the sky is happening blue the sun is happening shining.

There it is. All this happening. And may I introduce you, this is yourself. This begins to be a vision of who you really are. And that's the way you function you function by happening that is to say by spontaneous occurrence. And this is not a state of affairs that you should realise. I cannot possibly preach it to you because the minute you start thinking I should understand that this is the stupid notion again that I should bring it about when there is no you to bring it about so that's why I'm not preaching you can only preach to egoss.

All I can do is to talk about what is. It amuses me to talk about what it is because it's wonderful. I love it and therefore I like to talk if I get paid for it. And I make my living and sensible people get paid for doing what they enjoy doing. So this is not an easy this is the whole approach is not to convert you not to make you over not to improve you but for you to discover if you really knew the way you are, things would be would be sane. But you see you can't do that. You can't make that discovery because you're in your own way. So long as you think "I'm I." So long as that hallucination knocks it. And the hallucination disappears only in the realisation of its own futility. When at last you see you can't do it. You cannot make yourself over, you cannot really control your own mind. See, when we try to control the mind. A lot of yoga teachers try to get you to control your own mind mainly to prove to you that you can't do it. There's nothing, you know a fool who persists in his folly will become wise, so they what they do is they speed up the folly. And so you get concentrating. And you can have a certain amount of superficial and initial success by a process commonly called self-hypnosis. And you can think you're making progress. And a good teacher will let you go along that way for a while until he really throws you with one. Why are you concentrating?

Buddhism works this way, Buddha said if you suffer you suffer because you desire and your desires are either unattainable or always being disappointed or something. So cut out desire. So those disciples went away and they stamped on desire jumped on desire cut the throat of desire and threw out desire but then they came back and but as said but you are still desiring not to desire. It. I wonder how to get rid of that so when you see that that's nonsense they are naturally comes over you a quietness. In seeing that you cannot control your mind, you realize there is no control. What you took to

be the thinker of thoughts is just one of the thoughts what you took to be the feeler of the feelings which was that chronic muscular strain was just one of the feelings. What you took to be the experience of experience is just part of the experience.

So there isn't any thinker of thoughts feel or feelings we get into that bind because we have a grammatical rule that verbs have to have subjects. And the funny thing about that is that verbs are processes and subjects and nouns which are supposed to be things how does a noun start a verb. How does the thing put a process into action. Obviously it can't. But we always insist that there is this subject called the knower. And without a knower there can't be knowing. Well that's just a grammatical rule it isn't the rule of nature. In nature there's just knowing like you're feeling it and how to say you are feeling it as if you were somehow different from the feeling when I say I am feeling I what I mean is there is feeling here. When I say you are feeling I mean there is feeling there. I have to say even "There is feeling. What a cumbersome language we have. Chinese is easier you don't have to put all that in writing that why you can say things twice as fast in Chinese as you can in any other language.

Well anyway. When you come to see that you can do nothing that the play of thought of feeling etc just goes on by itself as a happening. Then you are in a state which we will call meditation. And slowly. Without being pushed your thoughts will come to silence that is to say all the verbal symbolic chatter going on in the skull. Don't try and get rid of it. Because that will again produce the illusion that there's a controller. Just, it goes on it goes on it goes on finally it gets tired of itself and bored and stops. And so then there's a silence. And this is a deeper level of meditation. And in that silence. You suddenly begin to see the world as it is. And you don't see any past. And you don't see any future. You don't see any difference between yourself and the rest of it that's just an idea you can put your hand on the difference between myself and you. You know you can't blow it, you can't bounce it, you can't pull it. It's just an idea. You can't find any material body. Because material body is an idea, so is spiritual body, somebody is philosophical notions see reality isn't material. That's an idea reality isn't spiritual That's an idea reality is [claps].

So we find, if I've got to put it back into words that we live in an eternal now. You've got all the time in the world because you've got all the time there is which is now. And you are this universe. And you feel this strange feeling when when when ideas don't define the differences you feel that other people's doings or your doings. And that makes it very difficult to blame other people. If you're not sophisticated theologically You may of course run screaming in the streets and say that you're God.

In a way that's what happened to Jesus because he wasn't sophisticated theologically he only had Old Testament Biblical theology behind him. If he'd had Hindu theology he could have put it more subtly. But it was only that rather primitive theology of the Old Testament. And that was a conception of God as a monarchical boss. And you can't go around sandboxes son. If you're going to say "I'm God," you must allow it for everyone else too. But this was a heretical idea from the point of view of Hebrew theology and so what they did with Jesus was they pedestaled him, I mean they kicked him upstairs so that he wouldn't be able to influence anyone else and only you maybe god. And that stopped the Gospel cold right at the beginning. It couldn't spread.

Well anyway. This is therefore to say that the transformation of human consciousness through meditation is frustrated so long as we think of it in terms of something that I myself can bring about. By some kind of wangled, by some sort of gimmick. Because you see that leads to endless games of spiritual one upmanship. And of guru competitions, of my guru is more effective than your guru, my yoga faster than your yoga, I'm more aware of myself than you are I'm humbler than you are I'm sorry for my sins than you are I love you more than you love me it is interminable goings on about which people fight and wonder whether they're a little bit more evolved than somebody else and so on all that can just fall away. And then. We get this strange feeling that we have never had to see in our lives except occasionally by accident some people get a glimpse. That we are no longer. This poor little stranger and afraid in a world it never made. But that you are this universe and you are creating it at every moment because YOU SEE IT STARTS NOW. It didn't begin in the past there was no past so if the universe began in the past when that happened it was now, see. But it's still now and the universe is still beginning now and it's trailing off like the

wake of a ship from now in the wake of the ship fades out so does the past. You can look back there to explain things but the explanation disappears, you never find things are not explained by the past or explained by what happens now. That creates the past and it begins here. That's the birth of responsibility. Because otherwise you can always look over your shoulder and say well I'm the way I am because my mother dropped me and she dropped me because she was neurotic because a mother dropped her, and away we go back to Adam and Eve, to disappearing monkey or something and we never get at it. But in this way you're faced with it you're doing all this. And it's an extraordinary shock. So. Cheer up. You can't blame anyone else for the kind of world you're in. And if you know you see that I, in the sense of the person, the front, the ego really doesn't exist. Then it won't go to your head too badly if you wake up and discover that your god.

Sense of Nonsense

It's very commonly said that the root of most human unhappiness is the sense that one's life has no meaning. This is, I suppose most frequently said in circles interested in psychotherapy because the feeling of meaninglessness is often equated with the existence of neurosis. And so many activities into which one is encouraged to enter, philosophies one is encouraged to believe and religions one is encouraged to join, are commended on the basis of the fact that they give life a meaning. And, I think it's very fascinating to think out what this idea itself means, or what it – is intended when it is said that life has to have a purpose. I remember so well as a child listening to sermons in church in which the preacher would constantly refer to God's purpose "for you and for me." And, I could never make out what it was because when questioned about this, the reverend gentleman seemed to be evasive: "What is the purpose of God for the world?" We used to sing a hymn too: "God is working His purpose out as the year succeeds the year," and the nearest clue one got to it was in the (sort of) refrain of the hymn: "Nearer and nearer draws the time, the time that shall surely be, when the earth shall be filled with the glory of God, as the waters cover the sea." And of course, that raises the question, "What is the glory of God?"

Well, now, it's pretty obvious, I think, that when we talk about life having or not having a meaning, we are not using quite the ordinary sense of the word "meaning" as the attribute of a sign. We are not saying – are we? – that we expect this natural universe to behave as if it were a collection of words, signifying something other than themselves. It isn't a point of view which would reduce our lives in the world merely to the status of signs. And, it's obviously in some different sense than that, that Goethe wrote his famous lines at the end of Faust: "Alles Vergängliche ist nur ein Gleichnis" – forgive my pronunciation of German. "All that is mortal, or all that is perishable, is but a symbol." And so, a symbol of what? What do we want to feel, what would satisfy us as being the meaning behind this world? It's so often, you know, that we don't follow our ideas and our desires through. Most of the things that we want very fervently are things that we have only half-glimpsed. Our ideals are very often suggestions – hints – and we don't know really exactly what we mean when we think about it. But there is this obscure sense in which we feel that life ought to have significance, and be a symbol in at least that sense if not just so arid a symbol as a mere sign.

Or it also may mean that life is meaningful. An individual feels that his life amounts to something when he belongs and fits in with the execution of some group enterprise; he feels he belongs in a plan. And this too seems to give people a sense of great satisfaction, but we have to pursue that question further too. Why is it that a plan – why is it that fellowship with other people gives the sense of meaning? Does it come down perhaps to another sense of meaning that life is felt to be meaningful when one is fully satisfying one's biological urges, including the sense of hunger, the sense of love, the sense of self-expression in activity, and so on? But then again, we have to push that inquiry further. What do our biological urges really point towards? Are they just, however, things always projected towards a future? Is biology and its processes nothing but "going on towards going on towards going on"?

Or there's a fourth and more theological sense of the meaning of life. In all theistic religions at any rate, the meaning of life is God himself. In other words, all this world means a person, it means a heart, it means an intelligence, and the relationship of love between God and man is the

meaning of the world. The sight of God is the glory of God, and so on, but again here, there's something to be further pursued.

What is it that we want in love with a person, and even a person in the sense of the Lord God? What is the content of it? What is it that we are really yearning after? Well, now, if we go back to the first point, taking Goethe's words that all that is transitory is but a symbol and that we want to feel that all things have significance, it does seem to me that there is a sense in which we often use the word "significance" where the word seems to be chosen quite naturally, and yet at the same time it is not quite the right word. We say, for example, often, of music, that we feel it to be significant, when just at the same time, we don't mean that it expresses some particular kind of concretely realizable emotion, and certainly it is not imitating the noises of nature. A program music, you know, which simply imitates something else, and it deliberately sets out to express sadness or joy (or whatever) is not the kind of thing I mean. So often when one listens to the beautiful arabesque character of the Baroque composers, Bach or Vivaldi, it is felt to be significant not because it means something other than itself, but because it is so satisfying as it is. And we use, then, this word, "significance," so often in those moments when our impetuous seeking for fulfillment cools down, and we give ourselves a little space to watch things, as if they were worth watching – ordinary things.

And in those moments when our inner turmoil has really quietened, we find significance in things that we would not expect to find significant at all. I mean, this is, after all, the art of those photographers who have such genius in turning the camera towards such things as peeling paint on an old door, or mud and sand and stones on a dirt road, and showing us there that if we look at it in a certain way those things are significant. But we cannot say significant "of what" so much as significant "of themselves." Or perhaps significance then is the quality of a state of mind in which we notice that we are overlooking the significance of the world by our constant quest for it later.

All this language is of course quite naturally vague and imprecise because, I think, the wrong word is used. And yet not entirely the wrong word because as I said, it comes so naturally to us.

It was Clive Bell, the great aesthete, who wanted to say that all the characteristic of art, especially the characteristic of aesthetic success in painting, was the creation of significant form. Again, a very vague, imprecise expression. But it certainly is an attribute not only of those moments in which we are tranquil inside, but also of moments of deep, spiritual experience of what would be called moksha, or “release,” in Hinduism or satori in Zen. In those moments the significance of the world seems to be the world – seems to be what is going on now. And we don’t look any further – the scheme of things seems to justify itself at every moment of its unfoldment. I pointed out that this was particularly a characteristic of music- it’s also a characteristic of dancing, and in the sensation of belonging with one’s fellow man, in the carrying out of some significant pattern of life which I mentioned as a second sense of the world being meaningful. Again, the character of this feeling is again something that is fulfilled in itself: to dance is not to be going anywhere. When we dance in the ballroom, we don’t have a destination – we’re just going around a room. And it’s in doing this – it’s in executing the pattern, in singing the music with other people, that even though this does not point to anything else outside itself we again get the sense of meaning, and this is also obviously the case so often in the satisfaction of the biological urges. Does one live to eat or eat to live? I am not at all sure about this. I’m sure I very often live to eat because, sitting around a table with people – I don’t like eating alone – and enjoying food is absolutely delightful. And we’re not thinking when we do this – at least certainly I’m not – that we have to eat because it is good for us, and that we have to “throw something down the hatch,” as Henry Miller said, and swallow a dozen vitamins just because our system needs nourishment.

I remember, quite recently, there was an article in the Consumer Reports about bread. It seems there had been some correspondence and protest, saying that the bread one bought –the white bread one buys in the stores –is perfectly inedible and lacking in nutrition, and that it was much better to eat peasant-type breads – rough pumpnickel and things of that kind. And the experts replied that our white bread is perfectly full of good nutrients and there is nothing really the matter with it at all. Well, I felt like saying it is not a matter perhaps of the bread being deficient in the essential vitamins. Bread is not medicine, it is food, and one’s complaint against it is that it is

bad cookery. It tastes of nothing. And we do tend – don't we? – to look upon food, so often, for what it will do for us, rather than the delight of eating it. But if the satisfaction of biological urges is to mean anything, surely the point of these urges is not the fatuous one of mere survival. We might say that the point of the individual is simply that he contributes to the welfare of the race, and the point of the race is that it “reproduces itself to reproduce itself” and keep going. But of course that is not really a point at all; that is just fatuous. Surely the race keeps going because going is great – because it's fun. If it is not and never will be, then there is no point, obviously, in going, I mean, looking at it from the most hedonistic standpoint. But then when we come to the question, “What is fun?” – “What is the joy of it?” again we come to something that cannot very well be explained in the ordinary language of meaning of leading to something else. And this, I think, becomes preeminently true if we think of it in theological language – that the meaning of life is God. In any of the theistic religions what is God doing? What is the meaning of God? Why does He create the universe? What is the content of the love of God for His creation? Well, there's the frank answer of the Hindus that the godhead manifests the world because of lila, which is Sanskrit for “play.”

And this is likewise said in the Hebrew scriptures or the Christian Old Testament in the Book of Proverbs where there is a marvelous speech by the divine wisdom, Sophia, which in describing the function of the divine wisdom in the creation of the world – the world, in other words, is a manifestation of the wisdom of God. The wisdom uses the phrase that in producing men and animals and all the creatures of the earth, wisdom is playing, and it was the delight of wisdom to play before the presence of God. And when it is likewise said in the scriptures that the Lord God created the world for His pleasure, this again means, in a sense, for play. And certainly this seems to be what the angels in Heaven are doing according to the traditional symbolic descriptions of Heaven: they are ringed around the presence of the Almighty, calling out “Alleluia! Alleluia! Alleluia!” through all eternity. Well, “alleluia” may have meant something originally, but as it is used now it does not mean anything, except, well, in our own slang, “whoopie!” It is an exclamation of nonsensical delight, and it was Dante in *The Paradiso* who described the song of the angels as the laughter of the universe.

Now this sense of nonsense as the theme of the divine activity comes out also very strongly in the Book of Job. I always think that the Book of Job is the most profound book in the whole Bible, Old Testament and New Testament. Because here is the problem of the man – the righteous man – who has suffered and all his friends try to rationalize it and say, “Well, you must have suffered because you really had a secret sin after all, and you deserve the punishment of God,” or because... rationalize it somehow. And when they’ve had their say, the Lord God appears on the scene and says, “Who is this that darkeneth counsel with words without knowledge?” and then proceeds to ask Job and his friends a series of absolutely unanswerable conundrums, pointing out all the apparent irrationality and nonsense of His creation. “Why,” for example, He said, “do I send rain upon the desert where no man is?”

Most commentators on the Book of Job end with the remark that, “This poses the problem of suffering and the problem of evil, but doesn’t really answer it.” And yet in the end Job himself seems to be satisfied. He somehow surrenders to the apparent unreasonableness of the Lord God, and this is not, I think, because Job is beaten down and becomes unduly impressed with the royal, monarchical, and paternalistic authority of the deity and does not dare to answer back. He realizes that somehow these very questions are the answer. I think of all the commentators on the Book of Job, the person who came closest to this point was (old) G. K. Chesterton. He once made the glorious remark that it is one thing to look with amazement at a gorgon or a griffin, a creature who does not exist, but it is quite another thing to look at a hippopotamus, a creature who does exist, and looks as if he does not. In other words, that all this strange world with its weird forms like hippopotami – and when you look at them from a certain point of view – , stones and trees and water and clouds and stars – when you look at them from a certain point of view and don’t take them for granted – they are as weird as any hippopotamus, or any imagination of fabulous beasts of gorgons and griffins and things like that. They are just plain improbable, and it is in this sense, I think, that they are the “alleluia,” as it were, the nonsense song.

Why do we love nonsense? Why do we love Lewis Carroll with his “’Twas brillig, and the slithy toves did gyre and gimble in the wabe, all mimsy were

the borogroves, and the mome raths outgrabe. . . .”? Why is it that all those old English songs are full of “Fal-de-riddle-eye-do” and “Hey nonny-nonny” and all those babbling choruses? Why is it that when we get “hep” with jazz we just go “Boody-boody-boop-de-boo” and so on, and enjoy ourselves swinging it? It is this participation in the essential glorious nonsense that is at the heart of the world, that isn’t going anywhere – that is a dance. It seems that only in moments of unusual insight and illumination that we get the point of this, and find that thus the true meaning of life is no meaning, that its purpose is no purpose, and that its sense is non-sense. But still, we want to use about it the word “significant.” Is this significant nonsense? Is this a kind of nonsense that is not just chaos, that is not just blathering balderdash, but that has in it rhythm, fascinating complexity, a kind of artistry? It is in this kind of meaninglessness that we come to the profoundest meaning.

Coincidence of Opposites

It is really a very unorthodox and unacademic thing to do to start a discussion with a group of psychologists on the subject of metaphysics, but we have to do that because a lot of people say that their approach to life is scientific, as distinct from metaphysical, and that metaphysics is bosh anyway. But everybody, by virtue of being a human being, is willy-nilly a metaphysician. That is to say, everybody starts from certain fundamental assumptions as to what is the good life, what he wants, [or] what are his, shall we say, axioms for living. And I find that psychologists generally tend to be blind to these fundamental assumptions. Maybe it is truer of psychiatrists than of psychologists, but they tend to feel that they are scientists. They’re rather bending over backwards to have a scientific status because that is fashionable in our age. But, you know, it’s so amusing that when, say – let’s take psychoanalysis for example – as pointed out to many philosophers that their philosophical ideas are capable of being shown to have a psychoanalytic reference. For example, John Wisdom wrote a book about the philosophy of Berkeley, in which he attributed a great deal of his point of view to his experiences at toilet training as a child. The philosopher is very grateful to the psychoanalyst for revealing to him his unconscious and its emotional contents, but the psychoanalyst must in turn await a

revelation from the philosopher as to his philosophical unconscious and the unexamined assumptions which lie in it.

So if I may start by insulting your intelligence with what is called the most elementary lesson – the thing that we should have learned before we learned “1 – 2 – 3” and “A – B – C,” but somehow was overlooked. Now, this lesson is quite simply this, that any experience that we have through our senses, whether of sound, or of light, or of touch, is a vibration. And a vibration has two aspects: one called “on,” and the other called “off.” Vibration seems to be propagated in waves, and every wave system has crests and it has troughs.

And so life is a system of now you see it, now you don't, and these two aspects always go together. For example, sound is not pure sound; it is a rapid alternation of sound and silence, and that is simply the way things are. Only, you must remember that the crest and the trough of a wave are inseparable. Nobody ever saw crests without troughs or troughs without crests. Just as you do not encounter in life people with fronts but no backs, just as you do not encounter a coin that has heads but no tails. And although the heads and the tails, the fronts and the backs, the positives and the negatives are different, they are at the same time one. And one has to get used, fundamentally, to the notion that different things can be inseparable, and that what is explicitly two can at the same time be implicitly one. If you forget that, very funny things happen. If therefore we forget, you see, that black and white are inseparable, and that existence is constituted equivalently by being and non-being, then we get scared, and we have to play a game called “Uh-oh, Black Might Win.” And once we get into the fear that black – the negative side – might win, we are compelled to play the game, “But White Must Win,” and from that start all our troubles.

Because, you see, the human awareness is a very odd mechanism. I do not think “mechanism” is quite the right word, but it will do for the moment. That is to say, we have as a species specialized in a certain kind of awareness which we call conscious attention, and by this we have the faculty of examining the details of life very closely. We can restrict our gaze, and it corresponds somewhat to [peripheral field] – the central field of vision in the eyes. We have central vision and we have peripheral vision.

Central vision is that which we use for reading and for all sorts of close work, and it's like using a spotlight. Whereas peripheral vision is more like using a floodlight. Now, civilization and civilized human beings, for maybe 5,000 years, maybe much longer, have learned to specialize in concentrated attention. Even if a person's attention span is short, he is, as it were, wavering his spotlight over many fields. The price which we pay for specialization in conscious attention is ignorance of everything outside its field. I would rather say "ignore-ance," than ignorance, because if you concentrate on a figure, you tend to ignore the background and you tend, therefore, to see the world in a disintegrated aspect. You take separate things and events seriously, imagining that these really do exist, when actually they have the same kind of existence as an individual's interpretation of a Rorschach blot; they are what you make out of it.

In fact our physical world is a system of inseparable differences. Everything exists with everything else, but we contrive not to notice that because what we notice is

what is noteworthy, and we notice it in terms of notations: numbers, words, images. What is notable, noteworthy, notated, and noticed is what appears to us to be significant, and the rest is ignored as insignificant. And as a result of that we select from the total input that goes to our senses only a very small fraction, and this causes us to believe that we are separate beings, isolated by the boundary of the epidermis from the rest of the world. You see, this is also the mechanism involved in not noticing that black and white go together – not noticing that every inside has an outside. That the inside, what's inside – what goes on inside your skin, is inseparable from what goes on outside your skin. You see that, for example, in the science of ecology one learns that a human being is not an organism in an environment, but is an organism-environment, that is to say, a unified field of behavior. If you describe carefully the behavior of any organism you cannot do so without at the same time describing the behavior of the environment, and by that you know that you've got a new entity of study: you are describing the behavior of a unified field. But you must be very careful indeed not to fall into old Newtonian assumptions about the billiard ball nature of the universe. The organism is not the puppet of the environment being pushed around by it, nor on the other hand is the

environment the puppet of the organism being pushed around by the organism. The relationship between them is, to use John Dewey's word, "transactional," a transaction being a situation like buying and selling in which there is no buying unless somebody sells, and no selling unless somebody buys. So that fundamental relationship between ourselves and the world, which is, in an old-fashioned way, by people such as [B. F.] Skinner, who has not updated his philosophy – interpreted in terms of Newtonian mechanics – he interprets the organism as something determined by the total environment. He doesn't see that in a more modern way of talking about it we're simply describing a unified field of behavior, which is nothing more than what any mystic ever said. That's a dirty word in the modern, academic scientific environment, but if a mystic is one who is sensibly or even sensuously aware of his inseparability as an individual from the total existing universe, he is simply a person who has become sensible – aware through his senses – of the way ecologists see the world. So when I am in academic circles I do not talk about mystical experiences, I talk about ecological awareness. Same thing.

And so the next aspect of our metaphysical introduction must be about games. You know, I think there are really four questions that all philosophers have discussed from the beginning of recorded time. The first is: Who started it? The second is: Are we going to make it? The third is: Where are we going to put it? And the fourth is: Who is going to clean up?

When you think these over it poses a fifth question: Is it serious? And that is the one I want to discuss. Is existence serious, like you say, "Doctor," after he has looked at your X-ray picture, "is it serious?" What does that mean? It means, "Am I in danger of not continuing to survive?" The question is "Ought I to continue to survive?" In other words, "Must I survive?" If life is serious, then of course I must survive. If it is not serious, it really does not matter whether I do or I don't. Now, in Western culture it is practically a basic assumption that existence is serious, and this is particularly true among people who call themselves existentialists. When they talk about a person who exists authentically they mean that he takes his life seriously and other people's lives seriously. But the poet and essayist, G. K. Chesterton, once observed that the "angels fly because they take themselves lightly." And if I may venture into mythology, if the angels take

themselves lightly, how much more so the lord of the angels? But you see, we have been brought up in a mythological context where the Lord God definitely does take Himself seriously and is indeed, the serious person. So, that when we go into church, laughter is discouraged in the same way as it is discouraged in court. This is a serious matter and everybody has to have the right expression on their faces because this is the great, great authority figure. This is Grandpa, [imitates old man] and we do not realize that he has a twinkle in his eye. But the basis of it all is this: If we say, “You must survive” or “I must survive,” and “Life is earnest and I have got to go on,” then your life is a drag and not a game.

Now it is my contention and my personal opinion – this is my basic metaphysical axiom, shall we put it that way – that existence – the physical universe – is basically playful.

There is no necessity for it whatsoever. It is not going anywhere; that is to say, it does not have some destination that it ought to arrive at. But it is best understood by analogy with music because music as an art form is essentially playful. We say, “You play the piano.” You do not work the piano. Why? Music differs from, say, travel: when you travel you are trying to get somewhere and, of course, we, because of being a compulsive and purposive culture, are busy getting everywhere faster and faster till we eliminate the distance between places. I mean, with modern jet travel you can arrive almost instantaneously, and what happens as a result of that is that the two ends of your journey become the same place. So you eliminate the distance and you eliminate the journey. Because the fun of the journey is to travel, not to obliterate travel. So the, in music, though, one does not make the end of a composition the point of the composition. If that were so, the best conductors would be those who played fastest, and there would be composers who wrote only finales. People would go to a concert just to hear one crashing chord because that is the end. Say you went dancing – you don’t aim at a particular spot in the room – that’s where you should arrive – the point of dancing is the dance.

Now, but, we don’t see that as something brought by our education into our everyday conduct. We have got a system of schooling which gives it a completely different impression. It’s all graded, and what we do is we put

the child into the corridor of this grade system, with a kind of “Come on, kitty – kitty – kitty.” And you go to kindergarten, and that is a great thing, because when you finish that you will get into first grade; and then “Come on!” First grade leads to second grade, and so on. And then you get out of grade school, you go on to high school, and it’s “revving up,” the thing is coming, and then you go on to college, and by Jove, you get into graduate school, and when you are through with graduate school you go out to join the world. And then you get into some racket where you are selling insurance and they’ve got their quota to make, and you’ve gotta make that. And all the time that thing is coming, it’s coming, it’s coming – that great thing –the success you are working for. Then when you wake up one day, about forty years old, you say, “My God, I have arrived! I am there.” And you do not feel very different from what you always felt, and there is a slight let-down because you feel there’s a hoax. And there was a hoax, a dreadful hoax: they made you miss everything by expectation. Look at the people who live to retire and they put those savings away, and then when they are sixty-five they do not have any energy left, they’re more or less impotent, and they go on and rot in an old people’s – senior citizen’s community.

Because we simply cheated ourselves the whole way down the line. We thought of life by analogy with a journey, with a pilgrimage – which had a serious purpose at the

end. The thing was to get to that end, success, or whatever it is, or maybe Heaven after you are dead, but we missed the point the whole way along. It was a musical thing, and you were supposed to sing or dance while the music was being played. But you had to do “that thing” and you did not let it happen. So this is why the human being sometimes becomes an organism for self-frustration. Let’s take – Korzybski called man a “time binder.” That means that he is the animal peculiarly aware of the time sequence. And as a result of this he is able to do some very remarkable things. He can predict: he studies what has happened in the past and he says the chances are so-and-so of that happening again, and so he predicts. Well, it’s very useful, to be able to predict, because that has survival value, but at the same time it creates anxiety. You pay for this increased survivability involved in prediction by knowing that in the end you will not succeed. You’re all going

to fall apart by one way or another; it might happen tomorrow, it might happen fifty years from now, but it all comes apart in the end. And people get worried about that – they get anxious, so what they gained on the roundabout, they lost on the swings.

So then, if you see on the other hand, that existence – this is, as I said, my basic metaphysical assumption, which I won't conceal from you – that existence is musical in nature, that is to say that it is not serious – it is a play of all kinds of patterns and we can look upon different creatures as we look at different games, as we look at chess, checkers, backgammon, tennis. There is the, the tree game, the beetle game, the grass game. Or you can look at them as different styles of music – mazurkas, waltzes, sonata, etc. All down the line there are all these different things doing their stuff. They're going, "do-do-do-do-do..." in different rhythms. And we're doing that. If you were in a flying saucer from Mars, or somewhere, and you came and looked, tried to make out what was living on this world from about ten thousand feet late at night, or early morning, you would see these great ganglia with tentacles going out all over the place. And early in the morning you would see little blobs of luminous particles going into the middle of them. Then in the late afternoon or early evening it would spit them all out again. And they'd say, "Well, this thing breathes, and it does it in a special rhythm. It goes in – and – out, in – and – out, and in – and – out, once every twenty – four hours. But then it rests a day and doesn't spit so much, it just spits in a different way. There is a kind of irregularity, and then it starts spitting all over again the same way." They would say, "Well, that is very interesting, but that is just the kind of thing we have. This is something that goes this way, and then goes that way."

Now, existence, you see is something that is spontaneous. The Chinese word for nature is tzu-jan. It means that which happens of itself. Your hair grows by itself, your heart beats by itself. You breathe – pretty much by itself. Your glands secrete their essences by themselves – you do not have voluntary control over these things, and so we say it happens spontaneously. So, when you go to sleep and you try to go to sleep you interfere with the spontaneous process of going to sleep. If you try to breathe real hard you will find you get balled-up in your breathing. So if you are to – if you gotta be human, you just have to trust yourself to have bowel movements and go

to sleep, and digest your food. Of course if something goes seriously wrong and you need a surgeon that is another matter, but by and large the healthy human being does not right from the start of life need surgical interference. And he lets it happen by itself, and so with the whole picture that is fundamental to it. You have to let go and let it happen, because if you don't, you're going to be all clutched up.

Then you gotta be constantly trying to do what can happen healthily only if you do not try. And when people – when you think a bit about what people really want to do with their time, what they do when they are not being pushed around and somebody is telling them what to do, they like to go – they like to make rhythms. They listen to music and they dance or they sing, or perhaps they do something of a rhythmic nature like playing cards, bowling, or raising their elbows. Everybody wants to spend their time swinging. That's the nature of this whole thing we're in. You see, he likes the swings. That's why he does it.

Seeing Through the Net

Now, what I want to do is have a mutual brain-picking session and I'm going to start the ball rolling by saying why I, as a philosopher, am interested in many things that you are all probably interested in professionally. Basically, what we are going to talk about I suppose, is the problem of control, as exemplified in the ancient Latin question *Quis custodiet custodiet ipsos?* – “Who guards the guards?”

Now, we know that we are living in an age when there has been an enormous proliferation of techniques for subjecting every kind of natural process outside the human skin, and now increasingly inside the human skin, to some form of rational control. And as we succeed in doing this, it also becomes apparent that we are failing, that the process becomes of such a high degree of complexity that we begin to feel that we are standing in our own way. That everybody complains, the state of affairs in the modern world, in the technological world is so complicated that nobody can understand it, and nobody really knows what to do. That for example, you want to run a small business and you find you run in to such enormous legal hassles that you need so many secretaries to do the paperwork that you can

hardly do the business. That you're trying to run a hospital, but that you have to spend so much time making records and writing things down on paper that you don't have much time to practice medicine. That you're trying to run a university and the requirements, the recording, the endless red tape of the registrar's office in the administration building is such that the actual work of research and teaching is seriously hampered.

So individuals increasingly feel themselves obstructed by their own cautiousness. This is basically what it is. Now, to explain myself first of all, because most of you are strangers to me, I am a philosopher who has for many years been interested in the mutual fructification of Eastern cultures and Western cultures, studying Oriental ideas, not in the spirit of saying to the West, "You ought to be converted to Oriental ideas," but in the spirit of saying, "You don't understand the basic assumptions of your own culture if your own culture is the only culture you know." Everybody operates on certain basic assumptions, but very few people know what they are. You can say, very often encounter the sort of character who is an American businessman, and he says, "Well, I'm a practical businessman. I believe in getting results and getting things done, and all this high-falutin' logic and nonsense is of no concern to me." Now I know that the practical basic assumptions, the metaphysics of that man, can be defined as pragmatism, as a school of philosophy. But it's bad pragmatism because he has never thought it through. And so, it is very difficult, you see, to get down to what are your basic assumptions? What do you mean by the good life? What do you mean by consistency? What do you mean by rationality? The only way of finding out what you mean by these things is by contrasting the way you look at something to the way it is looked at in another culture.

Therefore, we have to find cultures which are in some ways as sophisticated as our own but as different from our own as possible. And of course for this purpose I always thought that the Chinese were optimal, and the Indians, the East Indians and that, by studying the ideas of these people, and by studying their life goals, we could become more aware of our own. It's the old principle of triangulation, you don't establish the situation of a particular object unless you observe it from two different points of view, and thereby calculate its actual distance from you.

So, by looking at what we are pleased to call the reality of the physical world from these basic standpoints of different cultures, I think we are in a better position to know where we are than if we only have one single line of sight. Therefore, this has been my interest and my background, and arising out of this there has come a further question which I would call “the problems of human ecology.” How is man to be best related to his environment, especially in circumstances where we are in possession of an extremely powerful technology and have therefore the capacity to change our environment far more than anyone else has ever been able to do so? Are we going to end up not by civilizing the world but by Los-Angelezing it? In other words, are we going to foul our own nest as a result of technology? But all of this gets down to the basic question is, really: “What are you going to do if you are God?” If, in other words, you find yourself in charge of the world through technological powers, and instead of leaving evolution to what we used to call in the nineteenth century “the blind processes of nature” – that was begging the question, to call them blind – but at any rate, we say we are not going to leave evolution anymore to the blind forces of nature. But now we are going to direct it ourselves, because we are increasingly developing, to say, control over genetic systems, control over the nervous system, control over all kinds of systems. Then, simply, “What do you want to do with it?” But most people do not know what they want, and they have never even seriously confronted the question of what they want. You ask a group of students to sit down and write a solid paper of twenty pages on “What is Your Idea of Heaven”, what would you really like to happen, if you could make it happen. And that’s the first thing that starts people really thinking because you soon realize that a lot of the things you think you would want are not things they want at all. Supposing, just for the sake of illustration, you had the power to dream every night any dream you wanted to dream. And you could, of course, arrange for one night of dreams to be seventy-five years of subjective time, or any number of years of subjective time. What would you do? Well, of course you would start out by fulfilling every wish. You would have routs and orgies, and all the most magnificent food and sexual partners and everything you could possibly imagine in that direction. When you got tired of that after several nights, you would switch a bit and you would soon find yourself involved in adventures, and contemplating great works of art, fantastic mathematical conceptions, you would soon be rescuing princesses from a dragons and all

sorts of things like that, and now you would say, “Now, tonight what we are going to do is we are going to forget this dream is a dream, and we are going to be really shocked.” And when you woke up from that one you would say, “uuu, wasn’t that an adventure!” Then you would think more and more far of ways to get involved and let go of control, knowing that you would always come back to “center” in the end. But while you were involved in the dream you would not know you were going to come back to center, be in control, and so eventually you would be dreaming a dream in which you found yourselves sitting around in this room listening to me talking or involved with the particular life problems which you have. And maybe that’s what you are doing.

But there is a difficulty, you see, the difficulty of control. Are you wise enough to play at being God? And to understand what that question means. We’ve to go back to metaphysical assumptions underlying Western common sense. And whether you are a Jew, or a Christian, or an agnostic, or an atheist you are not uninfluenced by the whole tradition of Western culture. The models of the universe, which it is employed, which influence our very language, the structure of our thought, the very constitution of logic, which are going into, say computers. The Western model of the universe is political, and engineering or architectural. It’s natural for child to ask his mother “How was I made?” It would be inconceivable for a Chinese child to ask, “How was I made?” It might ask “How was I grown?” or “How did I grow?” but not “How was I made?” as if I were an artifact, something put together, something which is a construct.

But all Western thought is based on the idea that the universe is a construct, and even when we got rid of the idea of the constructor, the personal God we continue to think of the world in terms of a machine, in terms of Newtonian mechanics, and later in terms of what we call quantum mechanics, although I find it rather difficult to understand how quantum theory is in any sense “mechanics.” It is much more like “organics,” which is to me a different concept. However that may be, it is percolated, you see, into the roots of our common sense. That the world is a construct, it is an artifact. And therefore as one understands the operations of a machine by analysis of its parts, by separating them into their original bits, we have “bitted” the cosmos, and see everything going on in terms of bits, bits of

information. And I have found that this is an extremely fruitful enabling us to control what is happening. After all, the whole of Western technology is the result of “bitting.” That’s suppose, you know, you want to eat a chicken you cannot eat the whole chicken at once. You have to bite it, you have to reduce it to bits, which you do not get a cut-up fryer out of an egg, it does not come that way. So what is happen is this, that we don’t know the origins of all this, it may be go back a thousands of years. The way we develop the art of thinking, which is essentially calculus is this: the universe as it comes in nature, the physical universe, is something like a Rorschach blot; it’s all wiggles. We who live in cities are not really used to this because we build everything in straight lines, and rectangles, and so on. Wherever you see this sort of things, you know human beings have been around because they are always trying to straighten things out.

But nature itself is clouds, is water, is the outlines of continents, is mountains, is a biological existences, and all of them wiggle. And wiggly things are to human consciousness a little bit of a nuisance because we want to figure them out. And it is as if therefore, some ancient fisherman one day held up his net and looked at the world through the net, he said: “My, just think of that. There I can see the view, and the peak of that mountain is one – two – three – four – five – six holes across, and the base is one – two – three – four – five holes down. I’ve got its number.” See? So the lines of latitude and longitude, lines of celestial and terrestrial, latitude and longitude, the whole idea of a matrix – of looking at things through graph paper printed on cellophane – is the basic idea of measurement. This is the way we calculate. We break down the wiggleness of the world into comprehensible, countable, geometrical units, and thereby figure it and construct it in those terms. And this is so successful up to a point that we can of course come to imagine that this is the way the physical world really is – discreet, discontinuous, full of points, and in fact a mechanism.

But I want to just put into your mind the notion that this may the prejudice of a certain personality type. You see, in the history of philosophy, and poetry, and art we always find the interchanges of two personality types which I call “prickles” and “goo.” The prickly people are advocates of intellectual porcupinism. They want a rigor, they want precise statistics and they have a certain clipped attitude in their voices, and you know, very well

known in academic circles where there are the people who are always edgy like that. And they accuse other people of being disgustingly vague, miasmic, and mystical. But the vague, miasmic, and mystical people accuse the prickly people of being mere skeletons with no flesh on their bones. They say, "You just rattle. You are not really a human being. You know the words but you don't know the music." So therefore, if you belong to the prickly type, you hope that the ultimate constituent of matter is particles. If you belong to the gooey type you hope it is waves. If you are prickly you are a classicist; and if you are gooey you are a romanticist. Going back into medieval philosophy, if you are prickly you are a nominalist; if you are gooey you are a realist, and so it goes.

But we know very well that this natural universe is neither prickles nor goo exclusively. It is gooey prickles and prickly goo. You see, all depends on your level of magnification. If you have got your magnification on something so that the focus is clear, you have got a prickly point of view, you've got structure and shape clearly outlined and sharply defined. You go a little out of focus and it goes blaa, and you've got goo. But we are always playing with the two because, it's like the question is "Is the world basically stuff, like matter, or is it basically structure?" We find out, of course today that in science we don't consider the idea of matter of being some sort of stuff because, supposing you wanted to describe "stuff", what terms would you use to describe it? You always have to describe it in terms of structure, something countable, something that can be designated as a pattern. So we never get to any basic stuff. It seems to me that this way of thinking is based on a form of consciousness which we could best call "scanning." The capacity to divide experiences into bits is somehow related to a physical facility which corresponds to the sweeping of a radar beam, or a spotlight, over the environment. The advantage of the spotlight is it gives you intensely concentrated light on restricted areas. A floodlight, by comparison, has less intensity. But if you examine, say this room were in total darkness, and you used the spotlight with a very thin beam and you scanned the room with it, you would have to retain in memory all the areas over which it passed and then, by an additive process, you would make out the contours of the room.

Now it seems to me that this is something in which civilized man, both in the East and in the West, has specialized. In a method of paying attention to things which we call “noticing,” and therefore it is highly selective. It picks out, features in the environment which we say are noteworthy and which we therefore register with a notation, be it the notation of words, the notation of numbers, or such a notation as algebra or music. We notice those things, only those things, for which we have notation. When very often child will point at something and say to its parents, “What is that?” and they are not clear what the child is pointing, the child has pointed to something which we consider that is not a “thing.” The child has pointed to, say an areas of funny pattern on a dirty wall, and has noticed a figure on it. But the child does not have a word for it and says, “What’s that?” The adult says, “Oh, that’s just a mess,” because that does not count for us as a thing. When you come through this understanding: “What do you mean by a thing?”, it is very fascinating to ask children: “What do you mean by the thing?” and they do not know because it is one of the unexamined suppositions of the culture. “What do you mean by an event?” Well, everybody knows what an event is but nobody can say, because a thing is a “think.” It is a unit of thought, like an inch is a unit of measurement. So we “thing” the world, which is to say that in order to measure a curve you have to reduce it to point instance, and apply the calculus, so in exactly the same way, in order to discuss or talk about the universe you have to reduce it to things. But each thing, or “think,” is, as it were, one grasp of that spotlight, going yeh-yeh-yeh, like this, you see. So, we reduce the infinite wiggleness of the world to grasps, or bits, we are getting back to biting, you see, the idea of teeth, to grasp of thoughts. So we thereby describe the world in terms of things, just as that fisherman could describe his view by the number of net-hole over and through which the view was showing, and this has been the immensely and apparently successful enterprise of all technological culture, superbly emphasized by ourselves.

The Western model of the universe is political, and engineering or architectural. And therefore as one understands the operations of a machine by analysis of its parts, by separating them into their original bits, we have “bitted” the cosmos, and see everything going on in terms of bits, bits of information. And I have found that this is an extremely fruitful enabling us

to control what is happening. After all, the whole of Western technology is the result of “bitting.” And so we “thing” the world, that is to say that in order to measure a curve you have to reduce it to point instance, and apply the calculus, so in exactly the same way, in order to discuss or talk about the universe you have to reduce it to things. But each thing, or “think,” is, as it work, one grasp of that spotlight, going (yeh-yeh-yeh) like this, you see. So, we reduce the infinite wiggleness of the world to grasps, or bits, we are getting back to biting, you see, the idea of teeth, to grasp of thoughts. So we thereby describe the world in terms of things, just as that fisherman could describe his view by the number of net-hole over through which the view was showing.

But the problem that arises is this: first of all, very obviously, everybody knows , I hardly need to mention it, go to the science of medicine. You’ve got a specialist who really understands the function of the gallbladder and has studied gallbladders ad infinitum, and he really thinks he knows all about it. But whenever he looks at a human being he sees them in terms of gallbladder. So, if he operates on the gallbladder, he may do so very knowledgeably about that particular area of your organism but he does not foresee the unpredictable effects of this operation in other connected areas, because the human being’s gallbladder is not a “thing” in the same way as a spark plug in a car can be extracted and a new one replaced. Because the system isn’t the same. There is a fundamental difference between a mechanism and an organism, which can be described operationally. A mechanism is assembled; you add this bit to that bit, to that bit, to that bit. But an organism grows, that is to say, when you watch in a microscope a solution in which crystals are forming, you do not see this thing of little bits coming, coming, coming and drawing each other, and finally making up a shape. You see a solution where, it is more like watching a photographic plate developing. Suddenly the whole area which you are watching seems to organize itself, to develop, to make sense, moving from the relatively simple and gooey to the relatively structured and prickly. But not by addition.

So then, if we are trying to control and understand the world through conscious attention which is a scanning system, which takes in everything bit, bit, bit, bit, bit, what we are going to run into is, if that’s the only

method we rely on, everything is going to appear increasingly to complicated to manage. So that you get for example, let us take the problem of the electronics industry. The catalogs of products that are being produced over the world by the electronic industry. Who has read all the catalogs? How do you know whether something you are working on is patented or not? Who else has taken out a patent? Has anybody had time to read all the catalogs? Well nobody has, they are just voluminous, and it is exactly the same in almost any other field. There is an information explosion like the population explosion, how on earth are you going to scan all that information? Yes, of course, you can get computers to help you in this direction but by Parkinson's Law the sooner you become more efficient in doing this, the more the thing is going to develop, so that you will have to have more efficient computers still to assimilate all the information. You may get ahead, but only for a short time.

So you see there's this problem of the sort of competition of consciousness, of it's—how fast can you go doo-te-doo doo-te-doo de doo-te-doo de doo-te-doo de doo-te-doo and keep track of it, you see? You say, 'I've got a good memory, I can keep track of that.' And you say to you, 'I'll bet you you can't, I'll go more complicated than you.' Musicians do this, drummers you know? And they get things going, and they start—so long as they can count, and lots of musicians do count, it's crazy, but they do—and they count count count and they out-complicate each other to the point where, you can't retain it any longer in memory. So you say, 'OK, if I can't retain it we've got this gadget here that can, and we've got these um marvelous mechanical memories and they'll retain it. They'll go much more fancy, they'll go de doo-te-doo at a colossal speed zwwiiip like that, you see? But it's the same old problem. Because you'll get something that can outdo that.

So we end up asking that, yes. But supposing if there were some other way of understanding things. Let us go back from the spotlight to the floodlight, to the extraordinary capacity of the human nervous system to comprehend situations instantaneously without analysis, that is to say without verbal or numerical symbolism of the situation in order to understand it. I hope you understand what I mean. We – we do do that. We have this curious ability of pattern recognition, which the mechanical systems have only in a very primitive way. Xerox have put out a machine which recognizes figures

written in almost anyone's handwriting provided their handwriting is a fairly grade-school and normal. But a computer has a terrible time trying to recognize the letter "A" when it is printed in say, san serif, gothic, longhand, or whatever kind of "A" you may write. The human recognizes instantly this pattern but the computer is at a disadvantage here. It seems to lack a kind of capacity I would call "field organization" because it is all punctive, it's digital, dut dut dut dut, like a newspaper photograph which, when you look at it under a microscope, is all dots. So the problem is this: in developing technology, are we leaving out of consideration our strongest suit, which is the brain itself. See, we are in a situation where the brain is still not really worked out by even the most competent neurologists. It puzzles them, they cannot give a model of the brain in numerical or verbal language. Now, you are that, you see? You are this thing, you yourself are these things which you yourself cannot figure out. In the same way that I cannot touch the tip of this finger with the tip of this finger, I can't bite my own teeth. But I who is attempting to touch the tip of this finger with this finger am by the sheer complexity of my structure far more evolved than any system which I can imagine. This is, in a way, slightly akin to the "girdle theorem", that you cannot have a system of logic, which defines its own axioms. The axioms of any given system must always be defined in terms of a higher system. So you are the most complex thing that has yet been encountered in the cosmos, and you can't figure you out.

Now let us suppose that we are going to try to do that and become, as it were, completely transparent to ourselves so that we could entirely understand the organization or the mechanics of our own brains. What happens when we do that? Well, you are back in the situation of God, and when you are God what are you going to do? When you're God, what you're going to do: you are going to say to yourself, "Man, get lost." Because what you want is a surprise, and when you have figured everything out there will be no more surprises, you will be completely bored. But on the other hand, a person, I would say, who is really functioning completely is basically a person who trusts his own brains and permits his brain to operate at a more optimal level. In other words, he knows how to think things out but he makes his best discoveries without thinking. In other words, you all know very well the processes of creative invention, you've got a problem you think it over but you can't find any answer to it because

the digital system of thinking is too simple, too clumsy to deal with it. It's more complex, there're more variables than can be kept in mind at one time, so you say, "I will sleep on it." Or you go to the Institute of Advanced Studies at Princeton, or of Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, where they paying to goof off, which is an excellent idea. And you moon around and you've got a blackboard and you look out and pick your nose and so on, and your brain eventually hands you the solution to the problem. And you immediately, because you have the technical knowledge, you recognize that's a solution. Then naturally you go back and check it and you work it out in the bit-by-bit form of thinking on it and see if does it come out in those terms. And if it does, everybody will agree with you, "Yes, that is the answer." But if it doesn't come out in those terms they will not agree with you because you have not subjected it to the socially acceptable traditional form of analyzing knowledge.

But here is the problem. It takes an awfully long time to check these things out, it takes an awfully long time to arrive at the solution which you've got, like that, by a purely calculated process. Most of the situations in life are such that they do not wait for us to make up our minds. So an enormous amount of carefully worked-out scientific knowledge is trivial. It is all very well, very finely worked out, but much too late because life presents you, life comes at you from all sides, all over everywhere at once. And the only thing you've got to deal with that is the thing inside here, in the skull.

Now, I am not saying this, to put down all this marvelous work of calculation, brought to immense sophistication electronically and so on. No at all, because actually, you people are the first people to understand the limitations of their own kind of knowledge, and you are going to have to tell the politicians about this, they don't understand. They think that this kind of knowledge is the answer to everything and I think most of us know it is not. Which is not something, I repeat, against technology. I'm only saying, when you walk you put your right foot forward, and that is fine, but then you must put your left foot forward. So that's say, the great technological enterprise has been putting the right foot forward but you must bring up the left foot, that is to say, bring up reevaluation, a new respect for the organic type of organization which is incomprehensible to technological thinking but which always underlies it. That by itself doesn't

work because after you bring the left foot up you have again got to bring up the right foot, the analytic, after goo comes prickles, and after prickles comes goo. We have to keep these things up.

I think our danger at the present time is that we are so heady, so delighted with the results of prickles, that we have to allow a little bit of goo back into the system. Well now, what we have to try and do is, I think, to work out a way of making the brain itself more efficient, and this is the thing that civilized education has neglected. Lynn White, I have to quote him again, used to say that, the academic world today only values three kinds of intelligence: verbal intelligence, mnemonic intelligence, in other words remembering, and computational intelligence. He said it entirely neglects kinesthetic intelligence, social intelligence, and at least seven other kinds of intelligence. But it is the extraordinary capacity of the neural organization say, to engage in pattern recognition and in solving instantly certain complex problems without knowing how it does it. The trouble is, when you do something you do not know how to do, you've got a non-repeatable experiment, in a certain sense. In other words, you cannot explain to someone else how to put it together, but you can do it like you can open and close your hand without any knowledge of physiology. You do it every time. Oops, I don't know how you do it, I just do it, you see? So we have an enormous potential of intelligence, of knowing how to do all sorts of things, which to the extent that we are academically minded people, we will not allow ourselves to do because we cannot explain it. For example, there is a way of cooling a blazing furnace, very simple, but engineers say it is theoretically impossible, it cannot happen, it's like bees that cannot fly by the laws of aerodynamics but they do. So, the rather practical issue I come to is this: that technology, if it relies exclusively on linear thinking, is going to destroy the environment. It is going to become too complicated to handle, man is going to be like the dinosaur which had to have a brain in its head and a brain in its rump because it was so big. You know, the caveman kept a dinosaur, and when he went to bed at night he'd clump it on the tail with a club, and it would scream at eight o'clock in the morning, wake him up. It seems to me we are getting into that kind of saurian situation with our technology, which it is going to lead us to extinction.

So the question is: are we going to foul things up by insisting on using linear input, information and controlling it, as the dominant tool of controlling the world? Or can we master all that as we have done and still use the linear input and analysis but with a fundamental trust in our power to assimilate multiple inputs, although we really do not know how we do it? My point is that you cannot find an absolute which you can pin down, you see, so there always remains in any human operation the basic central thing which you cannot pin down because it is you, just as teeth cannot bite themselves. Now, the assumption of Judeo-Christian culture is that man in his nature is sinful, and therefore cannot be trusted. The assumption of at least ancient Chinese culture is that man in his essential nature is good, and therefore has to be trusted. Because they say to us, "If you cannot trust your own basic nature you cannot really rely on the idea that you are untrustworthy, therefore you are hopelessly fouled up." So this has an amazing political and other consequences, this different assumption. If we say, "No, we human beings are fallible, and basically selfish, and really, really fundamentally evil, therefore we need law and order and a control system to put us in order." We thereby project these control systems onto the church or the police, or onto somebody who is really ourselves disguised. They are like daylight saving time. Everybody could simply get up an hour earlier, but instead of doing that we alter the clock because a clock is a kind of authority, and we say "Well, the clock says it is time for you to get up." The Indians, the Amer Indians laugh at the "palefaces" because they say, "The paleface, he doesn't know when he is hungry until he looks at his watch." So in this way we become clock-dominated, and the abstract system takes over from the physical, organic situation. And this is my big pitch, if I'm gonna make a big pitch, is that we run into a cultural situation where we have confused the symbol with the physical reality, the money with the wealth, and the menu with the dinner, and we are starving on eating menus.

Myth of Myself

I believe that if we are honest with ourselves, that the most fascinating problem in the world is "Who am I?" What do you mean, what do you feel when you say the word "I", "I, Myself"? I do not think there can be any more fascinating preoccupation than that because it is so mysterious, it's so

elusive. Because what you are in your inmost being escapes your examination in rather the same way that you can not look directly into your own eyes without using a mirror, you can't bite your own teeth, you can't taste your own tongue and you can't touch the tip of this finger with the tip of this finger. And that is why there is always an element of profound mystery in the problem of who we are. This problem has fascinated me for many years and I have made many enquiries "What do you mean by the word I?" And there is a certain consensus about this, a certain agreement, especially among people who live in Western civilization.

Most of us feel "I" – ego, myself, my source of consciousness – to be a center of awareness and of a source of action that resides in the middle of a bag of skin and so we have what I have called the conception of ourselves as a skin-encapsulated ego. It is very funny how we use the word "I", if we just refer to common speech, we are not accustomed to say, "I am a body." We rather say, "I have a body." We do not say, "I beat my heart" in the same way as we say, "I walk, I think, I talk." We feel that our heart beats itself, and that has nothing very much to do with "I." In other words, we do not regard "I, myself" as identical with our whole physical organism. We regard it as something inside it, and most Western people locate their ego inside their heads. You are somewhere between your eyes and between your ears, and the rest of you dangles from that point of reference. It is not so in other cultures. When a Chinese or Japanese person wants to locate the center of himself, he points (here, not here, here) to what Japanese call the kokoro or the Chinese call shin, the heart-mind. Some people also locate themselves in the solar plexus, but by and large we locate ourselves behind the eyes and somewhere between the ears. As if within the dome of the skull there was some sort of arrangement such as there is at the SAC (Air Force) headquarters in Denver where there are men in great rooms surrounded with radar screens and all sorts of things, and earphones on, watching all the movements of planes all over the world. So, in the same way, we have really the idea of ourselves as a little men inside our heads who has earphones on which bring messages from the ears, and who has a television set in front of him which brings messages from the eyes, and all sorts of electrode things all over his body giving him signals from the hands, and so on. He has a panel in front of him with buttons and dials and things, and so he more or less controls the body. But he is not the same as the body

because “I” am in charge of what are called the voluntary actions, and what are called the involuntary actions of the body they happen to me. I am pushed around by them, but to some extent also I can push my body around. This, I have concluded, is the ordinary, average conception of what is one’s self.

Look at the way children, influenced by our cultural environment, ask questions. “Mommy, who would I have been if my father had been someone else?” You see, the child gets the idea from our culture that the father and mother gave him a body into which he was popped at some moment; whether it was conception or whether it was parturition is a little bit vague, but there is in our whole way of thinking the idea that we are a soul, a spiritual essence of some kind, imprisoned inside a body. And that we look out upon a world that is foreign to us, in the words of the poet Housman: “I, a stranger and afraid, in a world I never made.” So therefore we speak of confronting reality, facing the facts. We speak of coming into this world, and this whole sensation that we are brought up to have of being an island of consciousness locked up in a bag of skin, facing outside us, a world that is profoundly alien to us in the sense that what is outside “me” is not me, this sets up a fundamental sensation of hostility and estrangement between ourselves and the so-called external world. Therefore we go on to talk about the conquest of nature, the conquest of space, and view ourselves in a kind of battle array towards the world outside us. I shall have much more to say about that in the second lecture, but in the first now I want to examine the strange feeling of being an isolated self.

Now actually it is absolutely absurd to say that we came into this world. We did not: we came out of it! What do you think you are? Supposing this world is a tree. Are you leaves on its branches or are you a bunch of birds that settled on a dead old tree from somewhere else? Surely everything that we know about living organisms – from the standpoint of the sciences – shows us that we grow out of this world, that we, each one of us, are what you might call a symptoms of the state of the universe as a whole. But you see, that is not part of our common sense.

Western man has, for many centuries, been under the influence of two great myths. When I use the word “myth” I don’t necessarily mean falsehood. To

me the word myth signifies a great idea in terms of which man tries to make sense with the world; it may be an idea, it may be an image. Now the two images which have most profoundly influenced Western man are: number one – the image of the world as an artifact, like a carpenter’s table or a jar made by a potter. Indeed, in the Book of Genesis there comes the idea that man was originally a clay figurine made out of the Earth by the Lord God who then breathed into this clay figurine and gave it life. The whole of Western thought is profoundly influenced through and through by the idea that all things – all events, all people, all mountains, all stars, all flowers, all grasshoppers, all worms, everything – are artifacts; they have been made. And it is therefore natural for a Western child to say to its mother, “How was I made?” That would be quite an unnatural question for a Chinese child, because the Chinese do not think of nature as something made. They look upon it as something that grows, and the two processes are quite different. When you make something you put it together: you assemble parts, or you carve an image out of wood or stone, working from the outside to the inside. But when you watch something grow, it works in an entirely different way. It doesn’t assemble parts. It expands from within and gradually complicates itself, expanding outwards, like a bud blossoming, like a seed turning into a plant.

But behind our whole thought in the West is the idea that the world is an artifact, that it is put together by a celestial architect, carpenter, and artist, who therefore knows how it was done. When I was a little boy and I asked many questions which my mother could not answer, she used to resort in desperation to saying, “My dear, there are some things that we are not meant to know,” and I would say, “Well, will we ever find out?” And she said, “Yes, when we die and we go to Heaven it will all be made clear.” And I used to think that on wet afternoons in Heaven we would all sit around the throne of grace and say to the Lord God, “Now, just why did you do it this way, and how did you manage at that?” and He would explain it and make it all very clear. All questions would be answered because, as we have in popular theology understood the Lord God, He is the mastermind who knows everything. And if you ask the Lord God exactly how high is Mount Whitney to the nearest millimeter, He would know exactly like that, and would tell you. Any question, because He is like the Encyclopedia Britannica. Unfortunately, this particular image, or myth, became too much

for Western man because it was oppressive to feel that you are known through and through, and watched all the time by an infinitely just judge.

I have a friend, a very enlightened woman, she is a Catholic convert, but very enlightened Catholic, and in her bathroom she has on the pipe that connects the tank with the toilet seat a little framed picture of an eye. And underneath in Gothic letters is written "Thou God seest me." Everywhere is this eye – watching, watching, watching – watching and judging you, so that you always feel you are never really by yourself. The old gentleman is observing you and writing notes in his black book, and this became too much for the West, became oppressive. They had to get rid of it, and so instead we got another myth, the myth of the purely mechanical universe. This was invented at the end of the eighteenth century, became increasingly fashionable throughout the course of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, so that today it is common sense. Very few people today really believe in God in the old sense. They say they do, but they really hope there is a God, they don't really have faith in God. They fervently wish that there was one, and feel that they ought to believe that there is, but the idea of the universe being ruled by that marvelous old gentleman is no longer plausible. It isn't that anybody has disproved it, but it just somehow does not go with the vast infinitude of galaxies and of the immense light-year distances between them, and so on.

Instead, it has become fashionable, and it is nothing more than a fashion, to believe that the universe is dumb, stupid, that intelligence, values, love, and fine feelings reside only within the bag of the human epidermis, and outside that it is simply a kind of a chaotic, stupid interaction of blind forces. Courtesy of Dr. Freud, for example, biological life is based on something called "libido," which was a very, very loaded word. Blind, ruthless, uncomprehending lust, that's the foundation of the human unconscious, and similarly to thinkers of the nineteenth century like Ernst Hegel, even Darwin, and T.H. Huxley and so on, there was this notion that at the root of being is an energy, and this energy is blind. This energy is just energy, and it is utterly and totally stupid, and our intelligence is an unfortunate accident. By some weird freak of evolution we came to be these feeling and rational beings, more or less rational, and this is a ghastly mistake because here we

are in a universe that has nothing in common with us. It does not share our feelings, has no real interest in us, we are just a sort of cosmic fluke.

And therefore, the only hope for mankind is to beat this irrational universe into submission, and conquer it, master it. Now all of this is perfectly idiotic. If you would think that the idea of the universe has been the creation of a benevolent old gentleman, although He is not so benevolent, He takes sort of “this hurts me more than it is going to hurt you”, sort of attitude to things. You can have that on the one hand, and if that becomes uncomfortable you can exchange it for its opposite, the idea that the ultimate reality does not have any intelligence at all, at least that would get rid of the old bogey in the sky in exchange for a picture of the world that is completely stupid.

Now, these ideas don't make any sense, especially the last one, because you cannot get an intelligent organism, such as a human being, out of an unintelligent universe. The same in the New Testament, that figs do not grow on thistles nor grapes on thorns – applies equally to the world. You do not find an intelligent organism living in an unintelligent environment. Look, here is a tree in the garden, and every summer it produces apples; and we call it an apple tree because the tree “apples” – that's what it does. All right? Now, here is a solar system inside a galaxy, and one of the peculiarities of this solar system is that, at least on the planet earth, it “peoples” in just the same way that an apple tree “apples.” Now, maybe two million years ago, somebody came from another galaxy in a flying saucer and had a look at this solar system, and they looked it over and shrugged their shoulders and said, “Just a bunch of rocks,” and they went away. Later on, maybe two million years later, they came around and they looked at it again and they said, “Excuse me, we thought it was a bunch of rocks but it is peopling, and it is alive after all; it has done something intelligent.” Because you see, we grow out of this world in exactly the same way that the apples grow on the apple tree. If evolution means anything, it means that. But you see, we curiously twist it. We say, “Well, first of all in the beginning there was nothing but gas and rock. And then intelligence happened to arise in it like a sort of fungus or slime on the top of the whole thing.” And we are thinking in a way that disconnects the intelligence from the rocks. Where there are rocks, watch out, watch out! because the rocks

are going eventually to come alive and they are going to have people crawling over them. It is only a matter of time, just in the same way as the seed, the acorn is eventually going to turn into the oak because it has the potentiality of that within it. Rocks are not dead.

You see, it depends on what kind of attitude you want to take to the world. If you want to put the world down, you say, "Oh well, fundamentally it is only just a lot of geology, it's a stupidity, and it so happens that a kind of a freak comes up in it which we call consciousness." That is an attitude that you take when you want to prove to people that you are a tough guy, that you are realistic, that you face facts, and that you don't indulge in wishful thinking. It's just a matter of role-playing, and you must be aware of these things; they're fashions in the intellectual world. On the other hand, if you feel warmhearted towards the universe, you put it up, instead of putting it down, and you say about rocks, "They are really conscious, but a very primitive form of consciousness." Because, after all, when I take even this crystal here, which is glass, and go (I tap on it), well it makes a noise. And that response, that resonance is an extremely primitive form of consciousness. Our consciousness is much more subtle than that, but when you hit a bell and it rings, you touch a crystal and it responds, inside itself it has a very simple reaction. It goes "jangle" inside, whereas we go "jangle" with all sorts of colors and lights and intelligence, ideas, and thoughts, it is more complicated. But both are equally conscious, but conscious in different degrees. That is a perfectly acceptable idea. It's just the opposite of the idea, you see, all I am saying is that minerals are a rudimentary form of consciousness, whereas the other people are saying that consciousness is a complicated form of minerals. You see? What they want to do is to say everything is kind of bleh, whereas what I want to say is "Hooray! Let's a life is a good show!"

As we study man or any other living organism and try to describe him accurately and scientifically, we find that our normal sensation of ourselves as isolated egos inside a bag of skin is a hallucination. It really is it's absolutely nutty, because when you describe human behavior, or the behavior of a mouse or a rat or a chicken or anything you want to describe, you find that as you try to describe its behavior accurately, you must also describe the behavior of its environment. Supposing I walk and you want to describe the action of walking, you cannot talk about my walking without

also describing the floor, because if you do not describe the floor and the space in which I am moving all you will be describing is somebody swinging his legs in empty space. So as to describe my walking, you must describe the space in which you find me. You know, you couldn't see me unless you could also see my background, what stands behind me. See, if I myself, if the boundaries of my skin were coterminous with your whole field of vision you would not see me at all. You would see my bright, red vest instead. That's why put it on this evening and to demonstrate this point. And that would be the thing that filled your field of vision, that was the thing standing there, you would not see me, because in order to see me you have to see not only what is inside the boundary of my skin, but you have to see what is outside it too.

Now, that is terribly important. Really, the fundamental, ultimate mystery – the only thing you need to know to understand the deepest metaphysical secrets – is this: that for every outside there is an inside and for every inside there is an outside, and although they are different, they go together. There is, in other words, a secret conspiracy between all insides and all outsides, and the conspiracy is this: to look as different as possible, and yet underneath to be identical. Because you do not find one without the other. Like Tweedledum and Tweedledee agreed to have a battle. Note that – agreed. So there is a secret: what is esoteric, what is profound, and what is deep is what we will call the “implicit.” What is obvious and in the open is what we will call the “explicit.” And I and my environment, you and your environment are explicitly as different as different could be, but implicitly you go together. And this is discovered by the scientist, when he tries, with the whole art of sciences describe what happens exactly, when he describe exactly what you do, he finds out that you, your behavior, is not something that can be separated from the behavior of the world around you. He realizes then that you are something that the whole world is doing, just as when the sea has waves on it, all right, you see is the ocean is waving. So each one of us is a “waving” of the whole cosmos, the entire works, all there is, and with each one of us it is waving and saying, “Yoo-hoo! Here I am!”, only does it differently each time, because variety is the spice of life.

But you see, the funny thing is we have not been brought up to feel that way. Instead of feeling that we, each one of us, are something that the

whole realm of being is doing, we feel that we are something that has come into the whole realm of being as a stranger. When we were born we do not really know where we came from because we do not remember, and we think when we die that is just going to be that. Some people console themselves with the idea that they are going to Heaven, or that they are going to be reincarnated, summer land or something you know, but people don't really believe that. For most people it is implausible, and the real thing that haunts them is that when they die they will go to sleep and are never going to wake up. They are going to be locked up in the safe deposit box of darkness forever. But that all depends, you see, upon a false notion of what is one's self. Now, the reason why we have this false notion of ourselves is, as far as I can understand it, that we have specialized in one particular kind of consciousness. Being very general, rough, we have two kinds of consciousness. One I will call the "spotlight," and the other the "floodlight." The spotlight is what we call conscious attention, and that is trained into us from childhood as the most valuable form of consciousness. When the teacher in class says, "Pay attention!" everybody stares, and looks right at the teacher (like that). That is spotlight consciousness; fixing your mind on one thing at a time. Concentrate, and even though you may not be able to have a very long attention span, nevertheless you concentrate, you use your spotlight: one thing after another, one thing after another, flip, flip, flip, flip, flip, like that. But we also have another kind of consciousness which I call the floodlight. For example, you can drive your car for several miles with a friend sitting next to you, and your spotlight consciousness will be completely absorbed in talking to your friend. Nevertheless, your floodlight consciousness will manage the driving of the car, will notice all the stoplights, the other idiots on the road, and so on, and you will get there safely without even thinking about it.

But our culture has taught us to specialize in spotlight consciousness, and to identify ourselves with that form of consciousness alone. "I am my spotlight consciousness, my conscious attention; that is my ego; that is me." And very largely we ignore the floodlight. The floodlight consciousness is working all the time, every nerve end that we have is its instrument. You know, you can go out to a luncheon or something, and you sit next to Mrs. So-and-So, and you go home and your wife says to you,

“Was Mrs. So-and-So there?”

“Yes, I sat next to her.”

“Well, what was she wearing?”

“I haven’t the faintest idea.”

You saw, but you did not notice. Now, because we have been brought up to identify ourselves with the spotlight consciousness, and the floodlight consciousness is undervalued, we have the sensation of ourselves as being just the spotlight, just the ego that looks and attends to this and that and the other. And so we ignore and are unaware of the vast, vast extent of our being. People, who by various methods become fully aware of their floodlight consciousness, have what is called “a mystical experience” or a cosmic consciousness or what the Buddhists call bodhi, awakening. The Hindus call it moksha, liberation, because they discover that the real deep, deep self, that which you really are, fundamentally and forever, is the whole of being – all that there is, the works, that is you. Only that universal self that is you has a capacity to focus itself at ever so many different here-and-nows. So, when you use the word “I”, as William James said “is really a word of position like ‘this,’ or ‘here’.” Just as a sun or star has many rays, so the whole cosmos expresses itself in you and you and you, in all the different variations. It plays games: it plays the John Doe game, the Mary Smith game. It plays the beetle game, the butterfly game, the bird game, the pigeon game, the fish game, the star game. Just like these are games that differ from each other just like backgammon, whist, bridge, poker, pinochle; or like the waltz, mazurka, minuet, and so on. It dances with infinite variety, but every single dance that it does, that is to say – you – is what the whole thing is doing. But you see, we forget it, we do not know. We are brought up in a special way so that we are unaware of the connection, unaware that each one of us is the works, playing it this way for a while. So we have been taught to treat death as if that were the end of the show, that won’t happen any more. And therefore to be afraid of all the things that might bring about death: pain, sickness, suffering. And if you don’t know this, if you are not really vividly aware of the fact that you are basically “the works,” you have no real joy in life, you are just a bundle of

anxiety mixed up with guilt, because, you see, when we bring children into the world, we play awful games with them.

Instead of saying, “How do you do? Welcome to the human race. Now my dear, we are playing some very complicated games, and these are the rules of the game we are playing. I want you to understand them, and when you learn them when you get a little bit older you might be able to think up some better rules.” Instead of being quite direct with our children, we say, “You are here on probation, and you must understand that. Maybe when you grow up a bit you will be acceptable, but until then you should be seen and not heard. You are a mess, and you have to be educated and schooled and whipped until you are human.” So these attitudes which are inculcated into us from infancy go on into old age, the way you start out is liable to be the way you finish. So people are going around feeling fundamentally that they do not belong because their parents said to them in the first place, “Look, you don’t really belong here, you are here on sufferance. You are on probation. You are not a human being yet.” And people feel this right on into old age and so they figure that the universe is presided over by this kind of awful God-the-Father parent who has our best interest at heart, he’s loving, but “Who spares the rod, spoils the child. Whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth.” So, where is it going to hit next? You do not feel that you belong, and so we get this ghastly, what I call, “Christian ego,” and a little bit Jewish, too, who really feels that he is homeless, that he is orphan. Even the Christians say we are sons of God by adoption, grace; not real sons but only by adoption, grace, and sufferance. So there comes a sensation so characteristic of Western man and, indeed, of all highly civilized people, of being a stranger on the earth, a momentary flash of consciousness between two eternal blacknesses.

And so therefore we speak of confronting reality, facing the facts. We speak of coming into this world, and this whole sensation that we are brought up to have of being an island of consciousness locked up in a bag of skin, facing outside us, a world that is profoundly alien to us in the sense that what is outside “me” is not me, this sets up a fundamental sensation of hostility and estrangement between ourselves and the so-called external world.

So, my main point last night was then, that we need a new kind of consciousness in which every individual becomes aware that his real self is not just his conscious ego. You know, let's take a headlight of a car. The headlight shines on the road in front, the headline does not shine on the wire which connects it with its own battery. So, in a way, the headlight is unaware of how it shines, and in the same way we are unaware of the sources of our consciousness. We do not know how we know. There was a young man who said, "Though it seems that I know that I know, what I would like to see is the I that knows me, when I know that I know that I know." And so, we are ignorant of, we ignore, it does not come within the scope of our attention how it is that we manage to be conscious, how it is that we manage to grow our hair, to shape our bones, to beat our heart, and to secrete all the necessary fluids that we need from our glands. We do it, but we do not know how we do it. Because you see, underneath the superficial self, which pays attention to this and that, there is another self more really "us" than "I." And if you become aware of the unknown self – the more you become aware of it – the more you realize that it is inseparably connected with everything else that there is. That you are a function of this total galaxy, bounded by the Milky Way, and that farther more this galaxy is a function of all other galaxies. And that vast thing that you see far off, far off with great telescopes, and you look and look, and one day you are going to wake up and say, "Why, that is me!" and in knowing that you know that you'll never die. You are the eternal thing that comes and goes, that appears now as John Jones, now as Mary Smith, now as Betty Brown; and so it goes, forever and ever and ever.

Most of us are brought up to feel that what we see out in front of us is something that is, that lies beyond our eyes out here. That the colors and the shapes that you see in this room, are out there. Now, in fact that is not so, in fact all that you see is a stated affairs inside your head. All these colors, all these lights are conditions of the optical nervous system. There are outside the eyes quanta, electronic phenomenon, vibrations but these things are not light, there are not color until there are translated into states of the human nervous system. So if you want to know how the inside of your head feels, open your eyes and look, that is how the inside of your head feels. But we are normally unaware of that and project it out.

Man and Nature

In my talk last night I was discussing the disparity between the way in which most human beings experience their own existence, and the way man's being and nature is described in the sciences. I was pointing out that in such sciences as ecology and biology, ecology for example describes and studies the relationship between all organisms and their environments. The way in which they describe human, animal, and insect behavior is in flat contradiction with the way in which most of us experience our thinking, our action, and our existence. We have been brought up to experience ourselves as isolated centers of awareness and action, placed in a world that is not us, that is foreign, alien, other, which we confront. Whereas, in fact, the way an ecologist describes human behavior is as an action. What you do is what the whole universe is doing at the place you call "here and now". You are something the whole universe is doing in the same way that a wave is something that the whole ocean is doing.

This is not what you might call a fatalistic or deterministic idea. You see, you might be a fatalist if you think that you are a sort of puppet which life pushes around. You are separate from life, but life dominates you. That's fatalism. But in the point of view I am expressing, the real you is not a puppet which life pushes around. The real deep down you is the whole universe, and it is doing your living organism and all of its behavior, it's expressing it as a singer sings a song. We have been hoodwinked into the feeling that we exist only inside our skins, and I was showing last night that that is a hallucination. It is just as nutty as anybody could be, like a fruitcake, you know, who thinks he is Napoleon or something another, thinks he is a poached egg and goes around finding a piece of toast to sit on. It is just like that, a hallucination. And I was showing how we need to experience ourselves in such a way that we could say that our real body is not just what is inside the skin but our whole total external environment. Because, if we do not experience ourselves that way, we mistreat our environment. We treat it as an enemy. We try to beat it into submission, and if we do that, comes disaster. We exploit the world we live in, we do not treat it with love and gentleness and respect. We cut down millions of acres of forests to turn it into newspaper, of all things. Lovely trees turned into information about nothing, and we do not replace them properly. We kick

the world around in revenge for feeling that really we are puppets which the world kicks around.

So, my main point last night was then that we need a new kind of consciousness in which every individual becomes aware that his real self is not just his conscious ego. You know, let's take a headlight of a car. The headlight shines on the road in front, the headline does not shine on the wire which connects it with its own battery. So, in a way, the headlight is unaware of how it shines, and in the same way we are unaware of the sources of our consciousness. We do not know how we know. There was a young man who said, "Though it seems that I know that I know, what I would like to see is the I that knows me, when I know that I know that I know." And so, we are ignorant of, we ignore, it does not come within the scope of our attention how it is that we manage to be conscious, how it is that we manage to grow our hair, to shape our bones, to beat our heart, and to secrete all the necessary fluids that we need from our glands. We do it, but we do not know how we do it. Because you see, underneath the superficial self, which pays attention to this and that, there is another self more really "us" than "I." And if you become aware of that unknown self – the more you become aware of it – the more you realize that it is inseparably connected with everything else that there is. That you are a function of this total galaxy, bounded by the Milky Way, and that furthermore this galaxy is a function of all other galaxies. And that vast thing that you see far off, far off with telescopes, and you look and look, one day you are going to wake up and say, "Why, that's me!" and in knowing that you know, you see, that you never die. You are the eternal thing that comes and goes, that appears now as John Jones, now as Mary Smith, now as Betty Brown; so it goes, forever and ever and ever.

Now then, why I made this point as an introduction to what I want to say tonight is the problem of the relationship of man and nature. You know, in the history of philosophy there are really three theories of nature. Incidentally, what do you mean when you use the word "nature"? What is nature study, natural history, the Museum of Natural History, what do you expect to find there? Well, for many people nature means the birds, the bees, and the flowers. It means everything that is not artificial. People think, for example, a building like this is not natural; it is artificial. The natural

state of the human being is to be naked, but we wear clothes, and that's artificial. We build houses. Is there any difference between a human house and a wasp's nest or a bird's nest? Not really, but we do have in our minds, you see, the idea that nature is somehow outside us. We have got some nature in us, and we say there is a thing called human nature, that's mostly bad. Human nature, according to Dr. Freud, is motivated by the libido, and you know what that is and you cannot trust it. In the old days they used to beat it with whips, but Freud said, "Don't do it that way! You have to treat it as a good horse trainer trains a horse by giving it a lump of sugar every now and then, and get it control that way. Be kind to it and respect it, even though it is really very, very disrespectful."

Well now, there are, as I said, in the history of the mankind, three theories of nature. The first theory is the Western theory, which is that nature is a machine, or an artifact. We inherit this from the Hebrews who believed that nature was made by God in somewhat the same way as a potter makes a pot out of clay or a carpenter makes a table out of wood. It is not insignificant that Jesus is the son of a carpenter. Our tradition has been to look upon the world as a construct and somebody knows how it was put together. Somebody understands and that is the constructor, the architect, the Lord God. But it so happens that in the eighteenth century Western thought began to change. They became increasingly doubtful as to whether there was a maker – whether there was a God – but they continued to look upon the creation as an artifact, as a machine. And by the time of Newton, people were explaining the world in terms of mechanism and we are still under the influence of that idea because after all, things like life magazines and so on, when they give you an article on human physiology, they usually make drawings which show the human being as a kind of mechanism, as a sort of factory. And they show how the peristaltic action carries the food in and how it is processed by this organ and that organ, as just as if a certain product is fed into a factory, a cow at one end and comes out canned corned beef at the other. Just in such a way the human is illustrated and so in some kinds of rather degraded medicine, that is now practiced, when you go to the hospital for a medical examination, you are treated as a machine, they process you. You are not a person, you are putted in a wheelchair immediately even if you are perfectly healthy and can walk, nevertheless they have to have you in this wheelchair. And they put you through a

process and the heart specialist looks only at your heart, because he can't understand anything else. The otorhinolaryngologist, which means an ear, nose, and throat man, looks at that section of you, and he does not know about anything else. Then maybe a psychiatrist takes a look at you and goodness knows what happens there; and so on, and so on. Everybody looks at you from their specialized point of view as if they were a bunch of mechanics examining your automobile. Because as I said last night, we just ask for this because most of us consider ourselves as chauffeurs inside our bodies, which we own in the same way as we own a car. And when it goes wrong we take it to the mechanic to fix it. You don't really identify with our body, just as we do not really identify with your car. So here is this whole theory of nature which has grown up in the West, as an artifact, something made.

Now let me take a second theory of nature. This is an Indian theory, East Indian. Nature not as an artifact but as drama. Basic to all Hindu thought is the idea that the world is Maya. That is a Sanskrit word which means many things. It means magic, illusion, art, play. All the world is a stage, and in the Hindu idea of nature there is, the ultimate reality of the universe is the self which they call brahman, or atman. That is what there is; the Self – universal, eternal, boundless, indescribable – and everything that happens, happens on the Self, like you say “It's on me, the drinks tonight are on me,” or like we say when you hear the radio, “It's on the speaker.” You see, everything you hear on the radio, flutes, drums, human voices, traffic noises, any imaginable sound, all those sounds are vibrations of the diaphragm in the speaker. But the radio does not tell you that. The announcer does not come on and say every morning “Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, this is KQED. The following sounds that you are going to hear are vibrations of the diaphragm in your speaker, and they are not really human voices or musical instruments, but just that.” They never let you in on that, and in exactly the same way, the universe does not let you in on the truth that all sense experiences are vibrations of the self; not just your self, but the Self, and all of us share this Self in common because it is pretending to be all of us. Brahman, the ultimate principle, plays hide and seek eternally, and he does it for unspeakably long periods of time. The Hindus measure time in what is called a kalpa; K A L P A, that is 4,320,000 years. Don't take this seriously, this not meant to be taken literally, but just for an

unspeakably long time. The brahman, the self, pretends that it is lost, and is us. And all of our adventures and all our troubles, and all our agonies, tragedies, it gets mixed up in. Then, after the period of 4,320,000 years has elapsed, there is a catastrophe. The universe is destroyed in fire, and after that the Brahman wakes up and says, "Well, good, crazy! What an adventure that was!" He wipes the sweat off his brow and says, "Shwooo, let's rest a while." So, for another 4,320,000 years the Divine Self rests, and knows who It is. It's me. Then It says, "Well, this is rather boring. Let's get going again; let's get mixed up." And it does this in a very strange way because the way the Hindus time it, the first period of getting mixed up, getting lost is beautiful. That is the longest period. Everything is right, just life is glorious. Then there is the next period in which things get a little wonky. Something is vaguely out of order, that doesn't last so long. Then the next period, the third, is when good and evil are equally balanced, and that is still not so long. Finally comes the shortest period when everything bad triumphs, and the whole thing blows up and we begin all over again. We are supposed to be living in that now. It is called the Kali Yuga, the Age of Darkness, and it began on Friday, February the 23rd, 3123 B.C., and it has 5,000 years to run. But as it goes on, time gets faster, so do not worry. So you see, that's the theory of nature as a drama, it's a play.

Now, there is a third theory of nature which is Chinese, and this is very interesting. The Chinese word for nature they call tzu-jan, and this expression means "of itself, so", what happens of itself. Or we might say "spontaneity," it almost means "automatic," because automatic is what is self-moving, only we associate the word "automatic" with machinery. But tzu-jan, what-is-so-of-itself, is associated in the Chinese mind not with machinery but with biology. Your hair grows by itself; you do not have to think how to grow it. Your heart beats by itself; you do not have to make up your mind how to beat it. This is what they mean by nature. A poem says, "Sitting quietly, doing nothing, spring comes, and grass grows of itself." So there are principle of nature called the Tao, T A O, pronounced "dow" in the Mandarin dialect, "tow" in the Shanghai dialect, "toe" in the Cantonese dialect, take your choice.

Tao means the course of nature, and Lao-tzu, who was a philosopher who lived a little later than 400 B.C., wrote a book about the Tao. And he said,

“The Tao which can be spoken is not the eternal Tao.” You cannot describe it. He said the principle of the Tao is spontaneity, he said “the Great Tao flows everywhere, both to the left and to the right. It loves and nourishes all things but does not lord it over them. It accomplishes merits and lays no claim to them.” So there is a very great difference between the Chinese idea of Tao, as the informing principle of nature, and the Judeo-Christian idea of God as nature’s lord and master, because the Tao does not act as a boss. In the Chinese philosophy of nature, nature has no boss. There is no principle that forces things to behave the way they do, it is a completely democratic theory of nature. Correspondingly you see, most Westerners, whether they be Christians or non-Christians, do not trust nature. Of all things nature is the thing least to be trusted. You must manage it. You must watch out for it, it will always go wrong if you do not watch out, you know the goblins will get you if you do not watch out. So, we are always feeling that you can’t trust it. See, we are absolutely instilled with the idea of original sin. You cannot trust nature because it comes out with weeds and insects, and above all, you cannot trust human nature, because if you don’t hold a club over yourself, you go out and rape your grandmother.

Now, the Chinese would say, “If you cannot trust yourself you cannot trust anything, because if you cannot trust yourself can you trust your mistrust of yourself? Is that well-founded?” You see? If you can’t trust yourself, you are totally mixed up. You haven’t a leg to stand on, and you have no point of departure for anything. And in this respect, the Taoist philosophy and the Confucian philosophy are in agreement. In Confucius philosophy, the fundamental virtue of a human being is called jen, spelled J E N, for reasons best known to Chinese scholars. I don’t know what they are, but it is pronounced jen. It is a Chinese character that Confucius placed as the highest of all virtues, higher than righteousness, higher than benevolence, and it means approximately human-heartedness. Now, Confucius once said that “goody-goodies are the thieves of virtue.” Virtue in Chinese is teh, we Romanize it as T E H, and it means virtue not in the sense of moral propriety, but virtue in the sense of magic, as when we speak of the healing virtues of a certain plant. A man of true virtue is therefore a human-hearted man, and the meaning of this is that one should, above all, trust human nature in the full recognition that it is both good and bad, that it’s both loving and selfish.

Now, let me give an illustration of the wisdom of this. When people fight wars, I trust them. If the reason for which they fight a war is to expropriate somebody else's possessions and women, because they will fight a merciful war they will not destroy the possessions and the women that they want to capture. They want to enjoy them. And that's a war based on simple, ordinary, everyday human greed. The most awful wars that are waged, are the wars waged for moral principles. You are a lousy communist, you have a philosophy that is destructive to religion and to everything that we love, and value, and reverence, and therefore we will exterminate you to the last man unless you surrender unconditionally. Such wars are ruthless beyond belief. We can blow up whole cities, wipe people out because we are not greedy, we are righteous. That is why the goody-goodies are the thieves of virtue. If you are going to do something evil, do it for a plain, honest selfish motive. Don't do it in the name of God. Because if you do, it turns you into a monster who is no longer human. A sadist, a pure destroyer. So an inflexibly righteous person is not human. And that is why in Chinese ideas of justice a good judge is not somebody who abides by the book. Their idea of justice is for God's sake keep the case out of court. Let us have a concentration behind the scenes. And let's arrange a compromise. Because we know our opponent is a rascal, I know I am a rascal, and therefore, there can be a mutual arrangement between thieves. So we talk about it, we call the judge in, in an unofficial capacity. And the judge hums and haws and if he is a good judge, he has a sense of what is called Li. I'm going to talk you about another meaning of the word pronounced li later on, but it's quite a different word.

Li is justice, but you cannot write it down. There is another word for justice, or law, in Chinese tzu. And this word represents, in its Chinese character form, a cauldron for cooking sacrifices and a knife. In the high and far-off times of Chinese history there was an emperor who, when the people brought their sacrifices of meat and so on to be put in the cauldrons, he also scratched with a knife on the side of the cauldrons the laws of the state so all the people could read them and understand what they were. But the sages who advised this emperor said that was a very bad thing to do because the moment people see the law written down, they develop a litigious spirit. That is to say, they think out ways of wangling around it, and that's what we do all the time, don't we? The moment Congress passes

a law, a tax law especially, all the lawyers get together and they fill it full of holes. They say, “Well, it did not define this and it did not say that.” And some of those Confucians wanted to put the language in order and to make all the words mean just so. But the Taoists laughed at them and said, “If you define the words, with what words are you going to define the words that define the words?” So they said, therefore, that the emperor should not have written the laws down because a sense of justice is not something you can put in words. It is what our lawyers call “equity,” and if you talk to any lawyer and in discussing various judges around town he will say, “Well, Judge so-and-so is pretty much a stickler for the letter of the law, but on the other hand Judge so-and-so has a sense of equity. He knows when the law, the letter of the law just doesn’t apply to this particular case. And he just has an innate sense of fair play, that is the man to be trusted as a judge.” This is what the Chinese mean by a judge who has the sense of li, of real justice. It cannot be written down, it cannot be explained because every case is individual. But what such a man has fundamentally in his heart, he trusts the good and bad of human nature.

Human beings are complex, we don’t know ourselves at all, really. Consider your nervous system. Neurologists haven’t even begun to figure it out, and yet all of your conscious decisions are based on this thing that you do not understand. You are unbelievably more wise in your nature than you ever will be in your conscious thoughts, because behind your conscious thoughts lies your nervous system. And if you say, “Well, my nervous system is unreliable. It is just a bunch of strange, weird, biological chances that have become mixed up somehow,” then this very opinion that you are expressing, you see, is a function of that nervous system. So you are saying that you are a total hoax, you cannot trust yourself at all. So that is a set of game rules that don’t lead anywhere. It’s totally self-frustrating.

So you see, what the Chinese have developed here is a theory of nature, I said there are three theories – the western mechanical theory, nature as an artifact; the Hindu dramatic theory and the Chinese organic theory. Nature, human nature included, is an organism; and an organism is a system of orderly anarchy. There is no boss in it but it gets along by being left alone and being allowed to do its stuff. That is what the Chinese Taoist

philosophy calls wu-wei, which means not doing nothing but not interfering with the course of events, not acting against the grain.

Now this is the time to introduce the second word li in Chinese. The first li meant justice, the second li is a character which had the original meaning of the markings in jade, the grain in wood, and the fiber in muscle. And it's usually translated 'reason' or the 'principle of things', these are not very good translations. The best translation of li is organic pattern. Now look here. When you look at the clouds they aren't symmetrical. They do not form fours and they do not come along in cubes, but you know at once that they are not a mess. A dirty old ashtray full of junk may be a mess but clouds do not look like that. When you look at the patterns of foam on water they never make an artistic mistake and they are not a mess. They are wiggly but in a way, orderly, and it is difficult for us to describe that kind of order.

Now, take a look at yourselves. You are all wiggly. We think that we are pretty ordinary because there are a lot of us who look approximately the same. So when we see a human being we think, "Well, that is pretty much in order" and regular, and it's okay, we don't realize how wiggly we are. We are just like clouds, rocks, and stars. Look at the way the stars are arranged. Do you criticize the way the stars are arranged? Would you like them to form fours? Would you like them to be sort of set out like needlepoint on the canvas of the skies? There were somebody in the eighteenth century, in the days when they built formal gardens of clipped hedges and made all the tulips stand together like soldiers, who criticized the stars for being irregularly arranged, but today we don't feel that way. We love the way the stars are scattered, and they never make a mistake in their arrangement. What about mountain ranges? Do you criticize the valleys for being low, and praise the peaks for being high? You just say, "It is great, it's the way it is." Now, that kind of order the artist pays a tribute by painting a landscape. In every national park there is a place called "Inspiration Point," and people go there and say, "Oh! It's just like a picture!" And nobody knew this four hundred years ago. It took the artists to paint landscapes and then people realized how beautiful it is. Nowadays artists are painting pictures of damp, stained walls and floors where people have dropped a lot of paint. One day people will walk into a room where there is a lot of paint scattered on the

floor and they will say, “My goodness, it is just like a Jackson Pollock. Isn’t it just like a picture?” You see? It always takes the artist to show us the vision, but of course in the meantime, it is difficult. You go to an exhibition of contemporary, nonobjective painting, and a kind of square fellow walks in there and says, “That’s not what I call a picture”, because it is against his prejudices. But I say to people, “Now, excuse me, wait a minute. Take a look at that again. I’m going to tell you something. That painting is a colored photograph...of guess what?” Then they look at it in astonishment with entirely new eyes. What could that be a photograph of? They begins to see that it might be a photograph from a microscope, of globules of germs floating in liquid. It might be anything, very easy it suddenly comes over them. Goodness knows whether that was what the artist intended, but that’s a method of giving people a shock, of seeing things in a new way.

You know, a GI visited Picasso in Paris during the war and said, “I cannot understand your paintings. They are absurd. Life does not look like that.” Picasso said, “Do you have a girlfriend?” He said, “Yes.” “Have you a picture?” He said, “Yes.” “Show it to me.” So he drew out his billfold, and there was a little colored photograph of his girlfriend, and Picasso looked at it and said, “Is she so small as that?”

Now then, the idea of li, the idea of natural order, is like this patterns on foam, patterns in jade, the shapes of the clouds, the shapes of trees and mountains. They are orderly, but we cannot put our finger on the order. We know it is orderly but we do not know why. And we know it’s completely different from a mess. The order of nature is in that way indefinable. When Saint Augustine was asked, “What is time?” he said, “I know what it is, but when you ask me I don’t.” So in the same way the Chinese would say, “We know what the order of nature is, but if you ask us, we don’t.” The poet says, “Picking chrysanthemums along the eastern fence, gazing in silence at the southern hills, the birds fly home through the soft mountain air of dusk.” In all these things there is a deep meaning, but when we are about to express it, we suddenly forget the words. That’s li. Nature as a self-ordering principle, but it does not really know how it does it. Another poem says, “If you want to know where the flowers come from even the God of Spring doesn’t know.” This is a very remarkable attitude to nature. Politically you see, if you translate this into politics it is high philosophical anarchy, and

there is a lot to be said for this as a political point of view. That in other words, government is always a mess because the state opposes itself to the people. We live under a constitution where we are supposed to be governed by ourselves, somebody once said, “Down with democracy, when we get it.” Because the state, the government always creates itself as a business in competition with all the other businesses, and it wins because it is the biggest one of the bunch. The Taoists said of the state that it should be as anonymous and as unobtrusive as possible. That is to say that the emperor instead of going around in processions and being heralded with waving flags, should be as unobtrusive as the head of the sanitation department. You know, he’s a man, a guy who goes around in a plain ordinary suit and really attends to his job. The head of sanitation of the city of Dallas goes around, you don’t have a police escort and sirens blowing and flags waving. He simply does his job. And the feeling of Lao-tzu is that the president or the emperor should have the same kind of attitude. That he should simply help the people and retire, and not claim any merits for it, always withdraw himself, always be behind the scenes. Not striving for power, but simply to help things along. “Govern a great state,” he said “as you would cook a small fish.” Now, you know, when you have a small fish in the frying pan do not keep tossing it around and fidgeting with a spatula, otherwise it will fall apart. Do it gently, softly, softly, catchee monkey.

So then, here is a conception of nature as something you must trust; outside nature – the birds, the bees, the flowers, the mountains, the clouds, and inside nature, human nature. Now nature isn’t trustworthy, completely. It will sometimes let you down with a wallop, but that’s the risk you take, that’s the risk of life. What is the alternative? “I do not trust nature at all. It has got to be watched.” You know what that leads to? It leads to 1984 and Big Brother, it leads to the totalitarian state where everybody is his brother’s policeman, where everybody is watching everybody else to report them to the authorities. Where you can’t trust your own motivations, where you have to have a psychoanalyst in charge of you all the time to think, to be sure that you do not think dangerous thoughts or peculiar thoughts. And you report all peculiar thoughts to your analyst and your analyst would keep a record of them and report them to the government. And everybody is busy in keeping records of everything. It’s much more important to record what

happens than what happens. This is already eating us up, it's much more important that you have your books right than that you conduct your business in a good way. In universities it is much more important that the registrar's records be in order than the library be well-stocked. After all, you know, your grades are all locked up in safes, and protected from thievery and pilfering, and they are the most valuable property that the university has; the library can go hang.

Then further more, the main functioning of a university is, as a sensible person would imagine, to teach students and to do research. So the faculty should be the most important thing in the university, on the contrary, the administration is the most important thing. The people who keep the records, who make the game rules up. So the faculty are always being obstructed by the administration and forced into irrelevant meetings, and to do everything but scholarship. Do you know what scholarship means, or what a school means? The original meaning of schola is leisure. We talk of a "scholar and a gentleman" because a gentleman was a person who had a private income and he could afford to be a scholar. He did not have to earn a living and therefore he could study the classics and poetry and things like that. Today nothing is more busy than a school. They make you work, work, work because you have to get through on schedule. There are expedited courses, and you go to school so as to get a union card, to get a Ph.D. or something you could earn on living. So, on the whole, it's a contradiction of scholarship. Scholarship is to study everything that is unimportant, not necessary for survival, all the charming irrelevancies of life. So you see, the thing is this, if you do not have room in your life for the playful, life is not worth living. All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy, but if the only reason for which Jack plays is that he can work better afterwards, he is not really playing. He is playing because it is good for him, he is not playing at all. You have to be able to be a true scholars, you have to cultivate an attitude to life in which you are not trying to get anything out of it.

You pick up a pebble on the beach: look at it, beautiful, don't try to get a sermon out of it. Sermons-in-stones and God-in-everything be damned – just enjoy it! Do not feel that you have got to salve your conscience by saying that this is for the advancement of your aesthetic understanding. Enjoy the pebble. If you do that, you become healthy. You become able to

be a loving, helpful human being. But if you can't do that, if you can only do things because they're somehow, you are going to get something out of it, you are a vulture.

So, we have to learn, you don't have, you know, you don't have to do anything, but it is a great idea, it is a great thing if you can learn what the Chinese call "purposelessness." They think nature is purposeless. When we say something is purposeless, it is a put-down. There is no future in it, it is a washout. When they hear the word purposeless they think that's just great. It is like the waves washing against the shore, going on and on, forever, with no meaning. A great Zen master said, as his death poem, just before he died, "From the bathtub, to the bathtub, I have uttered stuff and nonsense." The bathtub in which the baby is washed at birth, the bathtub in which the corpse is washed before burial, all this time I have said many nonsenses. Like the birds in the trees go twee, twee, twee. What is it all about? Everybody tries to say, "Ah, yes, it is a mating call – purposeful. They are trying to get their mates, you know, by attracting them with a song." That's why they have colors, and why butterflies have eye-like designs on them for self-protection, an engineering view of the universe. Why do we do that? We say, "Well, it is because they need to survive." But why survive? What is that for? Well, to survive. See, human beings really are a lot of tubes, and all living creatures are just tubes. These tubes have to put things in one end and let them go out at the other. Then they get clever about it and they develop nerve ganglia on one end of the tube – the eating end called a head. And that has got eyes and ears, and it has little organs and antennae, thing like this, and that help you define things to put in one end so that you can let them out the other. Well, while you are doing this, you see, the stuff going through wears the tube out and so, the show can go on, the tubes have complicated ways of making other tubes which will go on doing the same thing, in at one end, out the other. And they say, "Well, that is terribly serious. That is awfully important. We have got to keep on doing this."

Then when the Chinese say nature is purposeless this is a compliment. It is like the idea of the Japanese word yugen. They describe yugen as watching wild geese fly and be hidden in the clouds; as watching a ship vanish behind the distant island; as wandering on and on in a great forest with no thought of return. Haven't you done this? Haven't you gone on a walk with

no particular purpose in mind? You carry a stick with you and you occasionally hit it at old stumps, wander along and sometimes twiddle your thumbs. It is at that moment that you are a perfectly rational human being; you have learned purposelessness. All music is purposeless. Is music getting somewhere? If it were, I mean, if the aim of music or the symphony were to get to the final bar, the best conductor would be the one who got there fastest. See, dancing, when you dance do you aim to arrive at a particular place on the floor? Is that the idea of dancing? The aim of dancing is to dance. Is the present. This is exactly the same in our life. We think life has a purpose. I remember the preachers who used to say, when I was a small boy, I've always heard it, we must follow the God's purpose, his purpose for you and his purpose for me. When I asked these cats what the purpose was, they never knew! They never knew what it was, they had a hymn "God is working his purpose out as year succeeds to year. God is working his purpose out and the time is drawing near. The time on the earth should be full of the glory of God as the waters cover the sea." What's the glory of God? Well, they weren't quite sure. I'll tell you what it is. In heaven all those angels are gathered around the glory of God. That is to say the which than which there's no whicher. Catholics call it the beatific vision, the Jews call it the shekhinah. There all are angels standing around and saying hallelujah, hallelujah, hallelujah. It means nothing. They're just having a ball. See, that's what happened in the beginning. When the God created the universe it was created like all star, all planets, all galaxies, they are vaguely spherical. He created this and said have a ball. But before he said that, he said you must draw the line somewhere. That was the real thing he said first, before 'let there be light' that came later. First thing was you must draw the line somewhere. Otherwise nothing would happen. You've got to have the good guys, the bad guys, you've got to have this, you've got to have that, the black and white, light and darkness. You must draw the line somewhere.

Now, here is the choice. Are you going to trust it or not? If you do trust it you may get let down, and this it is yourself, your own nature and all nature around you. There are going to be mistakes, but if you don't trust it at all, you are going to strangle yourself. You are going to fence yourself around with rules and regulations and laws and prescriptions and policemen and guards – and who's going to guard the guards. And who's going to look

after Big Brother to be sure he doesn't do something stupid. No-go. Supposing I get annoyed with somebody in the audience and I'm going to throw this ashtray at them but I don't want to hit my friend sitting next to that person. I want to be absolutely sure this ashtray hits that individual. And so I don't trust myself to throw it. I have to carry it along and be sure I hit that person on a head. See, I don't throw it because I can't let go of it. To throw it I must let go of it. To live I must have faith. I must trust myself to the totally unknown, I must trust myself, to a nature which does not have a boss. Because a boss is a system of mistrust. That is why Lao-tzu's Tao loves and nourishes all things, but does not lord it over them.

Limits of Language

Tonight at any rate we've got to go through some theoretical material so we're on a head-trip. I don't know where the trip will end up, it depends on you. But in order to lay the foundation for this, we have to examine ideas that are basic to our common sense. Ideas are very powerful. It is not only emotions that are powerful in human life. Psychoanalysis has, of course, examined the emotional bases of human opinions and beliefs, but one should also examine the intellectual bases of psychological principles, theories, or therapies. Because everybody who speaks any language at all has, has underneath the surface of the language or the figuring that he uses, certain basic assumptions which are usually unexamined, and these unexamined systems of belief are extremely powerful in their influence over our lives.

We will begin with one very common idea that is built into our common sense, which is that the physical world consists of two aspects: respectively, form and matter. This was foisted on us by Aristotle and also by the Bible. Because it is said that God created man out of the dust of the earth, and as it were made a figurine in His own image, and then breathed the breath of life into its nostrils so that this form of clay became a living being. So, underneath that lies the notion that everything material is made of some sort of basic stuff, like clay is the basis of pots. For centuries, scientists, philosophers wanted to know, "What is that stuff? What are we made of?" Now look here, a carpenter makes tables out of wood, and a potter makes pots out of clay, but I ask you: is a tree made of wood? Obviously not. A

tree is wood, it is not made of it. Is a mountain made of rock? Obviously not, it is rock. See, our language contains innumerable ghosts. Supposing I say, "The lightning flashes." Surely the flashing is the same as the lightning. There is not one thing called "lightning" and another called "flashing." The lightning is the flashing. It is raining. What is this it that is raining? The raining. I can make a noun out of a verb anytime by turning it into a gerund. So, we populate the world with ghosts which arise out of the structure of our language, and thus therefore of the structure of our thinking because we think in language, or in figuring, and numbers. So it is intensely fascinating investigation to find out what are the hidden assumptions that underlie language and figuring, in other words language and mathematics, and here is this basic assumption, you see, that almost all of us have, that, and it comes again and again into our everyday speech, that form, pattern, organization, organisms are made of something. As if there were some inert primordial and, of course, stupid stuff which had to be put into shape by an energy and an intelligence other than the stuff like the intelligence of the potter shapes the clay.

So therefore we have a basic picture of the world in which everything is being pushed around. There's a boss, there is somebody in charge who is different from what that somebody is in charge of, and puts everything into shape, because our common sense does not allow that things shape themselves. Very odd. In Chinese the word for nature is tzy-jan which is that which is so of itself, the spontaneous. The Chinese have no difficulty in thinking about nature as self-shaping. A Chinese child would not ask its mother 'how was I made?' It would ask its mother 'how did I grow?' which would be quite different, you see? So to be made is to be commanded and therefore every good being obeys, whether you obey god or whether you obey the laws of nature, you obey. And in an analog therefore of the world that has been putted into our common sense is one of military command, note that. Because the image of god, I would go further and say the idolatrous image of god, which has been handed down to us, is one of the beneficent tyrant – the boss, big papa.

So then, when our physicists started to find out what stuff was, they went into it and into it, and examined it with ever more minute instruments. First they started cutting up things with knives, and they cut them into smaller

and smaller and smaller until the particle that they wanted to dissect was exactly the same width as the edge of the knife, and so they got the atom. And that word in Greek atomas means the “non-cuttable.” A: non; tomas: cuttable. Thus, the basic atom, what you cannot cut anymore because you have come down to the end. Well, they were not satisfied with that, so they got an atomas – in other words a particle of something or other that was just the same width as the blade of the knife edge – and they looked at it under a microscope. They saw that it seemed to be composed of more small particles, so they found out means of working those out, and then they found extraordinary means of investigating the properties of matter, then they reached a point where they couldn’t decide whether was particles or weather was waves, so they called them “wavicles”, they thought they had come to certain ultimate wavicles called electrons. But then, unfortunately, everything fell apart, and they found protons, mesons, and many other extraordinary things. Because of course, what they did not realize was that as you make more and more powerful microscopic instruments, the universe has to get smaller and smaller in order to escape the investigation. Just as, when the telescopes become more and more powerful the galaxies have to recede in order to get away from the telescopes because what is happening in all these investigations is, through us and through our eyes and senses, the universe is looking at itself. And when you try to turn around to see your own head, what happens? You see? It runs away! You will never get at it. You cannot bite your own teeth, you can’t touch the tip of this finger with the tip of this finger. This is the principle. Shankara explained this beautifully in his commentary on the Kena Upanishad where he says, “That which is the knower – the ground of all knowledge – is never itself an object of knowledge, just as fire does not burn itself.” So there is always that profound mystery that you are never going to be in absolute control of what goes on, because if you were, to be like making love to a plastic woman. Who wants that? There’s always the mystery. The thing we don’t know, as Van der Leeuw put it, “The mystery of life is not a problem to be solved, but a reality to be experienced.” If there were not that, you see, there would be no life.

The reason why certain people turned to philosophy, well I became a philosopher was that ever since I was a little boy I always felt that existence, as such, was weird. I mean here we are, and isn’t that odd? Of

course it is odd, but what do you mean by odd? Well, it is what is different from even, and what is odd stands out. What is even lies flat, but you cannot see the outstanding without the flat background. Is the thing standing out? It's odd. Each one of you is odd: strange, unique, particular, different. How do we know what we mean by that, except against the background of something even that is not differentiated, like space? So, you get this philosophical itch, you begin to scratch your head and think about why is that so. Well after awhile you may realize that "Why?" is a meaningless question, and so you may ask: "How is it so?" Well, that leads you into science and other investigations. So you want to know, "What is it?" I mean, what is this happening, this thing called existence, "what is it"? You ask that question long enough, and it suddenly hits you that if you could answer it, you would not know what terms to put the answer in. I mean, when we investigate the properties of nature, and we do get some answers, all the answers are in terms of particular structures, forms, patterns. And these can be measured, and their behavior can be predicted. But when I want to ask the question "What are the forms made of?", I mean "What is it really?", we cannot think of any way in which we could answer the question, because we would have to have a class of all classes.

When you ask the question "What?" it is like saying: "Is you is or is you ain't?" Is you animal, is you vegetable, is you mineral? Are you a Republican or a Democrat? Are you male or female? Are you a Christian or a Jew or a Hindu, or a what have you? We classify, always, to give an answer to the question "What is it?" And when you classify you distinguish an inside group from an outside group. So what we want to know is what is the group of all groups. But we can't imagine what the outside would be. So we can't answer the question, "what is it"?

So, the physicists finally abandoned the quest for stuff, and they gave us a description of the universe entirely in terms of form: the pattern, not the stuff. People ask, "What is the work?", but you can't do that! "What is the pattern made of? Surely, there must be an answer to that?" See, what happens is, when you turn up the microscope all stuff turns into form, it becomes articulate. You know, the carpet looks like some sort of stuff, but when you look at it under a microscope you will see the crystalline structure of the nylon, or whatever it is made of. See? Then they want to know,

“What are the crystals made of?” All right? Turn up the volume and you will find molecules. Turn up the volume, you will find wavicles. Then, “But the wavicles must be of something!” Of course they are not, we find substance, or stuff, totally vanishes, and we are left with form. Sanskrit does not really have a word for “matter.” It has nama-rupa which means “named form,” it’s the form that matters. Or let us put it in another way: everything is a matter of form, and let’s go into this, it’s fascinating.

You see, “Does it matter? What does that mean? Does it matter? Is it important?” In other words, does it measure up to anything? Now let’s go back to the Indo-European roots of the language, matter comes from a Sanskrit root matra, which means “to measure”. Lay out the foundation, you say, for a building. So from this root matra if we go on into Sanskrit, we get the word maya, and maya is generally translated as illusion, although it also means magic, creative power. The word illusion comes from the Latin ludere, to play. “Let us pretend that we matter.” Also from the root matra we have “meter,” and that is also “to measure;” metere in Greek, mater in Latin, which means “mama”, “mother.” The mother of Buddha was called Maya, and Mary, ma again, is the mother of Jesus – ma, ma, ma, ma, ma. But ma, you see, is a matter of form, pattern. The Chinese call the basic principle of nature li, and the character for li means the markings in jade, the fiber in muscle, the grain in wood. So Joseph Needham translates it “organic pattern”. That’s what’s going on. There isn’t any stuff involved. What stuff is, is a pattern seen out of focus, where it becomes fuzzy, like kapok you see? We say, kapok is the stuffing of the cushion. And that’s stuff. You see, some kind of goop. But when we examine the kapok closely, we find structure. That’s what you will find, and there will be anything else. Crazy. Because it completely flouts our common sense. We say ...but surely, philosophers beat tables that are in front of them and you know, they say, “It is there, because ...bang!, you know. There must be something that is stuff, that is substantial.” But the only reason why you cannot pass your hand through a table is the table is moving too fast. It is like trying to put your finger through an electric fan, only it is going much faster than an electric fan. Anything solid is going so fast that there is no way to get this through it, that’s all. So you say, “What is it that is going so fast?”

Well, that question is based on a grammatical illusion. The grammatical illusion is that all verbs have to have subjects, can you imagine anything more weird than the idea that a verb, or action, or event must be set into motion by a noun? That is to say, a non-event or thing. Now what is the difference between a thing and an event? I can't, for the life of me, tell. We say, "This is a fist," that's a noun. Now, what happens to it when I open my hand? This thing has unaccountably disappeared, so I should have called this a "fisting," and this is a "handing." It may also be a "pointing." So, we could devise a language such as that of the Nootka Indians, where there are no nouns and there are only verbs. Chinese is very close to that, I think the superimposition of the idea of noun and verb on the Chinese language is a Western invention. I can't think of any Chinese word for a noun. But all those languages of Indo-European origin have nouns and verbs in them; they have agents and operations. That's one of the basic snags: when we divide the world into operations and agents, doings and doers, then we ask such silly questions as, "Who knows?" "Who does it?" "What does it?" When the "what" that is supposed to do it is the same as "the doing," you could very easily see that the whole process of the universe may be understood as "process." Nobody is doing it. Because when you go back to doing it, you go back to the military analogy, the chain of command, the boss who goes bang! and the object obeys. That's a very crude idea, very unsophisticated.

So, if you can bear it, we have suddenly eliminated a "spook," and the spook was called "stuff." So, we are now more at ease with ourselves in a world of form, nama-rupa, named forms. We can, of course, get rid of the names. We can now go further and try the experiment with not calling the forms by any names, but just observing the forms, although when we have got rid of the names we cannot even call them "forms," because that is a name. And, there is the bizazz going on, which Buddhists called tathata, and that means "suchness" or "thusness." Actually tathata is "da – da – da," because when a baby first talks it says "da": "Da, da, da, da." And fathers flatter themselves thinking that it is saying "dada", "daddy," it isn't, it is saying "da." So the Upanishads say, Tatvam asi: you are it. The basic "da" does not mean anything. Da is like everything else, you see, the world is a musical phenomenon, good music never refers to anything except the music itself. You do not ask Mr. Bach, Mr. Ravi Shankar, "What do you mean by

this music? What is it intended to express?” Bad music always expresses something other than itself, like the 1812 Overture or the Sunken Cathedral. Good music never talks about anything other than the music. If you ask Bach, “What is your meaning?” he say “Listen! That is the meaning.” Giraffes are giraffing, trees are treeing, stars are starring, clouds are clouding, rain is raining. And if you don’t understand, look at it again. And people are peopling. Wow.

We notice that all these suchnesses appear and disappear; they keep changing, they come and they go. But if you get hung up on your particular form, I’ll have to alter the language a little bit, because you see, your form makes a duality, whereas you are your form, you’re what you’re doing. Now, you think, “Hmm, for some strange reason I must make that go on as long as possible,” and therefore you think you have an instinct to survive. So the only thing anybody can agree about today, so far as the discussion of ethical and moral problems are concerned, is that we ought to survive. Therefore certain forms of conduct have survival value and certain forms do not. But when you say to yourself, “You must go on living,” you put yourself in a double bind because you’ve said [yes] to a process which is essentially spontaneous and it must happen. The basic form of the double bind which is imposed upon all children is you are required to do that which will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily. So, when we say to ourselves, “You must go on,” the reason is, you see, that we are not living in the eternal now, where the reality is. We are always thinking that the satisfaction of life will be coming later. “There’s a good time coming be it ever so far away, that one far off divinely sent to which all creation moves.” Don’t kid yourself. As the Hindus have taught us, in the course of time everything gets worse and eventually falls apart, comes the Kali-Yuga and Shiva at the end, which is to say, only suckers put hope in the future.

You see? I tell you, there are three classes of people in the Western world: the aristocracy, the proletariat, and the bourgeoisie. The aristocrats live on the past because they come of noble family, and they are like potatoes, because the best part is underground. The proletarians live in the present because they have nothing else. And the poor bourgeoisie live for the future, they are the eternal suckers, they can always open to a con game. So

when they find out that there really isn't much of a future, you are going to die, they transpose the future into a spiritual dimension. They figure, "This material world is not the real world, but the spiritual world is the real world; and there will be somewhere, somehow, an eternal life for me." "A charge to keep I have, a God to glorify, a never-dying soul to save and fit it for the sky." So when they say, "What are you going to do there?" Well, they do not have the faintest idea. You know that? If you ask theologians about what they think is going to happen in Heaven, they just dry up. "Why, we are going to play harps!" I mean this is a symbolic meaning of that which I could go into, but the average person's idea of Heaven is an absolute bore, I mean it's like being in church forever. Children see this immediately, when they hear a hymn like "Weary of earth and laden with my sin I look to Heaven and long to enter in," they, "Oh, God! Heaven is to be in church for always." And they think "Hell is preferable", at least some excitement is going on. You see it in medieval art, if you go to the Metropolitan Museum in New York you can see Jan Van Eyck's painting of The Last Judgment, Heaven on top and Hell below. In Heaven everybody is looking like the cat that swallowed the canary, sitting in rows and very smug. God the Father is president and, oh dear, beneath this there is a winged skull like a bat and squirming bodies, all nude, all being eaten by snakes. There is fantastic thing going on; but you see, Van Eyck had a ball painting that, because in medieval way, it was the only way you could get away with painting nudes and sexy scenes, sadomasochistic. So that's naturally why hell became much more interesting than Heaven.

So therefore, this hope for the future is a hoax, it's a perfect hoax. That maybe we will make spiritual progress, everybody puts it off. "Maybe if I work at yoga for ten years, twenty years and do this thing, I will eventually make it to moksha to nirvana", whatever. That is nothing more than a postponement, it's this business off, because if you are not fully alive now, you think maybe someday you will be. Look, supposing I ask you, "What did you do yesterday?" No, "What did I do yesterday? In fact, I have forgotten." But mostly we say, "Well, let me see now; let me get out my notebook. I got up at 7:30 and I brushed my teeth, and I read the newspaper over a cup of coffee, and then I looked at the clock and dressed, and got in the car and drove downtown. I did this and that in the office and so on." You go on and on and suddenly you discover that what you have described

has absolutely nothing to do with what happened. You have described a scraggly, skeletal, fleshless list of abstractions whereas, if you were actually aware of what went on, you could never describe it. Because nature is multidimensional, language is linear, language is scrawny. And therefore, if you identify the world as it is with the way the world is described, it is as if you were trying to eat dollar bills and expect a nutritious diet. Or eat numbers. A lot of people eat numbers. People play the stock market and they are doing nothing but eating numbers. They are always unhappy, absolutely miserable, because they never get anything. So therefore, they always hope more is coming because they believe that if they eat enough dollar bills eventually something satisfactory will happen. So eating the abstractions all the time we want more and more and more time.

Confucius very wisely said, “A man who understands the Tao in the morning may die with content in the evening.” Because when you understand, you do not put your hope in time, time will not solve a thing. So when we enter into the practice of meditation, of yoga, we are doing something radically unlike other human activities. Of course, the way yoga is sold in the United States, like everything else, is that it is supposed to be good for you. It is not. It has nothing to do with anything that is good for you. It is the one activity which you do for its own sake and not because it’s good for you, not because it will lead anywhere, because you cannot go to the place where you are now. Obviously. The Yoga is to be completely here and now. Why the word yoke means “join,” to get with it, to be completely here and now. This is the real meaning of concentration, to be in your center. And the Christian word for “sinning” in Greek is amatanene, which means “to miss the point.” And the point is eternal life which is here and now. Come to your senses.

So yoga is defined in Sanskrit in the Yoga Sutra: yoga chitra briti derota. Difficult to translate, but roughly yoga is the stopping of..., briti is turning like a wheel, and chitra is consciousness: “turnings in consciousness.” It is the attempt of the mind to catch hold of itself, which is what we call thinking, worrying, so you could say loosely: yoga is the cessation of thinking. It is not the cessation of awareness, but of symbolizing, trying to catch, clutch reality in terms of thoughts, symbols, descriptions, definitions. Give it up. It’s not easy because we do it habitually. But until there is

silence of the mind, it is almost impossible to understand eternal life, that is to say, eternal now. If you could, come to the place where you suspend conceptions. Conceptions in Sanskrit are called vikalpa. And so the stage is called nirvikalpa, “not conceptual.” And this will be basic to everything I’m going to talk about. To understand nonverbal reality, non-conceived reality, what I call “suchness”, ta ta ta, it is really very easy, it’s too easy, that’s why it is difficult. But then when you are fully aware and not thinking, you will notice some amazing absences: there is no past. Can you hear anything past incidentally? Can you hear anything future? They are just not there to the plain sense of one’s ears, ears are easiest to begin with. Can you hear anyone listening to something else other than sound? Can you hear the listener? No, well then presumably it’s not there. Then you become again as a child and simply forget all that you were ever told and contemplate on what is. All these ghosts go away. Weird, but they just go. And then you enter into the eternal state where there is no problem. When you’ll go back and you collect your opinions again, you think: “Well, that will not do. How can I be practical and be in that sort of state?”

Well, I remember in the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus said a lot of things about this. “Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin, and yet Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these.” “And if God so clothed the grass or the field which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you faceless ones? Wow. So do not worry about tomorrow saying, ‘What shall we eat? What shall we drink? Or how shall we clothe ourselves?’ All the rabble seek after these things, sufficient to the day is the worry of it.” Nobody ever preaches a sermon on that text, never. I have heard lots of sermons but never one on that, because people say, “Look, that’s all very well because Jesus was the boss’s son, and he knew that he was really in charge of the universe and had nothing to worry about. But we have to be practical.” Ooo, what do you suppose the Gospel was? The good news, but it never got out? You, too, are the boss’s son: that was the gospel.

If Jesus had lived in India they would not have put him to death, because everybody in India knows that we are all God in disguise. So if he had said, “I and the Father are one,” in India they would have said, “Hooray!”, you know? Lots of people in India know that perfectly well, but here? Uh! uh!

That is a no – no! “Who do you think you are? You own the place? You keep your position! You are just a creature, a critter.” It’s in the family system, it’s in everything. Because they have their own way of doing it in India, because they have a delayed action on it. When you get to be a certain age, and after you have studied long enough with a certain guru, then and only then may you realize this. But until then it is still a no – no. But if you have put in the time they finally let you in. Here you have to wait, until you are dead.

Well, the only place to begin is now, because here is where we are. So why put it off? A lot of people say, “Well, I am not ready.” What do you mean you are not ready? What do you have to do to be ready? Well, “I am not good enough because I am neurotic, I am perhaps not old enough, not mature enough for such knowledge. I am still frightened of pain, and of course I would have to overcome that. I am still dependent on material things. I have to eat a lot, drink a lot, have sex around, and all that kind of thing, and I think I had better get all that under control first.” Oh? You mean you have a case of spiritual pride. You want to be able to congratulate yourself for having gone through the discipline which is rewarded with realization. That is trying to quench fire with fire. Another words: “Wouldn’t it be great to be a mystic?” Look at it this way, I mean c-crazy, to have no fear, no attachments, no hang-ups, to be as free as the air so that you could just wander out in the streets, give away all your clothes to the beggars, and let go of the whole thing, let it all hang-up. Wouldn’t it be crazy to have that courage? But if you look into yourself honestly you will find that inside you are actually a quaking mess of sensitivity. This desire to be the great mystic is nothing more than a symptom of your quaking mess; it is self-defense.

You may think, “Wow! We will do yoga and get real tough.” That only means you are going to be increasingly insensitive, running away from the quaking mess, escaping. You never can, you are stuck with it. There is nothing you can actually do to transform your own nature into unattached selflessness because you have a selfish reason for wanting to do it. Well, that is pretty depressing, isn’t it? “You mean to tell me that the only people who really get enlightened and liberated are those whom the grace of God somehow hits in an arbitrary way? And all I can do is sit around and wait?”

Well, let us begin with that supposition. Let us suppose there is nothing we can do to change ourselves. No psychotherapy, religion all of this is absolutely in vain; there is nothing, nothing, nothing you can do about it. It is like trying, I said, to bite your own teeth, or to lift yourself up by your own bootstraps. Incidentally it struck me as funny, a lot of people are using that phrase in the wrong way. They say when something very difficult has to be done “we have to lift ourselves up by your own bootstraps”. You can’t! It’s impossible.

Now one might say, “That is terribly depressing. You mean, Alan Watts, you come here simply to tell us that there is nothing we can do? I mean, here we are all presumably assembled in a cultural milieu, spiritual milieu, psychotherapeutic milieu where we are supposed to get better.” And I tell you there is nothing you can do about it. Well, give us our money back! Go to somebody else who will be more encouraging! But; what does it mean that you cannot do anything about it? It is singing loud and clear: The reason you cannot do anything about it is that you do not exist, that is, as an ego, as a soul, as a separate will. It just is not there. When you understand that, you are liberated. As they say in Zen, “You cannot take hold of it nor can you get rid of it. In not being able to get it, you get it. When you are silent it speaks. When you speak it is silent.” But do not misunderstand me, this is not any kind of fatalism when I say “you” as you conceive yourself to be, that is your ego, your image of yourself is not there, it does not exist. It is an abstraction. It is like “three.” Did you ever see three? Just plain, ordinary three? No, nobody ever saw it. So it is a concept, it’s a vilkalpa.

So in the same way is oneself. There is the happening, the suchness, but it is not pushing you around because there is no you to be pushed around, like a billiard ball stuck on the end of the cue. There is the cue, and it goes this way and goes that way. They call a Buddha a tathagata, one who comes or goes thus, this way and that way. So this illusion of the persecuted ego who is pushed around by fate has altogether disappeared, and likewise the illusion of the ego who pushes fate around has also disappeared. There is a happening. So in this do you see what has happened? By dying to yourself, by having become completely incompetent and finding that you do not exist, you are reborn, you become everything. In the words of Sir Edwin Arnold, “Forgoing self, the universe grows I.”

Philosophies of Asia

Relevance of Oriental Philosophy

Theology has not, as a matter of fact, had a very distinguished record in promoting the study of other than the Christian religion. And this is rather puzzling. Most study of comparative religions that goes on in theological schools has historically been missionary oriented. To find out the weird ideas of the prospects so as to be able to undermine them. Because you see, if you know in the first place that you have the true religion, there really is no point in studying any other one and you can very quickly find reasons for showing them to be inferior, because that was a foregone conclusion. They had to be. And therefore, all arguments about the respective merits of various religions, especially where Christianity is involved, and often where Judaism is involved, and sometimes Islam too, all of which are essentially imperialistic religions. In all such discussions the judge and the advocate are usually the same person, because if for example you get into discussions as to whether Buddha was a more profound and spiritual character than Jesus Christ, you arrive at your decision on the basis of a scale of values which is of course Christian. And in this sense the judge and the advocate of the same.

And I really do marvel at this Christian Imperialism because it prevails even among theological liberals. And it reaches its final absurdity in religion-less Christianity, the doctrine that there is no God and Jesus Christ is His only Son. Because you see, there's some anxiety here that even though we don't believe in God anymore, somehow we've still got to be Christians and obviously because we have a very curious organization which must be understood. The inner meaning of the church as it works in fact. A society of the saved, you see, necessarily requires outside it a society of the not saved because if there is not that contrast, you don't know that you belong to the in-group. And in this way all social groups with claims to some kind of special status must necessarily create aliens and foreigners. And Sir Thomas Aquinas let the cat out of the bag one day when

he said that the Saints in Heaven would occasionally appear over the battlements into Hell and praise God for the just punishment visited upon the evil-doers.

Now, as you know I'm not being very fair and very kind to Modern Theology, but there is this strange persistence of insisting that our group is the best group. And I feel that there is in this something peculiarly irreligious, and furthermore it exhibits a very strange lack of faith. Because I believe that there is a strong distinction between faith on the one hand, and belief on the other. Because belief is as a matter of fact, quite contrary to faith. Because belief is really wishing. It's from the Anglo-Saxon root belief, "to wish", and belief stated say in the creed is a fervent hope that the universe will turn out to be thus and so. And in this sense therefore belief precludes the possibility of faith because faith is openness to truth to reality whatever it may turn out to be. I want to know the truth. That is the attitude of faith. And therefore to use ideas about the universe and about God as something to hang onto, in the spirit of Rock of Ages cleft for me, you know, hymnal imagery is full of rocks and mighty fortresses are God. "In vain the surges anguish shock, in vain the drifting sand, unharmed upon the eternal rock the eternal city stands." And there's something very rigid about this rock. And we are finding our rock getting rather worn out in an age where it becomes more and more obvious that our world is a floating world. It's a world floating in space where all positions are relative and any point may be regarded as the center. A world, which doesn't float on anything, and therefore the religious attitude appropriate to our time is not one of clinging to rocks but of learning to swim. And you know that if you get in the water and you have nothing to hold on to and you try to behave as you would on dry land you will drown. But if on the other hand you trust yourself to the water and let go you will float.

And this is exactly the situation of faith. This is surely all implied in the New Testament. When for example, Jesus began to foretell his own death, his disciples were very disturbed because it is written in our law that the Messiah does not die, and he replied "Unless a grain of corn fall into the ground and die, it remains isolated and brings forth no fruit. Or rather, if it die, it brings forth much fruit." And on another occasion he said to the disciples "It is expedient for you that I go away, but if I go not away from

the paraclete, the Holy Spirit cannot come to you.” But we have reversed all this. Jesus with me it was one of those rare and remarkable individuals who had a particular kind of spiritual experience which in terms of Hebrew theology he found most difficult to express without blasphemy. I am the Father are one. In other words I am God. And that is something of course if you are a Hindu. That is a rather natural statement to make. You see in our culture which has Hebrew theology in its background anyone who says I am God is either blasphemous or insane because our image of God and the image, don't forget, has far more emotional power than any amount of theology and abstraction. It is our Father which really influences us as a conception of God, not necessarily being ought to Luke's decontaminated name for God the ground of being. Or Professor Northrop's undifferentiated aesthetic continuum. These aren't very moving, even though subtle theologians prefer this kind of thing and will tell us that when we call God the Father, we don't have to believe literally that there is a cosmic male parent and still less that he has a white beard and sits on a golden throne above the stars. Nobody, no serious theologian ever believed in such a God.

But nevertheless, the imagery affects us, because the image of the monotheistic god of the West is political. The title King of Kings and a Lord of Lords is the title of the Emperors of ancient Persia. The image of God is based on the Pharaohs, the great rulers of the Chaldeans, and the kings of Persia. And so this is the political government and Lord of the universe who keeps order and who rules it from, metaphorically speaking, above. So anyone who would say I am God is therefore implying that he's in charge of everything that he knows all about it and therefore everybody else ought to bow down and worship him. But in India if you say I am God they say “Congratulations, at last you found out.” Because the image is quite different. See our image of the world is that the world is a construct and it's very natural for a child to say to its mother how was I made. As if you know you are somehow put together but that goes back to the imagery of Genesis where God creates Adam and makes a clay figurine and then he breathes the breath of life into this to the nostrils of this figurine and it comes to life. So that is the fundamental supposition which even underlies the development of Western science. That everything has been made and then someone knows how it was made. And you can find out the cause behind the universe there is an architect. This could be called the ceramic

model of the universe. Because there is a basic feeling that there are two things in existence one is stuff material and the other is form. Now material like clay by itself is stupid it has no life. It has no intelligence and therefore for matter to assume orderly forms it requires that the next turn all intelligence be introduced to shape it. And therefore with that deeply embedded in our common sense it's very difficult for people to realize that this image is not necessarily for description of the world at all. Indeed the whole idea of stuff is completely absent from modern physics which studies the physical universe purely in terms of pattern and structure. But the Hindu model of the world and I'm speaking of Hindu mythology, the popular imagery I'm talking about, the popular imagery on both sides I'm not at the moment getting into theological technicalities. The Hindu model of the universe is a drama. The world is not made it has acted. And so behind every face human animal plant mineral there is the face on face of the central self the up man. Which is Brahman, the final reality which is not defined. Because obviously that which is the center cannot be made an object of knowledge anymore than you bite your own teeth. Or lift itself up by own bootstraps. It's what there is it's the basis and you are it, which is a colloquial translation of the Sanskrit adage tat tvam asi, that art thou. The idea being you see that the nature of reality is a game of hide and seek. Because that's really the only game there is now you see it now you don't all nature is vibrating it's a wave like motion of Crest and trough. Pulse and interval pulse and interval. Only we don't always notice that because our senses respond slowly say to light and light appears to be a continuous energy without interval.

So there's the idea, goes like this that for endless cycles of time this is a premier reality the self plays hide and seek with itself. That for a period of a Kalpa, which is four million, three hundred twenty thousand years, the Self is awake to Itself. And knows that it's it but for another Kalpa it gets lost it says to itself man get lost and pretends. That it is a vast multiplicity. That's exactly what you would do if you had the privilege of dreaming any dream you wanted when you went to bed at night. This would enable you of course in one night to dream seventy-five years of clock time. And what you would do first of all, you would have marvelous adventures you would have every conceivable delight and satisfy every wish. And then as time went on that would get a little boring and you would get more daring. You

would have adventures, you would rescue princesses from dragons, and then you would get even more daring, then you would dream that you weren't dreaming. And then you'd get into really serious messes, because wouldn't it be a surprise when you woke up. And eventually you would be dreaming that you were sitting here in this auditorium listening to me. You would eventually get around to that, for your sins. Well maybe that's what's happening anyhow, you see. And in Sanskrit this dream is called Maya, but it's a word that means more than dream or illusion, it means creative power magic. Skill, art, and measurement. Laying down the foundations is making a minor. So then the world is a big act. It's play not in the sense of something trivial but in the sense of a stage play. Hamlet is a play. You play the organ in church. That's not trivial. And so the actor of this play being the best of all possible actors takes himself in totally. Almost but everybody knows in the back of their mind that the something funny about being itself. So you see when you go to the theater you know of course that the proceeding arch tells you that what's going on behind this arch is not for real. But somehow the actor almost persuades you that it is real. He wants to get you sitting on the edge of your chair, he wants you laughing crying, he wants you in a state of anxiety so that he almost persuades you. But you see if the actor is as good as the supreme Self. The audience is taken in that really and they believe the play is really, what skill, how marvelous. But you see in all acting. It's there is behind the stage a green room. Out on the stage with a law does not come on as the Lord. Becomes on as you and I. Heroes and Villains. But off-scene, he assumes his true nature and duffs his mask, which in Latin is his persona. In classical drama the persona was the megaphone mouth masked one for the open air theater and by a curious degradation of words the word person has come to mean the real individual and when Harry Emerson Fosdick wrote How to Be a Real Person, the real title of his book should have been How to Be a Genuine Fake. Well now this image this model of the universe is disturbing to Christians, what is particularly disturbing is the element in it of what's the very special theological chaos work, or pantheism. The feeling that if every part is being played by the supreme law then all the real distinctions between good and evil are obliterated. Now that is the biggest nonsense ever uttered. Distinctions between good and evil do not have to be eternal distinctions to be real distinctions. It is really to say that a distinction which is not eternal is not real is a highly un-Christian thing to say and certainly a very u-

Jewish thing because one of the fundamental principles of the Hebrew attitude is that all finite things that have been created by God are good. And therefore a thing that doesn't have to be infinite to be good or finite things come to an end. Furthermore to invoke the author already of heaven in matters of moral regulation is like putting a two million current through our electric shaver. It ended in the final asininity of the notion that if you went against the will of God, since evil is eternal, you would fry in hell forever and ever and ever and as the Chinese say, do not swat a fly on a friend's head with a hatchet. Like all kinds of judicial torture and harsh justice such ideas bring law into disrespect. And such a fierce God and such an unbending attitude resulted in the fact of people disbelieving in God altogether and shall we say throwing out the baby with the bathwater.

So this is among many reasons why people are saying God is dead it's very inconvenient to have the kind of god. Who is this authoritarian boss of the world, prying down over your shoulder all the time and knowing your inmost thoughts and judging you. It's a very uncomfortable feeling and everybody's happy to be rid of it. It has never significantly improved anybody's behavior in the so-called ages of faith. People were just as immoral, if not more so than they are today. Because you see all this fixed notion of god is idolatry. If thou shalt not make to die self any graven image of anything that is in the heaven above etc. The most dangerous and pernicious images are not those that made of wood or stone, nobody takes those seriously. They are the images made of imagination and conception and thought. And that is why in the fundamental approach to the Godhead, both the Christian, I mean both the Hindu and the Buddhist and for that matter the Taoist take what is called the negative approach which used to be known long ago in the Middle Ages as Apophatic theology. As and Thomas Aquinas said "To proceed to the knowledge of God, It is necessary to go by the way of remotion. Of saying what God is not, since God by his immensity exceeds every conception to which our intellect can attain."

So then when of the Godhead the Hindu says all that can truly be said is neti neti, "not this, not this," and when the Buddhist uses such a term for the final reality as Sunyata, which means voidness, or emptiness. Then textbook after textbook on comparative religion that I read by various theologians say this is terrible negativism this is nihilism. But he doesn't

realize that it's nothing of the kind. If for example, you have a window on which there's a fine painting of the sun, your act of faith in the real sun will be to scrape that off so that you can let the real sunlight in.

And so in the same way pictures of God on the window of the mind need scraping up, because otherwise they become idolatrous they become substitutes for the reality. Now I'm hoping that this sort of understanding will issue from God is a dead theology. I'm not quite sure whether it's going to. Because as a matter of fact there are precedents within the Christian tradition for an intelligent God is dead theology for what I would call atheism in the name of God. Or agnosticism in the name of God The word agnostic has a curious history. It's based on the Greek word agnosia. Which we used to translate into English as 'unknowing'. And there's a very interesting mystical treatise of the fourteenth century called the Cloud of Unknowing, showing how the highest form of prayer, contemplative prayer, as that in which all concept of God had been left behind. Where in other words, one completely lets go of clinging to God and this was the supreme act of faith. So that you don't any longer need an image. Because this gets in the way of the reality. But the moment you insist on an image then you have the church as a huge imperialistic vested interest organization. After all if the charge is the Body of Christ isn't it through the breaking of the Body of Christ that life is given to the world. But the church doesn't want to be broken up by Jove no, it goes around canvassing for new members see the difference between a physician and a clergyman is that. The physician wants to get rid of his patients and he gives them medicine and he hopes they won't get hooked on the medicine. Whereas the clergyman is usually forced to make his patients become addicts. So that they'll pay their dues. The doctor has faith in turnover. He knows that there'll always be sick people, and the clergy also need faith in turnover get rid of your congregations say now you've heard all I've got to tell you go away. If you want to get together for making celestial whoopee, which is worship, All right. But I don't I used to when I was a chaplain in the university, I used to tell the students that if they came to church out of a sense of duty they weren't wanted. They would be skeletons at the feast. It would be much better if they went swimming or stayed in bed. Because they were going to celebrate the Holy Communion and I meant celebrate. But somehow or other you see we take religion in a kind of dead earnest. I remember when I

was a boy at school how wicked it was to laugh in church. We don't realise, it's G.K. Chesterton said that the angels fly because they take themselves lightly. And asked Dante said in the parody, so when he heard the song of the angels, It sounded like the laughter of the universe. Why what are those angels doing? They're saying I don't know you Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, which doesn't really mean anything. It's sublime nonsense. And so in the same way there are Buddhist texts and Hindu texts which are the chants of the Buddhas or Divine Beings which don't mean anything at all and never did mean anything they are just glorious lolling, glossolalia. So the point that I wish to make most strong is that behind a vital religious life for the West there has to be faith which is not expressed in things to which you cling. In ideas, opinions to which you cling in a kind of desperation. Faith is the act of letting go, and that must begin with Letting Go of God. Let God Go.

The point that I wish to make most strongly, is that behind a vital religious life, for the West, there has to be faith which is not expressed in things to which you cling. In ideas, opinions, to which you cling in a kind of desperation. Faith is the act of letting go, and that must begin with Letting Go of God. Let God go.

But you see, this is not atheism in the ordinary sense. Atheism in the ordinary sense is further hoping that there isn't a god. It has become extremely plausible that this trip between the maternity ward and the crematorium is what there is to life. And we still have going into our common sense the nineteenth century myth which succeeded the ceramic myth in Western history, I call it the myth of the fully automatic model of the universe. Namely, that it's stupid. It's blind force. Hekels. Gyration. Fortuitous Congress of Atoms, is of the same vintage as Freud's libido. The blind surge of lust at the basis of human psychology.

But when you consider this attitude, you know, what is the poetic counterpart of it? Man is a little germ that lives on an unimportant rock ball that revolves about an insignificant star on the outer edges of one of the smaller galaxies. What a put down that was. But on the other hand, if you think about that for a few minutes, I am absolutely amazed to discover myself on this rock ball rotating around us of the spherical file. It's a very odd situation. And the more I look at things I cannot get it rid of the feeling

that existence is quite weird. A philosopher is a sort of intellectual Yokel who gawks at things that sensible people take for granted. And sensible people who claim that existence is nothing at all I mean just basic and go on and do something. This is the kind of movement in philosophy logical analysis says you mustn't think about existence. It's a meaningless concept, and therefore philosophy has become a discussion of trivia and philosophical journals is now satisfactorily dull as any other kind of purely technical inquiry. No good philosopher lies awake nights worrying about the destiny of man and the nature of God and all that sort of thing because a philosopher of today is a practical fellow who comes to the university with a briefcase at nine and leaves at five. He does philosophy during the day, which is discussing whether certain sentences have meaning and if so what and then he would as William Earl said in a very funny essay, he would come to work in a white coat if he thought he could get away with it. The problem is he's lost his sense of wonder.

Wonder is like a in modern philosophy something you mustn't have. It's like enthusiasm in eighteenth century England, it's very bad form. But you see I don't know what question to ask when I wonder about the universe. It isn't a question that I'm wondering about it's a feeling that I have. Imagine if you had an interview with God, everybody was going to have an interview with God, and you were allowed to ask one question what would you ask. And don't don't rush into it. You will soon find that you have no idea what to ask. Because I cannot formulate the question that is my wonder the moment my mouth opens to utter it I suddenly find I'm talking nonsense. But that should not prevent wonder from being the foundation of philosophy. Well, as Aristotle said wonder is the beginning of philosophy. Because it strikes you that existence is very very strange. And then moreso when this so-called insignificant little creature has inside his skull a neurological contraption that is able to center itself in the midst of these incredible expanse of galaxies and start measuring the whole thing. That is quite extraordinary. And then furthermore when you realize, that in a world where there are no eyes the sun would not be light. And that in a world where there were no soft skins rocks would not be hard, nor in a world where there were no muscles would they be heavy. Existence is relationship and you are smack in the middle of it.

So there is obviously a place in life for a religious attitude in the sense of awe. Astonishment at existence. And that is also a basis of respect for existence. We don't have very much of it in this culture even though we call it materialistic. A materialist as a person who loves material. And I suppose in the Christian tradition and in the Jewish one would say that the lord God is the greatest materialist because you know as William Temple once said "God is interested in many other things than religion". Well God only interested in religion the world would consist of nothing but church buildings and Bibles and clergyman. And that would be pretty boring.

So in the culture that we call materialistic today we are of course bent on the total destruction of material and it's going to version into junk and poisonous gas as quickly as possible. This is not a materialistic culture because it has no respect for material. And respect is in turn based on Wonder, on feeling the marble of just an ordinary pebble in your fingers. So I'm afraid you see for the God is dead theology, that it will sort of drift off into secular do-goodery in the name of Jesus. And this is I think where we can be strongly religious side and stimulated by the introduction into our spiritual life of certain things that are Oriental.

Now you see,, it must be understood that the crux of the Hindu and Buddhist disciplines is an experience not a theory. Not a belief. If we say that religion is a combination of creed, code, and cult, in other words, this is true of Judaism, Islam, and Christianity and if they are religions, Buddhism is not. Because the creed is a revelation they revealed the symbolism of, what the universe is about, and you are commanded to believe in it on the divine authority. The code is the revealed will of God for man which you are commanded to obey, and the cult is the divinely revealed form of worship which you must practice commandment because God is boss. He's ruler. King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

But the disciplines say of yoga in Hinduism or of the various forms of Buddhist meditation do not require you to believe anything. And they have no commandments in them, they do indeed have precepts, but they are really vows which you undertake on your own responsibility, not in obedience to anybody. They are experimental techniques for changing consciousness. And the thing they are mainly concerned with is helping

human beings to get rid of the hallucination that each one of us is a skin encapsulated ego. You know, a little source, a little man inside your head, located between the ears and behind the eyes who is the source of conscious attention and voluntary behavior.

Most people, you know, don't think, don't really think that they are anything but that and that the body is a thing you have. Mummy, who would have been if my father had been someone else? See the parents give you the body and you pop the soul into it at some period, conception or partition nobody could ever decide, and this attitude stays with us, that we are something in a body, that we have a body, and we are not it, so we experience the beating of the heart as something that happens to me, when I was talking or walking, is something that I do, don't you be charged for language won't allow you to think that it's not customary to say so. How do you think? How do you manage to be conscious? You don't know. How do you open and close your hand? Do you know? If you're a physiologist, you may be able to say, but that doesn't help you to open and close your hand any better than I do.

So, you know how to do it but I can't put it into words in the same way the Hindu god knows how he creates this whole universe because he does it but he wouldn't explain it that would be stupid you might as well try to drink the Pacific Ocean with a fork. So when a Hindu gets enlightened and he recovers from the hallucination of being a skin encapsulated ego and finds out that central to his own self is the eternal Self of the universe. And you go up to him and say "Well how do you do all this?" he says "Well, just like you open and close your hand." And because we are all it. Whenever a questioner used to come to Sri Ramana, the great Hindu sage who died a few years ago, they said to him Master. What was I living before in a previous incarnation and if so who was I? And he would say who is asking the question? Who are you? And a spiritual teacher in both Hinduism and Buddhism is a kind of, well, what he does to awaken you, to get you over the hallucination of being the skin encapsulated ego, he bugs you in a certain way. He has a funny look in his eyes as if to say "Come off it Shiva. I know what you are doing." And you say "What, me?" Here he looks at you in a funny way. And there, finally you get the feeling that he sees all the way through you, and therefore that all your selfish and evil thoughts

and nastiness is transparent to this gaze and then you have to try and alter them he suggests, you see, that you practice the control of the mind. That you become desireless. You give up selfish desires so as to cease to be a skin encapsulated self. And then you may have some success in quieting your mind, in concentrating, but then after that you throw a curve at you. Which is, but aren't you still desiring not to desire? Why are you trying to be unselfish?

Well the answer is I want to be on the side of the Big Battalions.. I think it's going to pay better to be unselfish than to be selfish. Well Luther saw that. Augustan saw that. But there it is. Because what he's done, you see, he's beginning to make you see the unreality, the hallucinatory quality of a separate self. This has merely conventional reality in the same sense as lines of latitude and longitude, the measurements of the clock, that's why one of the meanings of Maya, illusion, is measurement. Things for example, are measurements, they are units of thought, like inches are units of measurement. There are no things in physical nature. How many things are a thing? It is any number you want. Because a thing is a think or unit of thought as much of reality as you can catch hold of in one idea.

So when this realisation of the hallucination of a separate self comes about it comes about through discovering that your alleged separate self can't do anything. It can't improve itself either by doing something about it all by doing nothing about it. Both ways are based on illusion. You see this is what you have to do to get people out of hallucinations you make them act consistently on the suppositions of the hallucination. People who believe that the earth is flat cannot possibly be talked into seeing that it's round because they know it's flat. Because can't you see? So what you do is this you say let's go and look over the edge, wouldn't that be fun? But you see to be sure that we do get to the edge we must be very careful not to walk in circles. So you perform a discipline, you go steadily and rigorously westwards along latitude forty or something and then when you get back to the place where you started. He is convinced that the world is at least cylindrical. By experiment. By reductio ad absurdum of his premises and so in the same way, the guru whether Hindu or Buddhist performs a reductio ad absurdum on the premise of the skin encapsulated ego. Well what happens then? You might imagine from garbled accounts of eastern

mysticism that one thereupon disappears forever into an infinite see a faint glimmer of Jello and become so lost to the world in entranced that you forget your name address, telephone number, and function in life and nothing of the kind happens. In the state of mystical illumination, although it may in its sudden onset be accompanied by a sensation tremendous luminescence and transparency and as you get used to it it's just like everyday life. Here are the things that you formerly thought were separate individuals and the Here it is you who you formerly thought was merely confronting these other people. When the great Dr D.T. Suzuki was asked what is it like to be enlightened he said "It's just like ordinary everyday experience except about two inches off the ground." Because what is altered is not the way your senses perceive. What is altered Is that what you think about. Your definitions of what you see your evaluation of it. So when you don't cling to it when you have no longer a hostile attitude to the world because you know the world is you it is mean to take it from the point of view of biology if I describe the behavior of a living organism I cannot possibly describe that behavior without simultaneously describing the behavior of the environment. So that I discover that I don't describe organisms in environments, I describe a unified field of behavior called an organism-environment. It's an awkward word. But there it is. The environment doesn't push the organism around the organism doesn't push the environment around. They are two aspects, or poles of the same process.

And so you have to understand that this attitude towards nature, seeing the fundamental unity of the self which manifests it all, is not an attitude as the missionaries are apt to suppose which denies the value of differentiation. You must understand the principle of what are called Identical differences. Take a coin, the head side is a different side from the tail side, and yet the two are inseparable. Take the operation of buying and selling, selling is a different operation from buying but you can't buy unless somebody sells at the same time and vice versa. This is what is meant by the underlying unity of opposites what is called in Hinduism Vita, or non-duality. Or when the Chinese use the word Tao to designate The Way of operation of the positive and negative principles the yang and yin. It is not a unity that annihilates differences, but a unity which is manifested by the very differentiations that we perceive. Just as it's all polar. It's like the two poles of a magnet are different but yet one magnet. So when we say oriental monism is a point of

view towards life which merges everything into a kind of sickening goo. This is terribly unfair. It just isn't so. If you argue that the sort of doctrine that everybody is really the Godhead destroys the possibility of real love between individuals because you have to be definitively other than I am to love you, otherwise it's all self-love. Well that argument collapses in view of the doctrine of the Trinity. If the three persons are one God then they can't love each other by the same argument. Hinduism simply uses the idea which is in the Christian Trinity only it makes it a multi-Trinity instead of the three one. That's all. Of course the thorn in the flesh is always in approaching a doctrine which seems to be monistic pantheistic. What about evil? Are we to make the ground of being responsible for evil. And we don't want to do that because we want to keep God skirts clean. In spite of the fact that our own Hebrew Bible says I am the Lord, there is none else. I form the light and create darkness. I make peace and create evil I the law do all these things. And haven't you heard the story about the yetzer hara? That according to Jewish theology the law of God implanted in Adam at the beginning of time I think all the yetzer hara it means the wayward spirit. I call it the element of irreducible rascality. And it's very necessary to have this in order to be human. You see how it was done was this prohibition not to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. That was the one sure way of being a being, of getting it eaten. But of course when the Lord God accused out and said you have been eating of that tree, I told you not to eat. And he passed the buck to Eve said this woman that I gave is me she tempted me and I did eat. He looked at Eve, "Now what about it?" She said "Well it was the serpent." He looked at the serpent, and the serpent didn't say anything. Because he knew too much and he wasn't going to give away the show. Who is it that sits at the left hand of God? We know who sits at the right hand. But it's hushed up, because that's the side where the district attorney sits. And in the Book of Job, of course you know, Satan is the district attorney at the court of heaven, he's the prosecutor, he's a faithful servant of the court.

Because you see, the whole problem is, it would be very bad indeed if God were the author of evil and we were his victims. That is to say, if we keep the model of the King of the universe and the creatures are all subjects of the king, then a God who is responsible for evil is being very unkind to other people. But in this theory God is not another person. There are no

victims of God. He's never anything but his own victim. You are responsible. And if you want to stay in the state of illusion, stay in it. But you can always wake up.

Mythology of Hinduism

I wonder, I wonder, what you would do if you had the power to dream at night, any dream you wanted to dream. And you would of course be able to alter your time-sense and slip, say seventy-five years of subjective time into eight hours of sleep.

You would, I suppose, start out by fulfilling all your wishes. You could design for yourself what would be the most ecstatic life. Love affairs, banquets, dancing girls, wonderful journeys. Gardens, music beyond belief. And then, after a couple of months of this sort of thing at seventy five years a night you'll be getting a little taste for something different and you would move over to an adventurous dimension where there were certain dangers involved and the thrill of dealing with dangers. And you could rescue princesses from dragons. And go on dangerous journeys. Make wonderful explosions and blow them up. And eventually get into contest with enemies. And after you've done that for some time you'd think up a new wrinkle. To forget that you were dreaming so that you would think it was all for real. And to be anxious about it. Because it'd be so great when you wake up. And then you say well like children who dare each other on things, how far out could you get? Or could you take what dimension of being lost, of abandonment, of your power, what dimension of that could you stand you could ask yourself this because you know you would eventually wake up. And I feel gone on doing this you see for some time you would suddenly find yourselves. Sitting around in this room. With all your personal involvements problems that. Talking with me. How do you know that that's not what you're doing? Could be.

Because after all what would you do if you were God. If you were what there is. The Self. In the Upanishads, as the basic text of Hinduism one of them starts out saying in the beginning was the self. And looking around it said "I am." And thus it is that everyone to this day when asked who is there, says it is I, and they are to give whatever particular name you may

have. For if you were God and in the sense that you knew everything and you were completely transparent to yourself through and through. You would be bored. Because, if looking at it from another way, we push technology to its furthest possible development, and we had instead of a dial telephone on one's desk a more complex system of buttons. And one touch beep, would give you anything you wanted. Aladdin's lamp. You would eventually have to introduce a button labeled surprise.

Because all perfectly known futures as I pointed out are past. They have happened, virtually. It is only the true future is a surprise. So if you were God. You would say to yourself Man get lost. And it strange that this idea is obscurely embedded in the Christian tradition when in the epistle to the Philippians, Sir Paul speaks of God the Son the last the Word of God who is incarnate in Christ and says "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God thought not equality with God a thing to be clung to, but made himself of no reputation, and humbled himself and was found in fashion as a man and became obedient to death." Same idea. Same idea as the idea of the dream. And yet that very far out dream of getting as extreme as you can get.

And so this then is the basis of the Hindu view of the universe and of man. The Hindu looks upon the universe as a drama. The Westerner of course looks upon the universe as a construct, as something made. And it is not therefore insignificant that Jesus was the son of a carpenter. The Chinese looks upon the universe as an organism, as we shall subsequently see. But the dramatic idea is basic to Hinduism. Now you can speak about Hinduism on two levels at least. One I will call the metaphysical level, and the other the mythological level. If you speak on the metaphysical level, you can speak only in negative language. You can say what the Divine, the ultimate reality, is not. If you speak on the mythological level, you may speak of what the Divine is like because myth is not a falsehood as one uses the word in a sophisticated way. A myth is an image, a concrete image in terms of which man makes sense of the world. And thus the idea of God the Father or God the maker is a myth because it's an image. And Christian theologians distinguish equally between two kinds of theological language which are respectively called cataphatic and apophatic. Apophatic language is negative, as when we say God is infinite and eternal. Cataphatic language

is mythological, as when we say God the Father, God is love and all the positive designations. We are not saying God is a cosmic male parent, but is analogous with the Father. So is Hinduism. But what I'm going to speak to you and first of all is the mythological language of Hinduism. The idea of the universe as the big act. The universe is God playing hide and seek. With himself. For God is thought of fundamentally to the Hindu as the self. The Self. The cosmic I. And it is a basic proposition for the Hindu, that only the Self, the Godhead is real. There is nothing other than the Godhead.

So that the appearance, of the feeling that there are other things than the Godhead, is called Maya. Maya. We ordinarily translate that word illusion. But you must be careful about the word illusion. Illusion is related to the Latin ludere. And that means play. And this is why the analogy of the world is dramatic. It's a play-in the sense of a stage play. Now when you go to the theater, you know what you're going to see is not for real. Because what proscenium arch tells you that everything that happens on the far side of that arch is only in play. Not serious. But the actor and you will hope that he will be good at it is going to try and persuade you that it's for real. So that he will so move you that you are crying or sitting in anxiety upon the edge of your chair. And so the audience is almost persuaded to be taken in.

Now what about if this would happen with the very best actor of all. The great actor. The audience would have cost be completely taken in. But in this case of course the actor and the audience are the same. The Self. The Self has thus the capacity to abandon itself, to forget itself, to hide from itself, and thus to make the most completely convincing illusion but in play and so the activity of the creative activity of the Godhead in India is and is called Lila, which means play. Our word lilt is related to it I think. But so also in the Book of Proverbs. You will find a discourse being given by the Divine Wisdom "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways before his works of Old. I think it's the twenty second chapter of Proverbs in the course of wish. The wisdom says that. Its delight was to rejoice the King James Bible says in the presence of God and with the sons of men. But the Hebrew translated rejoice says play. Rejoice is a sort of dignified Elizabethen. But it says play. And Sir Thomas, aware of this, said that the divine wisdom was above all to be compared with games because games are played for their own sake. And not for any sort of ulterior motive. So

also music is a kind of non-purposeful thing because you don't either play music to reach a destination, nor do you dance to reach a particular place on the floor. It is the doing of it itself that is important because after all if the object of music were to gain a certain destination those orchestras that played fastest would be considered the best.

So the idea is that the that dancing and music more than other arts represent the nature of this world. That it is playful. That it is sport. That is maybe sincere but is definitely not serious. And as G.K. Chesterton well put it once "The angels fly because they take themselves lightly." How much more so a lot of the angels. So if a beautiful lady should say to me "I love you." And I were to reply, "Are you serious, or are you just playing with me?" that would be quite the wrong response, because I hope she is not serious and that she will play with me. I should say are you sincere or are you just toying with me because you see the word play has many different senses. A person who is playing the organ in church is certainly not doing something trivial. When you go to see a play called Hamlet you are not saying something trivial. When the concert artists plays Mozart he is suddenly entertaining you but it's not a trivial entertainment. But on the other hand we would use play in a did it quite a different sense when we mean just fooling around. Doing it for kicks.

So it is fundamental, as a matter of fact, to both the Hindu and the Christian traditions that the universe is the play of God. But the Christian thinks of it in the terms of construction play. Like building with blocks. And the Hindu thinks of it as dramatic play of the actual participation of the Godhead in the creation so that every being whatsoever is God in disguise. Hinduism speaks of the Godhead as you use is the word Brahman. This is neuter form in Sanskrit from the root "Bri". Which means to grow. To expand. To swell. The neuter form "Brahman," does not have quite the connotation then you see of kingship that we will find attached to the Western idea of God, but is also referred to as Atman. And this word we translate ordinarily the self so you can have the power are. You put the M. in to connect the particle, Param Atman, which means a part of the supreme self. Or sometimes just the Atman alone, and that means the Self in you.

But the fundamental principle of Indian philosophy is Atman as Brahman and your self is the Supreme Self. Or it is expressed also in the formula tat tvam asi, colloquially translated “you’re IT. Or tat, that, tvam, latin to arm, asi, you are that, that thou art. Tat, of course is the first word uttered by a baby. Da da da da da da. And fathers flatter themselves that it’s saying da-da. It’s not. It’s saying “that,” and so is pointing to that-ness in everything. It’s so important to see this. Because everything is just that. I could say it in a negative way which you won’t appreciate it first perhaps. Everything is meaningless. Only words have meaning. Because they point to something other than themselves. The sound water is undrinkable. But it points to the drink of all reality. But you say though what is that pointing at the water and somebody says water is not being correct because what you are pointing at is not the noise water so it’s not water. It’s that. Does. And what is a kind of jazz, bloop bloop bloop bloop bloop bloop, and it’s just doing that. And you can get to see two people or a kind of jazz. They talk and communicate with each other but what does that mean? Well they get together and they make more people and they do this and they do that and they eat and they go on doing this but it’s just jazz. And you begin to see as you do that, everything is like music you see it’s all these complicated vibrations could get do on all kinds of ways that’s that or that in this that are also called in Sanskrit.

So anyway this is the fundamental notion that you are really what there is. The works. Only you’re playing hide and seek with yourself. And on a stupendous scale. Hindus measure time in units which in Sanskrit are called Kalpa. And a Kalpa is a period of four million three hundred twenty thousand years. And there are two kinds of Kalpa. One is called Manvantara, and the other is called Pralaya. Manvantara is the Kalpa in which the universe is manifested. In other words, in which God puts on his big act. And Pralaya is the Kalpa succeeding Kalpa in which the universe is unmanifested And the Godhead does not dream but is awake to its own nature. So that for these, are called respectively the days and the nights of the Brahman. And this goes on for ever and ever and ever and ever the days, the days and nights adding up into years and centuries and aeons. They speak of Crore, a Sanskrit measure. Crore sort of a word that really I think means umpteen. Crores of kalpas. And this is the in breathing and the out-breathing. As this is the word hangsah. In this word in Sanskrit

hangsah, means a swan or a big water bird like a gander. And there's a myth that there is in the beginning the divine bird which lays the egg of the world and the egg splits and the upper is the heavens and the lower is the earth. Now so when the worlds are manifested, the Lord breathing out says "hung," and when the worlds are withdrawn the breath comes back. But if you say hung. Hungsah becomes a hangsah. That means, sah means that, the truth. I am, I am that. It's like imagine when we get to the final moment in which the world is blown up. You know, imagine the countdown. This is the end. Somebody has pushed the button. Eight, seven, six, five four three two one.

What are you listening to? The sound of the waves. And you can sit and listen to the little waves on the seashore. You get back here into this kind of thinking and you're hearing the ocean of the universe going. And that's your breathing too it's all one rhythm. So it may be that every star was once a planet populated by intelligent people who found out about the fundamental energy of the universe and blew themselves up. And as they blew up, they scattered all kinds of stuff out which became little planets, and in a long time life started all over again. Because the Hindu theory is very odd. Every cow but in a Manvantara period whether the manifested world is divided into four subdivisions of time, each one of which is called a Yugo. That means roughly an epoch or an era. And there are four Yugo's, and they are named after the different throws in the Indian game of dice. That for such throws in the first is called critter. That means. Creta means to do this when we say something is done truly done. It's the perfect throw of four. second is called Threta or which is the throw three. The next is called Vapira which is the throw of two. And the final one is called Kali which means the worst throw which is the throw of one. Now each of these periods of the Kalpa. Are of different lengths creator is the longest and Carly is the shortest and so arranged. So that when the world is first manifested as in those dreams that I were mentioning to you the world is in a golden age to begin with is perfect. And that is the longest period of time. Then when we get a little bit more adventurous you see, treta means that in this era a kind of disharmonious element enters into things it's like a three legged chair isn't so secure as a four legged chair it's just a bit inclined to tip. And as it were there's a fly in the ointment. The snake in the garden. Then comes Vapara in which the forces of Good and Evil are equally

balanced. And finally Kali which is the shortest period where the forces of evil triumph, and the world is destroyed at the end of it. For then the Godhead appears in the form of Shiva who represents the destructive aspect of the divine energy. And is the creative Vishnu, the Preserver, Shiva the Destroyer. But Shiva is always the destroyer in the sense of the liberator, the guy who breaks up the ruts. And he comes on with a blue body and ten arms and a necklace of skulls. Indian gods have many arms because they are cosmic centipedes. They do all things without having to think about it, like the centipede doesn't have to think about how to manipulate its legs. Like you don't have to think how to grow your hair. And as Shiva dances what is called the Tandava, which is the dance of destruction at the end of the cycle, at the end of the Kalpa. You will see that his hands contain clubs and knives and bells but one hand is like that, and that gesture means, don't be afraid, it's a big act. It is all as it were the outflowing of your own consciousness, of your own mind.

Now then, the Hindu life is related to this cosmology. And the object of life is of course in the end to wake up from the dream. When you've had enough. And so the dreaming process is called sometimes Samsara. Samsara is the round. The rat race. And Samsara is divided into six divisions. But I'd better draw a map, I think. This is common cosmology to both the Hindus and the Buddhists.

This is the world of the Deva. And this is the same root from which we get both divine and devil, but Deva means angel. The highest and most successful beings in the universe, and so opposite this is the world of narac, naraka, who are the most unsuccessful. These are the purgatorial worlds of extreme suffering. This is the world of Assura. They are also angels, but they're angry angels representing the wrath potential of energy. This is the world of animals. This is the world of Preta, for which we have no English equivalent, hungry or frustrated spirits who have enormous stomachs but mouths only the size of needles a vast appetite and no means of fulfillment. And this is the manu, the world, that is to say the world of man. You don't have to take this literally. You could say when you are extremely happy or ecstatic you are here. When you are miserable, you are here. When you are dumb, you're here, when you're mad you're here. When you're frustrated you're here, but when you're more or less your normal rational self you are. Now or so you are all life through the period of the Kalpas goes grinding

around this wheel. And if you go up and you succeed and you get to the top you have to come down. They don't look they don't see success in other words in the world as a method of liberation because it implies failure.

So the idea of liberation which is called Moksha. Is the ideal of Hindu life. Wake up, it's a dream. And in time, there is no hope in time. Everything is going to get worse in time, because as you know it does we all fall apart in the end. Everything falls apart, institutions buildings and nations, it all crumbles. And people say well that's an awfully pessimistic philosophy. Well is it? I would rather say that the people who have hope in the future are the miserable people. because they are like donkeys chasing carrots that are dangled before their noses from sticks attached to their collars. And they pursue and they pursue in vain, always hoping that tomorrow will be the great thing and therefore incapable of enjoying themselves today.

People who live for the future never get there. Because when their plans mature they are not there to enjoy them. They're the sort of people who spend their lives saving for their old age. And trying to teach their children to do the same thing. So that when they retire at sixty five, you know there have false teeth and wrinkles and prostate trouble and all that sort of thing. Where were you going what did you think it was all about? Furthermore, the fact that life is transient, is part of its liveliness. The poets, in speaking of the transience of the world, always tell their best poetry. You know, our revels now are ended, and these are actors as I foretold you are all spirits and are melted into air into thin air. And like the baseless fabric of this vision, the Cloud-Cap towers, the goddess palaces, the solemn temples, the great earth itself I always did inherit shall dissolve. And like this insubstantial pageant faded, leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff as dreams are made up, and our little life is rounded with a sleep. And said so well it doesn't seem so bad after all does it. You see there's always in the poetry of Evanescence a kind of funny nostalgia. Moralists will say all those lovely lips which you so delight to kiss today will in a few years of rot and disclose the grinning teeth of the skull.

So what?The skull says lying in the grass chattering Finch in water fly are not merrier than I here among the flowers I lie laughing everlastingly. No, I may not tell the best, surely friends I could have guessed, death was but the

good kings jest, it was hid so carefully. And monks used to keep skulls on their desks. And people nowadays think that was very morbid. But it's only I went and visited the chapel in the Via Vinetto in Rome where there's a crypt bones, where all the altar furnishings are made out of human bones. The altars of piles of skulls there are rib bones arranged across the ceiling like floral patterns with vertebrae representing flowers. And they're all dead cap which in monks. And there's a funny little monk collecting the admissions up at the top and he has one of the funniest grins on his face I see a long time. I said to him you know the Day of Resurrection is going to be an awful lot of scuttling up this narrow staircase, of people trying to reassemble their bones. Father isn't that my fifth metatarsal? So the whole idea you see is that everything's falling apart. So don't try to stop it! When you're falling off a precipice it doesn't do you any good to hang on hang on to rock that's falling with you. But everything is doing that and so again this is another case of a completely wasting our energy in trying to prevent the world from falling apart don't do it. And then you'll be able to do something interesting with the free energy.

So that's Moksha. Because when the Hindu says everything is unreal, the Western reacts and says, "No no you can treat life as a dream. It's serious, it's real, it's for real!" And what do you mean by? OK how really wanted to be. This is in other words. Everything in so far as it's falling apart, if one thing is changing, it is like smoke, and we all feel that smoke has a lesser degree of reality than would. It's is the image of the evanescent, of the ghostly. There's this idea the whole world is this mirage. That doesn't mean it's a bad thing it's only bad if you cling to it if you try to lean on it. But if you don't lean on it it's a grand illusion so the word Maya not means not only illusion but it means art. It means magic and it means creative power. So this is the big act. And it's perhaps easier to feel the world in that way in a tropical country where death is very common and where you just watch things dissolve before your eyes ad yet burst out and grow again. The whole world is changing. Maybe easier to think that way than in our environment although when you're out in California, the human landscape changes so fast, that no town is the same for two years. Any mailing list that you have change one third addresses per annum. Nothing stays put. The hills are shadows and they flow from form to form and nothing stands.

Now this you see is not a pessimistic attitude, therefore, at all, to be able to realize that this world is simply a dream. A dancing play of smoke, fascinating yes, but don't lean on it. Life is a bridge, says one of the Hindu sayings, "Pass over it but build no house upon it." And so immediately you see that this is responsible for the enormous gaiety of certain Hindu sages. This is a thing that often puzzles Westerners. The element of they expected anybody who's an ascetic or a sage or something to be rather miserable with a glum face, but on the contrary. You take this character who's going around these days that Mahashi Mahesh, he's always laughing. Because he sees through it he looks on every side, and there is the face of the beloved of the divinity in everybody in every direction in everything playing at being you. And you can look down into a person's eyes way way in and you see the Self, the Eternal Divine, and what is so funny when it puts on an expression saying "What me?" And the guru, the teacher. When people go to a guru, they get all sorts of funny ideas, they think he's looking right through me. He sees me through and through he knows how awful I am, reads my most secret thoughts because he has a funny look at things. He isn't even interested in your secret thoughts he is looking straight at the god it in you with a funny expression on his face which is saying "Why are you trying to kid me? You can have it Shiva, I know you are." But and therefore you see his his role is to gently humor you into waking up as to your true nature. Now of course as I intimated earlier. The Hindu is therefore saying everybody is God. And this is why when a Hindu greets you he does this. That is the word the act of puja or worship to the Godhead in you. And our theologians get rather worried about that. Because you see the two conceptions of God are different. Our conception is of the boss man the king. Theirs is of the cosmic centipede with the many arms. Who does not have to think, how to make the world or other, to act the world. That would be an insufferable nuisance. You may think it rather wonderful when some Thomas tries to explain that God is fully aware of everything that happens and in every detail is willing each single vibration of any mosquitoes wing.

But when you really begin to think about it, that approach is intellectual elephantitis. Imagine the Lord being aware of all the prayers, and having to listen to the sort of prayers that go on every night. God heard the embattled nation shout. Got star for England, then God Save the King, God this, God that, of God The other thing good God said God I've got my work cut out.

But so therefore when somebody in India suddenly announces that he's God, nobody accuses him of blasphemy or of being insane. They say simply congratulations, at last you found out. And they don't immediately request a miracle. As you see, if we get across someone who says "I'm God" or "I'm a Jesus Christ," they say what they said to Jesus Christ in the first place. Command that this bread, these stones be made bread. And you know, he used to wangle out of it and go out of it by saying "You're wicked and deceitful generation seek it after a sign, in the show no sign be given." The Hindu would say, but there is no point in changing it. It's going the way I want it to anyhow. Only really and truly. There is not this idea of God the technician, but rather the power of omnipotence is not to be able to do anything, but to be doing all things, whatever it is that's going on. And spontaneously without having to think about it which is very clumsy.

Now then, I must say something about how then this relates to the life of the Hindu. Hindus divide life into certain stages what I call the Asharmas. The first is called Brahma Charia. The second Gri Hasta. And the third Vannaprasta. Brahma Charia, means the stage of the student, the apprenticeship. Gri Hasta, to the stage of the householder. And Vanaprasta, the stage of the forest. This is really related to the cultural history of early India. Before we have agrarian communities, we have a hunting culture, which is on the move. In a hunting culture, every male knows the whole culture, there is no division of labor. And the holy man of the hunting culture is of course called a shaman. A shaman is a realized man, a man who knows the in a secret. He's seen through the game and he finds it by going away alone into the forest. And cutting himself off from the tribe. That is to say, from social conditioning. And he goes maybe for a long period into the forest and comes back. He's found out who he is, and he sure isn't who he was told he was. But as hunting culture settle into agrarian patterns of life, what do they do? They build a village. And around the village they set up a stockade, which is known as the pail. And the village is always of course standing at a crossroads. And there you get in an agrarian society a division of labor. And the division of labor comprises four. In medieval Europe we call them lords spiritual. Lords temporal. Commons and serfs. In India they are Brahmins. Chatrya that means fighters. Vichya, merchants or traders. Shudra, laborers. So you've got the priests, the Warriors, the merchants, and the laborers. Division of labor. The four

sections of town. So the four basic costs. So when you are born you are born into a caste. And your duty as a Gri Hasta, to our householder, is to fulfil your cost function, and to bring up a family. When you've done that. You go back to the forest, back to the hunting culture. And you drop your role. And you become nobody. A shaman again. So Hindu calls one who does this, which is of course the same word as Shaman. And the Chinese call him a Shaman. Shaman is an immortal. Why immortal? Because it's only the role that's mortal. The big front, the persona. The one who you really are. The common man, that is to say the man, who is common to us all which you could call the Son of Man. That's the real self that's the guy who's putting on the big act. And of course he has no name. Nobody can put the finger on him. Because you can't touch the tip of the finger with the tip of the finger.

So that means in practice then, that when you hand over your vocation in life which is called Svadarma, that means that's the same as the Latin, one's own karma means function your own function or we would call your vocation. When you've completed it, you drop out and become a nobody. Because you're going to find out now who you really are. You're no longer. Mr. Who is. Trust salesman. You drop that name. And you take on one of the names of God Swami Brahmananda Swami bliss of Brahma. And you're. You may go quite naked like the Shiite holy man. No clothes and they just go out and wander and don't make any provisions or anything they in literally take no thought for the morrow, what you shall eat, what you shall drink or where with all those will be clothed. But you seem people respect them. They say are we going to have those people up there because they are doing what human being is ultimately supposed to do, and we should do it in our turn and so give them some food. Now naturally caste holy men and all that kind of thing can be exploited. Anything can be exploited and abused. And we can look at it all and say. What a mess, why don't you do something for yourselves? Why don't you kill the sacred cows and eat them? Why don't you clean up why do you permit all this disease? Just try and see something from another point of view for a change. I'm not saying that we should do what the Hindus do, but just look at it from another point of view. And they would smile at us and say. "You really think it's as real as all that?" Have you never experienced what's on the inside of this game.

So the trouble with you Westerners is you never experienced bliss. You never got down to the root of reality. You don't know that state of consciousness. And so you're frantically trying to patch everything up and pin it all together and screw the universe up so it's fixed you can never do it or it is going to wildly rushing around and creating trouble. Cos Western educated induce think the same way. They are now rushing around and patching India up. And what's going to happen is they're going to arm all the millions of people in India and they're going to create a lot of trouble in Asia one of these days when they become powerful society. We're here of course.

Yeah that's true you know. Because of the big fight with the devil you see. The war in heaven, you see now the funny thing about that is, when you read Milton's Paradise Lost, long before Lucifer decided to rebel, the whole of Heaven was armed. And he describes the legions of angels with their discussions and gone for lungs and military department, who was looking for trouble? You know there Lucifer was a good guy back there, you see, the bearer of light. So the Hindu looks at our Christianity and sort of thinks, my goodness. Here is the eternal Self, but in the idea of Christianity, the God-head is having a real far one. Because not only is he incarnating himself, say as some wretched beggar, but he's incarnated himself as a Christian soul who believes that in this one short life he will decide his eternal destiny and the possibilities of making a mistake are far greater than the being a lousy beggar. The possibility involved in the Christian gamble is to fry in hell forever and ever and ever and ever. Even the Avici hell at the bottom of the Naraka only goes on for about one Kalpa. But the everlasting damnation. What an idea. So the Hindu says Bravo, you know. God has really done a dare on himself this time to be a Christian soul.

Introduction to Buddhism

The idea of a Yana, of vehicle, comes from the basic notion or image of Buddhism as a raft for crossing a river. This shaw is ordinary everyday consciousness, such as we have, mainly the consciousness of being an ego or a sensitive mind locked up inside a mortal body. A consciousness of being you in particular and nobody else. The other Shaw is release or Nirvana. A word which means literally blow out. As one says when heaving

a sigh of relief. Nirvana is a never, never, never to be interpreted as a state of extinction or a kind of consciousness in which you are absorbed into an infinitely formless luminous ocean which could best be described as purple jello. But luminous, you know, kind of spiritual. It isn't meant to be that at all. Nirvana has certain many senses, but the primary meaning of it is that this everyday life just as we have it now, but seen and understood and felt in a very very different way. Buddhism is called in, general a Dharma, and this word is often mistranslated as the law. It's better translated as the doctrine. And still better translated as the method. And the dharma is formulated originally by the Buddha, who was the son of a north Indian Raja living very close to Nepal who was thriving shortly after six hundred B.C. The word buddha is a title. The proper name of this individual was Guatama Siddhartha. The word Buddha means the Awakened One. From the Sanskrit root Budh, which means to wake. Or to know.

So we could say Buddha means the man who woke up, and the Buddha was a very very skilful psychologist. He is in a way the first psycho-therapist in history. A man of tremendous understanding of the wiles and deviousness of a human mind. What ism it is made to be easily understood. Everything is numbered so you can remember it. And the basis of it is and I want to call the four noble truths. The first one is the truth about suffering. The second the truth about the cause of suffering the third the truth about the ceasing of suffering. And the fourth, the truth about the way of ceasing the suffering. Then let's go back to the beginning: suffering. The Sanskrit word as Dukha D. U. K. H. A. Dukha. In means suffering in the widest possible sense but chronic suffering chronic trust ration is probably as good a translation as any chronic frustration and the blood it does and says the life of mankind and of animals indeed also of angels. If you believe in angels is characterized by chronic frustration. And so that constitutes the problem if if anyone if anyone of you says I have a problem I don't suppose you would be here if you didn't in some way have a problem. Well that's dukha.

Now the next thing is the cause of it., which is called Trishna T R I S H N A, is a Sanskrit word that is the root of our word thirst. Thirst. But more exactly craving or clutching or desiring. Because of craving or of clutching in us, we create suffering, but in turn this second truth includes that behind Trishna there lies another thing called ignorance. Avidya. Non Vision. And

you see video. Vid in Sanskrit is the root of the Latin v Dale and of vision. And in front of the word is none as we say atheist is a non theist so I Vidia is not seeing ignorance or better ignoring because our mind as it functions consciously is a method of attending to different and particular areas of experience, one after another one of time. When you focus your consciousness on a particular area, you ignore everything else. That is why to know is at the same time to ignore. And because of that there arises Trishna craving. Why? Because if you ignore what you really know you come to imagine that you are separate from the rest of the universe. And that you are alone. And therefore you begin to crave. To thirst. You but you develop an anxiety to survive. Because you think if you're separate if you're not the whole works you're going to die actually you're not going to die at all you're simply going to stop doing one thing and start doing something else you know when you die in the ordinary way you just stop doing this thing called Alan Watts. But you do something else, later, later man and I'm like that and you and it is nothing to worry about at all. Only if you are going tally law up in the illusion that you're only this then you begin to be frightened and anxious and that creates thirst. So if you can get rid of ignorance, ignore-ance, and widen your mind out so as to see the other side of the picture, then you can stop craving. That doesn't mean to say you won't enjoy your dinner. And that it won't be nice to make love to girls or anything like that. It doesn't mean that at all it means you enjoying your dinner and making love and generally. Enjoying the senses and all the experience that only becomes an obstacle to you if you cling to that in order to save yourself.

But if you don't need to save yourself you can enjoy life just as much as ever. You don't have to be a Puritan.

So then, that state of letting go instead of clinging to everything. Supposing you're in business, and you have to make money and keep up this family support or something like that you know the thing is do that but don't don't let it get you down. Do it what the Hindus call Nishkama Karma. Karma, Nishkama means passionless karma activity. And that means doing all the things that one would do in life one's business one's occupation and cetera et cetera but doing it without taking it seriously. Do it as a game. And then everybody who depends on you will like it much better, because if you take

it seriously, they'll be feeling guilty because they'll say "Oh dear papa absolutely knocks himself out to work for us," you see, and they all get miserable and they go on. They live their lives out of a sense of duty which is a dreadful thing to do.

So that's Nirvana, to live in a let-go way. Then the Four Noble Truths describes the way the method of realising Nirvana, and that's called the Noble Eightfold Path. And the eightfold path is a series of eight human activities such as understanding of your effort, vocation or occupation, speaking, conduct, etc., and they're all prefaced by the Sanskrit word Samyak, which is very difficult to translate. Most people translate it right, in the sense of correct. But this is an incomplete translation. The word sum, the root sam in Sanskrit is the same as our word sum, through the Latin suma. And of course the sum of things means completion. But it also has the sense of balanced, or middle wayed. Not W E I G H E D, but W A Y as in the middle way, and Buddhism is called the middle way. And we will find out a great deal about that later.

But the thing that you must recognize is this. Buddhism, although when you say right speech in other words, don't tell lies. Well let me put it this way, everybody who belongs to the Theravada school in the south expresses the fact that he is a Buddhist by reciting a certain formula. And it's called Kisarana, and Panchasila. This is I'm talking Pali now, not Sanskrit. And I means the three refuges punch a seal on the five precepts. And they put their hands together like this and say "But the hung on them be done hung on Tom the sun Hung's on me" [sic], that means I take refuge in Buddha, I take refuge in the method, the Dharma, I take refuge in the Sangha, which means the fraternity of the followers of Buddha, and then he goes on and he takes the five precepts [chants]. And this precepts one after another I have promised to abstain from taking from life. Taking life. I do not die now, that I many I have promised to abstain from taking what is not given Kama Summa. God, I promise to abstain from exploiting my passions. Most of out of out on me, I promise to abstain from false speech [chants]. I promise to abstain from getting intoxicated by a list of various boozes. [laughs] Now that this, everybody, Buddhists in the southern school says this.

Mahayanas have a different formula. All this is the method and the method, the dharma, is there for a moral law. Just like the Ten Commandments but it isn't. There's nothing. It's quite different. You see, you don't take the five precepts in obedience to a royal edict. You take them upon yourself. And there is a very special reason for doing so. How can you call fill the precept not to take life? Every day you eat, even if you're a vegetarian, you must take life. And so on.

Now therefore, understand this, and this is absolutely fundamental to an understanding of Buddhism. Buddhism is a method. It is not a doctrine. Buddhism is a dialogue. And what it states at the beginning is not necessarily what it would state at the end. The method of Buddhism is first of all a relationship between a teacher and a student. The student creates the teacher by raising a problem and going to someone about it. Now if he chooses wisely, you see, he'll find that if there's a Buddha around to use as the teacher. And then he says to the Buddha, "My problem is that I suffer, and I want to escape from suffering." So the Buddha replies. "Suffering is caused by desire. By Trishna, by craving. If you can stop desiring, then you will solve your problem. Go away and try to stop desire." And he gives him some methods. How to practice meditation, and to make his mind calm and still to see if he can stop desire. The student goes away and practices this. Then he comes back to the teacher and says, "But I can't stop desiring not to desire. What am I to do about that?" So the teacher says. "Try then to stop desiring not to desire." And now you can see where this is going to land up. Or he might put it in this way. "All right if you can't completely stop desiring, do a middle way." That is to say, stop desiring as much as you can stop desire. And don't desire to stop any more desire than you can stop. See where that's going to go.

Because he keeps coming back. Because what the teacher has done in saying stop desiring he has given his student what in Zen Buddhism is called a koan. This is a Japanese word that means a meditation problem, or more strictly it means the same thing as case means in law. Because koans are usually based on anecdotes and incidents of the old masters, cases, precedents. But a koan, the function of the koan is a challenge for meditation. Well who is it that desires not to desire? Who is it that wants to escape from suffering? And here we get to a methodological difference

between Hindus and Buddhism on the question of who are you. The Hindu says you, yourself, he calls Atman, the self. And he says now strive to know the self. Realize I am not my body because I can be aware of my body. I am not my thoughts because I can be aware of my thoughts, and not my feelings, for the same reason I am not my mind, etc., because I can be aware of it. Therefore I really am other than, above, transcending, all these finite aspects of me. Now that the Buddhist has a critique of that. He says “Why do you try to escape from yourself as a body?” The reason is your body falls apart and you want to escape from it. Why do you want to decide then to fight yourself from your emotion. The reason is your emotions are uncomfortable and you want to escape from. You don’t want to have to be afraid. You don’t want to have to be in grief or anger. And love even is too much, you see, it involves you and suffering because if you love someone you have a hostage to fortune.

So the Buddha says the reason why you believe you are the Atman, the eternal Self, which in turn is the Brahman, the self and the whole universe, is that you don’t want to lose your damn ego. And if you can fix your ego and put it in the safe deposit box of the lot. You’ve still got yourself, you haven’t really let it go. So the Buddha said there isn’t Atman. He taught the doctrine of an non-Atman, non-self. Your ego is unreal. And as a matter of fact, there’s nothing you can cling to. No refuge really. Just let go, man. There’s no salvation, no safety, nothing anywhere, you see how clever that cross. Because he what he was really saying is any Atman, that you could cling to or think about or believe in wouldn’t be the real one. This is the accurate sense of the original documents of the Buddha’s teachings, if you carefully go through it that’s what he’s saying he’s not saying that there isn’t the outline of a Brahman is anyone you could conceive wouldn’t be it. Anyone you believed in would be the wrong one. Because believing is clinging still. There’s no salvation through believing. There’s only salvation through knowledge.

And even then. The highest knowledge is to know is non-knowledge. And he agrees with the Hindus, who say in the opening Upanishads, if you think that you know Brahman, you do not know him. But if you know, that you do not know the Brahman, you truly know. Why? Well that’s very simple. If you really are it, you don’t need to believe in it. And you don’t need to

know it, just as your eyes don't need to look at themselves and see. So that's the the difference of method in Buddhism. Now understand method here. Method as that dialogue. And the so-called teachings of Buddhism are the first opening gambit in the dialogue. And when they say you cannot understand what is an out of books the reason is that the books only give you the opening gambits. Then having read the book you have to go on with the method. Now you can go on with the method without a former teacher, that is to say you can conduct a dialogue with yourself. Or with life. You have to explore and experiment on such things as, could one possibly not desire? Could one possibly concentrate the mind perfectly? Could one possibly do this that and the other and you have to work with it you see so that you understand the later things that come after trying these experiments. These later things are the heart of Buddhism.

So then shortly after the Buddha's time. the practice of Buddhism continued as a tremendous ongoing dialogue among little various followers, and eventually they established the great universities. Such as there was at a place called Nalanda in northern India. This discourse was going on, and if you looked at it superficially, you might think it was nothing but an extremely intellectual bull session where philosophers were outwitting each other. Actually, the process that was going on was this. That the teacher or guru in every case was examining students as to their beliefs and theories, and destroying their beliefs showing that any belief that you would propose any idea about yourself or about the universe which you want to cling to and make something of use for. A crutch, a problem, the security, the teacher demolishes that. This is how the dialogue works, until you are left with not a thing to hang on to. Any religion you might propose, even atheism, they'll tear up. Agnosticism they'll destroy. Any kind of belief. They're experts in demolition, so that they finally get you to the point where you've got nothing left to hang on to. Well then you're free, cause you're it, you see? Once you're hanging on to things, you put it, somewhere else and see, something I can grab. And even when you think that "I'm it," you're still hanging on to, then they're going to knock that one down.

So when you are left without anything at all, you have seen the point. Now that the method of the dialogue essentially. That is the dharma. And all but it's make jokes about. Buddha says in the Diamond Sutra "When I attained

complete perfect unsurpassed awakening I didn't attain anything." Because it's like, to use a metaphor that is used in the scriptures, it's like using an empty fist to deceive a child. So you know, you say to a child, "What have I got here?" The child gets interested immediately, and wants to find out, so you hide it, and the child climbs all over you can't get a give and finally you do let him get it and there's nothing in it.

Many of the problems that are now being discussed by modern logicians are unbeknownst to them already in the ancient Indian books. Problems of semantics, problems of meaning, problems of the nature of time and of memory. All these were discussed with very very meticulous, scholarly sophistication. So that it is my opinion that this was a very very fertile period of human history. And that the philosophy in which it eventually emerged, the philosophy of Mahayana Buddhism is as yet the most mature and really intelligent theory of human life and of the cosmos that man has ever devised. It is characteristic of this point of view. That it adheres to the Middle Way. And the Middle Way doesn't mean moderation, it means the bringing together of opposites. Of what we might call in our world spirit and matter, mind and body. Mysticism and sensuality. Unity and multiplicity. Conformity and individualism. All these things marvelously wedded together in the worldview of Mahayana. And fundamental to Mahayana Buddhism is the idea of what is called the bodhisattva. Bodhisattva means a person who has as his essence Satva, Bodhi, awakening. And it's usually used to mean a potential Buddha. Someone who is as it were, just about to become a Buddha. That was the original sense and so part of the Pali Canon is a book called The Jataka [sic], the tales of the Buddha's previous lives. How he behaved when he was an animal. How he behaved when he was a man, long before he became Buddha. And in all these stories, he is represented as sacrificing himself for the benefit of other beings. But since he had not yet become a fully fledged Buddha he's called in these stories a bodhisattva. That really means a potential Buddha.

But the point is that as a potential Buddha as a Bodhisattva, he is always involved in situations where he is feeding himself for the hungry tigers and so on. Now in the course of time, the term Bodhisattva underwent a transformation. A bodhisattva matures and becomes a Buddha. And what does that mean popularly? It means that whoever is fully awakened to the

way things are is delivered from any necessity to be involved in the world any more. In other words, you can go on to a transcendent level of being, where time is abolished. Where all times are now. Where there are no problems. Where there is perpetual eternal peace. Nirvana, in the sense of the word Pari-Nirvana means beyond Nirvana, super Nirvana. So that, if you are fed up with this thing and you don't want to play the game of hide and seek anymore you can go in the Pari-Nirvana and be in total serenity. However, and again I'm talking the language of popular Buddhism, a person who stands on the threshold of that peace can turn back. And say I won't be a Buddha. I'll be a Bodhisattva. I won't make the final attainment, because I would like to go back into the world of manifestation they call Samsara. Go back into that world and work for their liberation.

So then, when a Mahayana Buddhist does his formula. For Puja. He says, sentient beings are numberless, I take a vow to save them. Diluting passions are inexhaustible, I take a vow to destroy them. The gates of the method of the method, the Dharma, are manifold, I take a vow to enter them. The Buddha Way is supreme, I take a vow to complete it. All this is impossible. And see numberless sent in beings because their numbers can never be delivered. Diluting passions which are inexhaustible can never be eliminated. So the Mahayana say [chants]. That's their formula the Bodhisattva, who returns into the world and becomes involved again is in fact regarded as a superior kind of being to the one who gets out of it. And the person who gets out of the rat race and enters into eternal peace is called Pratyekabuddha, which means private Buddha, a Buddha who does not teach. Who does not help others, and in Mahayana literature that is almost a term of abuse. Pratyekabuddha is a class with unbelievers and heretics and infidels and fools. But the great thing is that Bodhisattva. All beings are thought of in popular Buddhism as constantly reincarnating AGAIN and AGAIN and AGAIN And AGAIN into the round of existence, helplessly, because they still desire. They're therefore drawn back into the cycle. The Bodhisattva goes back into the cycle with his eyes wide open voluntarily. And allows himself to be sucked in, and this is normally interpreted as an act of Supreme compassion and bodhisattvas can assume any guise. They can get furiously angry, if necessary, in order to discourage evil beings. Even could assume the role of a prostitute and live that way so as to deliver beings at that level of life. Could become an animal, become

an insect, become a maggot, anything you know. All deliberately and in full consciousness, to carry on the work of the deliverance of all beings. Now that's the way the popular mind understands it, and therefore the bodhisattvas are all revered and respected and worshiped and looked upon as gods as we look upon God in the West and as saviors as the Christian looked upon Jesus. But underneath this myth there is a profound philosophical idea. And that is this it goes back to the Hindu philosophy of advice and non-duality. Namely, there the apparent dualism of I and thou. Of the knower and the known, the subject and the object is unreal. And so also the apparent duality between. Maya the world illusion and reality is unreal. The apparent deluded duality or difference between the enlightened and the ignorant person is unreal.

So the apparent duality of bondage and deliverance, all liberation is unreal. The wise, the perfectly wise man, is the one who realizes vividly that the ideal place, is the place where you are. This is an impossible thing to put in words. The nearest I could get to it would be to say that if you could see this moment. That you need nothing beyond this moment, now, sitting here, irrespective of anything I might be saying to you, of any ideas you might have rattling around in your brains. That here and now is the absolute, which than which there is no whicher. Only, we prevent ourselves from seeing this, because we are always saying there ought to be something more on, I'm missing it something somehow. And nobody sees it. Now. Then also the most far out form of my own of Buddhism is in is called the Pure Land school Jodo Shinju. Jodo means pure land since you true sect. And. This is based on the. Idea that there was an immeasurably past ages a Great Bodhisattva called Amitava and he made a vow that he would never never become a Buddha unless any being who repeated his name would automatically, at death be born into the pure land over which he presides, over this kind of paradise. He did become a Buddha, and so the vow works. All you have to do is to repeat the name of Amitaba, and this will assure the fact that without any further effort on your part you will be reborn in his paradise when you die and in that Paradise becoming a Buddha is a cinch. There are no problems there. There Western paradise, you see, is a some kind of a level of consciousness, but it's represented as fact, as a glorious place and, see the pictures of it in, sound wonderful pictures where the Buddha Amitabha, who is actually a Persian figure related to a Uhura

Mazda, and he means boundless light, and the statue at Kamakura, that enormous bronze Buddha in the open air is Amitabha. So there he sits surrounded with his court and this court is full of ups silence and absoluteness beautiful girls playing lutes, and as you are born into the Paradise what happens when you die because you discover yourself inside a lotus. And the Lotus goes up and there you find yourself sitting coming out. Of the water. And here on the clouds in front of you are the Absaras, sitting, strumming their Lutes with the most sensuous, beautiful faces, and to get this, all you have to do is say the name of Amitabha. The formula is Namu-Amina-Butz [sic] Now I want to know what's and you get this fast man know what I mean everything I mean about them and I want [chants] I'm set any minute time to see you so you're quite sure it's going to happen. But actually only have to say it once. And you mustn't make any effort to gain this reward because that would be spiritual pride. Your karma you see your bad deeds your awful past is so bad that anything good you try to do is done with a selfish motive and therefore doesn't effect your deliverance. Therefore the only way to get deliverance is to put faith in the power of this I mean Amitabha Buddha. And to accept it as a free gift and to take it by doing the most absurd things, saying no more I mean the books. Don't even worry whether you have to have faith in it, because trying to have faith is also spiritual pride.

It doesn't matter whether you have faith or whether you don't the thing works anyway so to say now I mean the books and that's the most popular form of Buddhism in Asia. The two most vast temples in Kyoto, the Inisha and Higashi Hongaji temples, represent the sect. And everybody loves Amitabha, Amita they call him in Japan. Boundless light, infinite but of compassion. Sitting there with an angelic expression on his face, "It's all right man, all you have to do is say my name." So when we add together, try our wheels number, they call it Nembutsu, that's the means of remembering, but our bookcases and all these things where you just have to put it up, and the the work is done for you. Then wouldn't we Westerners say, especially if we are Protestants, "Oh what a scoundrelly thing that is. What an awful degradation of religion. What an avoidance of challenge and effort and everything that is required." Is this is what the Bodhisattva doctrine of infinite compassion deteriorates into.

Now you see there is a profound aspect to all that. Just as there is the diamond in the ice as we were talking about this morning. Just as there is desperation and despair. Nirvana. Desperation and despair of the horrors. So there are two ways of looking at this. Nothing to do, no effort to make idea. Depending completely on the Savior. For who is Amitabha. Popularly Amitabha is somebody else, he is some great compassionate being who looks after you. Esoterically, Amitabha is your own nature. I mean your real self, the inmost boundless light that is the root and ground of your own consciousness. You don't need to do anything to be that. You are that. And saying Nembutsu is simply a symbolical way of pointing out. That you don't have to become this, you are it. And Nembutsu therefore and its deeper side builds up a special kind of sage which they call mere Miokonin. Miokonin in Japanese means a marvelous fine man. But the Miokonin in is a special type of personality who corresponds in the West to the holy fool in Russian spirituality, or to something like the Franciscan in Catholic spirituality. And you know Miokonin. Well I tell you some Miokonin stories, that's the best way to indicate their character. One day I'm Miokonin was traveling and stopped in a Buddhist temple overnight. And he went up to the sanctuary where they have all these big questions like you know for the priest to sit down and he arranged the questions in a pile on the floor and went to sleep on. In the morning the priest came in and saw this tramp sleeping and said "What are you doing here? Desecrating the sanctuary by sleeping on the cushions, and so on right in front of your order! And the Miokonin looked at him in astonishment and said "Surely you must be a stranger here, you can't belong to the family." In Japanese when you want to say that a thing is just the way it is you call it sonomama. So as a Haiku poem which says "Weeds in the rice field, cut them down. Sonomama, fertilizer." Cut the weeds, leave them exactly where they are, and they become fertilizer sonomama. And so on mama means reality just the way it is just like that now there's an expression of parallel expression konomama, which means I just as I am. Just little me, with no frills no pretense, except that I naturally have some pretense. That's part of konomama. And the Miokononin is the man you see who realizes that he can i just as I am Buddha. Am delivered by Amitabha, because Amitabha is my real nature. If you really know that you see, that makes you a Miokonin. But be aware of the fact that you could entirely miss the point and become a monkey instead by saying, I am all right just as I am, and therefore I'm

going to rub it in, and I'm going to be going around parading my unregenerate nature because this is Buddha too you see. The fellow who does that doesn't really know that it's OK. He's doing too much he's coming on too strong. The other people who are always beating themselves, they're doing the opposite error, you see. The middle way right down the center is where you don't have to do a thing to justify yourself. And you don't have to justify not justifying itself which is the mistake that most beatniks make. They justify not justifying themselves. And go too far.

So you see there's something quite fascinating and tricky in this doctrine of the Great Bodhisattva Amitabha, who saves you just as you are who delivers you from bondage just as you are and you only have to say namu-amina-butz. Fascinating. But that is the principle of Mahayana, and that is, your acceptance of yourself as you are is the same thing as coming to live now as you are, you see now is as you are in the moment. But you can't come to now and you can't accept yourself. On purpose. Because the moment you do that you're doing something unnecessary. You're doing a little bit more that's what they call in Zen legs on a snake. Or a beard on a eunuch. You've overdone it you see. How can you neither do something about it nor do nothing about it as if that was something you had to do? You see? This is the same problem as originally posed in Buddhism. How do you cease from desiring? Because when I try to cease from desiring, I am desiring not to design. All of this is what is called Upaya, or what is called a skillful device to slow you down so that you can really be here. By seeing that there is nowhere else you can be. You don't have to come to now, where else can you be? It isn't a task, it isn't a contest, that the Greeks called argon, agony. A contest. There's nowhere else to be, so they say Nirvana is no other than Samsara. This shore is really the same as the other shore. It's not a, so if you look far in this Langvatara [sic] Sutra says, if you look to try and get Nirvana in order to escape suffering and being reborn, that's not nirvana at all.

Eco Zen

I suppose most of you have heard of Zen. But before going on to explain any details about it I want to make one thing absolutely clear. I am not a Zen Buddhist. I am not advocating Zen Buddhism. I'm not trying to convert

anyone to it. I have nothing to sell. I am an entertainer. That is to say, in the same sense that when you go to a concert and you listen to someone play Mozart, he has nothing to sell except the sound of the music. He doesn't want to convert you to anything. He doesn't want you to join an organization in favor of Mozart's music as opposed to say Beethoven's. And I approach you in the same spirit as a musician with his piano or violinist with his violin. I just want you to enjoy a point of view which I enjoy.

Now then, having then...when that's been said and I hope it's put your minds at rest. Let me give you first of all some simple historical information. Zen is a form of Buddhism. It originated in China about five hundred A.D. and about twelve hundred A.D. it migrated to Japan where it exists today. And it is a form. It's a way of life that has had an immense influence on the arts, and on the culture, the poetry and architecture of the Far East. It has lately become of enormous interest to many people in other parts of the world. Now, normally when one talks about Buddhism and Zen is a form of Buddhism, it is supposed that you're talking about a religion, and people are apt to classify themselves as Buddhists as they might say I am a Catholic, or a Methodist, or a Baptist, or an Episcopalian, or a Jew. But that is rather misleading. Buddhism is not a religion in that sense.

If we want to find an equivalent to Buddhism in our society today in the West, probably the nearest thing to it is psychotherapy. When a person goes to a psychiatry store psychoanalyst to work out a serious personal problem, not because he's just nutty. I mean not necessarily because he has hallucination or excessive ringing in the ears with no clear physical origin but when a person feels that his whole life is somehow disoriented and wrong, and he doesn't go to the preacher, because the preacher only moralizes to him and says, My man you should have more faith in God or something. So he goes instead to a doctor because in our day is a man with a tag of science on him has more prestige than a man who has the tag of religion. And so when psychiatrist goes to work on you, his objective is more or less to change your state of consciousness. That is to say, if your state of consciousness, your state of mind is one of being day after day constantly depressed, the objective of going to a psychiatrist, or a

psychotherapist is to have your state of consciousness changed to one of happiness.

Now in a somewhat similar way, the object of Buddhism in all its forms, is to bring about a fundamental change in a human being's everyday state of consciousness. If I make it yet more specific, it's to bring about a change in your sense of personal identity, that is to say in your sensation of who and what you are. And in this way, Buddhism which I suppose you know, is a method of changing consciousness that was discovered or invented by a man called Guatama, who lived in India shortly after six hundred B.C.. Who was given the title Buddha because the word means the awakened one the man who woke up. And therefore that very title suggests that ordinary people are asleep. I remember a very wise man who used to give lectures like this and when he came in he used to be silent and he'd look at the audience and he had gaze at everybody in the audience particularly, for a long time, and everybody would begin feeling they get embarrassed, and when he gazed at them for a long time he'd say, "Wake up! You're all asleep. And if you don't wake up I won't give any lecture." Now in what sense are we asleep? The Buddhist would say that almost all human beings have a phony sense of identity. A delusion a hallucination as to who they are. I'm terribly interested in this problem of identity and I try and find out what people mean when they say the word I. I think this is one of the most fascinating questions. Who do you think you are? Now what seems to develop is this. Most people think that I is a center of sensitivity somewhere inside their skin. And the majority of people feel that it's in their heads. Civilizations in different periods of history of differed about this. Some people feel that they exist in the solar plexus; other people feel that they exist about here, but in American culture today or in the Western culture in general most people feel that they exist in here [forehad]. And there is as it were a little man sitting inside the center of the skull. And he has a television screen in front of him which gives him all messages from the eyeballs. He has earphones on and that gives him all messages from the ears, and he has in front of him a control panel with various dials and buttons and things which enable him to influence the arms and legs and to get all sorts of information from the nerve ends and that's you.

So we say in popular speech, I have a body. Not, I am a body, but I have one because I am the owner of the body in the same way as I own an automobile. And I can take the automobile to the mechanic and occasionally in the same way, I have to take my body to the mechanic the surgeon the dentist the doctor and have it repaired. But it belongs to me. It goes along with me, I mean it a child for example can ask mother mom who would I have been if my father had been someone else? And that seems a perfectly simple and logical question to a child asked because of the presumption that your parents gave you your body, and you were popped into it, maybe at the moment of conception or maybe at the moment of birth, from a repository of souls in heaven and your parents simply provided the physical vehicle.

So that age long idea that is indigenous, especially to the Western world, is that I am something inside a body. And I am not quite sure whether I am or am not my body. Some doubt about it. I say, I think. I walk, I talk, but I don't say I beat my heart. I don't say, I shake my bones, I don't say I grow my hair. I feel that my heart beating, my hair growing, my bone shaping, is something that happens to me. And I don't know how it's done. But other things I do. And next, I feel quite sure that everything outside my body is quite definitely not me. There are two kinds of things outside my body. Number one is other people. And they're the same sort of thing as I am. But also they are all little men locked up inside their skins. And they're intelligent, they have feelings, and values and are capable of love and virtue. But number two is the world that's non-human that we call nature. And that stupid. It has no mind. It has emotions maybe, and animals. But on the whole it's a pretty grim business, dog eat dog. And when it gets to the geological level it's as dumb as dumb can be. It's a mechanism and there's an awful lot of it. And that's what we live in the middle of and the purpose of being human is, we feel, to subjugate nature. To make it obey our will and we arrived here, we don't feel that we belong in this world. It's foreign to us. In the words of the poet Housman." I a stranger and afraid in a world I never made."

And so all around us today we see the signs of man's battle with nature. I'm living in the moment in a marvelous house in the Hollywood Hills. And we're overlooking a lake. And on the other side of the lake the whole hill

has suddenly been interrupted with a ghastly gash where they have made level lots for building tract homes of the kind you would build on a flat plane. This is called the conquest of nature. These houses will eventually fall down the hill. Because they are causing soil erosion and they're being maximally stupid. The proper way to build a house on a hillside, is to do it in such a way as to effect the minimum interference with the nature of the hill. After all, the whole point of living in the hills is to live in the hills. There's no point in converting the hills into something flat and then going and living there. You can do that already on the ground. So people the more people live in the hills the more they spoil the hills and they're just the same as people living on the flat ground. How stupid can you get? Well anyway that this is one of the symptoms of a phoney sense of identity. Of our phony feeling, that we are something lonely locked up in a bag of skin and confronted with the world and external, alien, foreign world that is not me. Now according to certain of these great ancient philosophy is like Buddhism, this sensation of being a separate lonely individual is a hallucination. It's a hallucination brought about by various causes the way we are brought up, being the chief of them of course. I remember as a child, and you probably have very similar memories to mine that all our parents were desperately interested in identifying us. Don't you remember that sometimes you went out and played with other children and there was someone in the group of other children you admired and look up to and you came home imitating the mannerisms of that other child. And your mother said to you Johnny, that's not you, that's Peter. And you felt a little bit ashamed, because somehow you let her down. She wanted you to be you her child and not Mrs Jones's child Peter. And so in many ways we are all taught this. For example, the main thing that we're all taught in childhood is that you must do that which will only be appreciated if you do it voluntarily. Now darling, a dutiful child must love its mother, but now I don't want you to do it because I say so but because you really want to. Or, you must be free. See, this comes into politics. Everybody must vote. You see, imagine. You are members of a democracy. And you must be members of a democracy, you're ordered to. Crazy. Also, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. Is that a commandment or a joke? You know, if you suggest that the Lord is joking, most people in our culture are offended, because they have a very moronically conception of God as a person totally devoid of humor.

But the Lord is highly capable of joking because joking is one of the most constructive things you can do.

So when you are told who you are and that you must be free; furthermore, that you must survive, and you must go on living, and that becomes a kind of compulsion, you get mixed up. It's very simple, of course you get mixed up if you think you must do something which will only be the thing required of you if you do it freely. These are the sort of influences then that cause human beings all over the world to feel isolated. To feel that they are centers of awareness locked up in bags of skin.

Now this sensation of our identity can be shown and demonstrated to be false by some of the disciplines of our own science. When we describe a human being or any other living organism from a scientific point of view, all that means is that we're describing it carefully. We're going to describe very carefully what a human being is and what a human being does. All right. And we find that as we go on with that description, we can't describe the human being without describing the environment. We can't say what a human being is doing without also saying what the world around him is doing. Just imagine for a moment that you couldn't see anything up here except me. You couldn't see behind me, you couldn't see the stage you couldn't see the microphone, you could only see me. That was all you could see. What would you be looking at? You wouldn't see me at all. Because you wouldn't see my edges, and my edges are rather important for seeing me. My edges would be identical with the edge of your eyesight, with that vague oval curve which is the field of vision, and what you would be looking at would be my necktie, my nose, my eyes and so on but you wouldn't see my edges. So you'd be confronted with a very strange monster. And you wouldn't know it was a human being. Because to see me you need to see my background. And therein lies a clue of which we are mostly ignorant. In Buddhist theory, because of our phony sense of identity is called Avidya, and that means ignorance, although it's better to pronounce it ignore-ance. Having a deluded sense of identity is the result of ignoring certain things.

So when you look at me and I manage by behaving up here in a kind of a more or less interesting way, I cause you to ignore my background because

I concentrate attention on me. Just like a conjurer stage magician in order to perform his tricks misdirects your attention. He talks to you about something he's doing here, and he talks to you about his fingers and how empty they are and he can pull something out of his pocket in plain sight and you don't notice it. And so a magic happens. That's ignoring. Selective attention focusing your consciousness on one thing to the exclusion of many other things. So in this way we concentrate on the things the figures. And we ignore what we don't concentrate on the background and so we come to think that the figure exists independently of the background. But actually they go together, and they go together just as inseparably as backs go with fronts, as positives go with negatives, as ups go with downs. And as life goes with death. You can't separate it. So there's a sort of secret conspiracy between the figure and the background. They are really one, but they looked different. They need each other. Just as male needs female. And vice versa. But we are ordinarily completely unaware of this. So then when the scientist starts paying attention to behavior of people and things carefully, he discovers that they go together. That the behavior of the organism is inseparable from the behavior of its environment.

So you see if I am to describe what I am doing what am I doing. Am I just waving my legs back and forth? No. I'm walking. And in order to speak about walking you have to speak about the space in which I am walking about the floor. About the direction left or right in relation to what kind of room, what kind of stage, what kind of situation. Because if obviously if there isn't a ground underneath me I can't very well walk. So the description of what I am doing involves the description of the world. And so, the biologist comes to say that what he is describing is no longer merely the organism and its behavior. He is describing a field which he now calls the organism hyphen environment. And that field is what the individual actually is. Now this is very clearly recognised in all sorts of sciences, but the average individual and indeed the average scientist does not feel in a way that corresponds to his theory. He still feels as if he were a center of sensitivity locked up inside a bag of skin. The object of Buddhist discipline or methods of psychological training is as it were, to turn that feeling inside out. To bring about a state of affairs in which the individual feels himself to be everything that there is. The whole cosmos. Focused, expressing itself here. And you as the whole cosmos expressing itself there and there and

there. And so on. That what, in other words, the reality of myself fundamentally is, not something inside my skin but everything, and I mean everything outside my skin, but doing what is my skin and inside. I mean, imagine that every one of us...look, in the same way that the sea when the ocean has a wave on it. The wave is not separate from the ocean is it. Every wave on the ocean is the whole ocean wave in the ocean waves and it says you I'm here. But I do I can wave all over the place I can wave in many different ways I can wave this way or that way. So the Ocean of being waves every one of us. And we are its waves, but the wave is fundamentally the ocean.

Now in that way, your sense of identity would be turned inside out. You wouldn't forget who you were, you wouldn't forget your name and address, your telephone number, your social security number and what sort of role you are supposed to occupy in society. But you would know, that this particular role that you play, this particular personality that you are, is superficial and the real you, is all that there is.

The object of Buddhist discipline or methods of psychological training is as it were, to bring about a state of affairs in which the individual feels himself to be everything that there is. The whole cosmos, focused, expressing itself here. Now, in that way, your sense of identity would be turned inside out. You wouldn't forget who you were. You wouldn't forget your name and address, your telephone number, your social security number and what sort of role you are supposed to occupy in society. But you would know that this particular role that you play. This particular personality that you are, is superficial and the real you is all that there is.

And that inversion, turning upside down of the sense of identity, of the state of consciousness which the average person has, is the objective of Buddhistic disciplines. The method of teaching something in Buddhism is rather different from methods of teaching which we use in the Western world. In the Western world, a good teacher is regarded as someone who makes the subject matter easy for the student. A person who explains things cleverly and clearly so you can take a course in mathematics without tears.

In the Oriental world, they have an almost exactly opposite conception, and that is that a good teacher is a person who makes you find out something for

yourself. In other words, learn to swim by throwing the baby into the water. There's a story used in Zen about how a burglar taught his child to burgle. He took him one night on a burgling expedition and locked him up in a chest in the house that he was burgling and left him. And the poor little boy was all alone locked up in the chest and he began to think, how on earth am I going to get out? So he suddenly called out fire, fire, and everybody began running all over the place and they heard the shriek coming from inside the chest and they unlocked it and he rushed out and shot out into the garden. And just then, everybody was in hot pursuit calling out thief thief and he went by a well he picked up a rock and dropped it in the well. And everybody thought the poor fellow has jumped into the well and committed suicide. And he got away. And got home and his father said Congratulations you have learned the art. So do you see? William Blake once said a fool who persists in his folly will become wise.

And so, the method of teaching used by these great eastern teachers is to make fools persist in their folly, but very rigorously and very consistently and very hard. So then, if I may now having given you the analogy, the image let's go to the specific situation. Supposing you want to study Buddhism under a Zen master, what will happen to you. Well first of all, let's ask the question why would you want to do this anyway? I mean I can make the situation fairly universal it might not be as an master that you go to it might be a Methodist minister. It might be a Catholic priest it might be a psychoanalyst but what's the matter with you. Why do you go? And surely the reason that we all would be seekers is that we feel some disquiet about ourselves. Many of us want to get rid of ourselves. We can't stand ourselves and so we watch television and go to the movies and read mystery stories and join churches in order to forget ourselves. In order to merge with something greater than ourselves. We want to get away from this ridiculous thing locked up in a bag of skin. So I have a problem. I hurt. I suffer. I'm neurotic, or whatever it is, and one goes to the teacher and say my problem's me, change me. Now if you go to a zen teacher. He'll say. Well I have nothing to teach. There is no problem, everything's perfectly clear. And you think that one over. And you say he's probably being cagey. But he's testing me out to see if I really want to be a student. So I know, according to everybody else who's been through this, that in order to get this man to take me on I must persist. Do you know our saying, anybody

who goes to a psychologist ought to have his head examined. That's a very there's a double take in that saying. So in the same way anybody who goes with a spiritual problem to a zen master defines himself as a nut, and the teacher does everything possible to make him as nutty as possible. But the teacher says quite honestly I haven't anything to tell you. I don't teach anything. I have no doctrine as I said to you in the beginning of this talk, I have nothing whatsoever to sell you. So the student thinks, this is very deep, because this nothing that he's talking about this nothing that he teaches, is what they call in Buddhism Sunyata, is Sanskrit for nothingness. But, and it's supposed to be the ultimate reality but as you know if you know anything about these doctrines This doesn't mean real no-thingness, not kind of just nothing there at all not just blank but it means no thing. It's the transcendental reality behind all separate and individual things and that's something very deep and profound so he knows that when the teacher said I have nothing to teach he meant this very esoteric no thing. Well he might also say then if you have nothing to teach what are all these students doing around here? And the teacher says they are not doing anything they're just, they're just a lot of stupid people who live here. And he knows again you see, this stupid doesn't mean just straight stupid but the higher stupidity of being, people who are humble and don't have intellectual pride.

So finally the student having gone out of his way to define himself as a damn fool in need of help has absolutely worked himself into the situation. He's defined himself as a nut and then the teacher accepts him, and the teacher says now, I'm going to ask you a question. I want to know who you are before your father and mother conceived you. That is to say, you come to me with a problem and you said I have a problem I want to get one up on this universe. Who is it that wants to get one up? Who are you who is this thing called your ego your soul, your eye, or identity for whom your parents provided the body? Show me that and, he says Father I'm from Missouri and I don't want any words I want to be shown. So the student may open his mouth to make an answer but the teacher says. You're not ready. And he takes him back and introduces him to the chief student, all those so-called Zen monks who live together. And the chief student says now what we do here is so and so, we have this discipline, but the main part of the discipline is meditation. And we all sit crosslegged in a row and then we do that, and you sit cross-legged and you learn how to breathe and be still. In other

words to do nothing. But you mustn't go to sleep, and you mustn't get into a trance. You have to stay wide awake, not thinking anything, but perfectly doing nothing. And there's a monk walking down all the time with a flat stick rather long about so long and if you go to sleep or if you get into a trance or if you get dreamy he hits you on the back. So that you'll stay quite clear and wide awake but still doing nothing. And the idea is that out of the state of profoundly doing nothing you will be able to tell the teacher who you really are. And in other words, the question Who are you before your father and mother conceived you is a request for an act of perfect sincerity and spontaneity, as if I were to say to you, will you be absolutely genuine with me? No deception please, I want you to do something that expresses you without the slightest deception no more role acting, no more playing games with me I want to see you.

Now imagine. Could you really be that honest with somebody else? Especially a spiritual teacher. And you know, he looks right through you. He sees all your secret thoughts. And he knows the very second when you've been a little bit phony. And that bugs you. Just like a psychiatrist. You're sitting in there discussing your problems with him and you start picking your nose. And the psychiatrist suddenly says to you is your finger comfortable there, do you like that? And you know you know your Freudian slip is showing. What do fingers symbolize, what do nostrils symbolize? And then use it quickly to put your hand sort of. And you say, oh no it's nothing it's nothing I was just picking my nose. And the analyst says Oh really? Then why are you justifying it? Why are you trying to explain it away? He has you everywhere you turn. But that's the whole art of psychoanalysis and it's then it's the same thing.

In other words, when you are challenged to be perfectly genuine. It's like saying to a child, now darling come out here and play, don't be self-conscious. Or it's like I would say to you now look if you come here tonight at exactly midnight and put your hands on the stage you can wish and have granted any wish you want provided you don't think of a green elephant. So everybody will come there put their hands here and they will be very careful not to think about a green elephant. Well now do you see the point, that everybody if we transfer this to the dimension of spirituality where the highest ideal is to be unselfish, to let go of oneself. When you are trying to

be unselfish, you are doing it for selfish reasons. You can't be unselfish by a decision of the will, any more than you can decide not to think of a green elephant. There is a story about Confucius, who one day met Lao Tzu, who was a great Chinese philosopher. And Lao Tzu said so what is your system and Confucius said it is charity and love of one's neighbor and elimination of self interest. Lao Tzu said, [that's] stuff and nonsense. Your elimination of self is a positive manifestation of self. Look at the universe. The stars keep their order. The trees and plants grow up words without exception the waters flow. Be like this. All your nonsense about elimination of self is like beating a drum in search of a fugitive. So in this way these are all examples of the thing, that trickery the master is playing on you. You came to him with the idea in your mind that you are a separate, independent, isolated individual, and what he is simply saying to you is show me this individual. I had a friend who was studying Zen in Japan and he got pretty desperate to produce the answer of who he really is and on his way to an interview with the master to give an answer to the problem he noticed a very common sight in Japan, a big bullfrog sitting around in the garden, and he swooped this bull frog up in his hand dropped it in the sleeve of his. And then he went into the master. And to give the answer of who he was, he suddenly produced the bull frog. And the Master said, too intellectual. In other words, this answer is too contrived. It's too much like Zen. You've been reading too many books. It's not the genuine thing.

So after a while what happens is this. When the student finds that there is absolutely no way of being his true self. Not only is there no way of doing it, there is also no way of doing it by not doing it. You can't do it by doing something you can't do it by not doing something. Let me make this clear or put it into Christian terms. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God. Now what are you going to do about that? If you try very hard to love God and you ask yourself Why am I doing this? You find out you're doing it because you want to be on the side of the big battalions. You want to be right. After all the Lord is the master of the universe isn't he? And if you don't love him you're going to be in a pretty sad state. So you realize I'm loving him just because I'm afraid of what will happen to me if I don't, then you think that's pretty lousy love isn't it. And you think I am that's a bad motivation. I wish I could change that I wish I could love the Lord. Out of a genuine heart. But why do you want to change? I realize that the reason I want to

have a different kind of motive is that I've got the same mode. So I say, oh heaven sakes God I'm a mess. Will you help me out? And then he reminds you, why are you doing that? Now you're you're just giving up, aren't you, you're asking someone else to take over your problem.

So you suddenly find you see you're stuck. So in this way, what is called the Zen problem or koan is likened to a person who swallowed a ball of red iron. He can't gulp it down and he can't spit it out. Or it's like a mosquito biting an iron bull. It's the nature of a mosquito to bite and it's the nature of an eye and the bull to be unbiteable and both go on doing their thing that is their nature. And so nothing can happen. You are absolutely up against it. Absolutely no answer to this problem. No way out.

Now what does that mean? If I can't do the right thing by doing and if I can't do the right thing by not doing what does it mean it means of course. That I do is say to do all this am a hallucination. There is no independent self to be produced. There is no way at all of showing it because it isn't there. So you recover from the illusion and you suddenly wake up and think what a relief. And they call that Satori, that's awakening, the first step in awakening. Let me try and translate this. When this kind of experience happens you discover that what you are is no longer this sort of isolated center of action and experience locked up in your skin. That by being, the teacher has asked you to produce that thing. To show it to him genuine and naked and you couldn't find it. So it isn't there. And when you see clearly that it isn't there, you have a new sense of identity. And you realize that what you are is as I said the whole world of nature doing this.

Now that's a difficult thing for many Western people, because it suggests to them a kind of fatalism. It suggests that the individual is nothing more than the puppet of cosmic forces. So in the same way, when your own inner sense of identity changes, from being the separate individual to being what the entire cosmos is doing at this place, you become not a puppet, but more truly and more expressively an individual than ever. This is the same paradox which the Christian knows in the form whosoever would save his soul shall lose it. Now I think that this is something of very great importance to the western world today, because we have developed an immensely powerful technology. We have stronger means of changing the

physical universe than has ever existed before. How are we going to use it? There is a Chinese proverb that if the wrong man uses the right means, the right means work in the wrong way. Let us assume that our technological knowledge is the right means. What kind of people are going to use this knowledge? Are they going to be people who hate nature and feel alienated from it or people who love the physical world and feel that the physical world is their own personal body? And extension the whole physical universe right out of the galaxies is simply one's extended body. Now at the moment, the general attitude of our technologists who are exploring space is represented in the term "the conquest of space". And they are building enormous shell like phallic objects to go into the sky. And this is downright ridiculous because who is going to get anywhere in a rocket. You know it takes a terrible long time even to get to the moon, and it's going to take longer than anybody can live to get outside the solar system just to begin with.

The proper way to study space is not with rockets, but with radio astronomy. Instead of going bang, you know, with tough fist at the sky. Become more sensitive. Develop subtler senses, that's radio astronomy and everything will come to you be more open be more receptive and eventually you will develop an instrument that will examine a piece of rock on Mars with greater care than you could if you were holding it in your own hand. Let it come to you. But you see this whole attitude of using technology as a method of fighting the world will succeed only in destroying the world as we are doing with uninformed and shortsighted methods of getting rid of insect pests of forcing our fruit and tomatoes to grow of stripping our hills of trees, and so on and so on, thinking with all this is some kind of progress when actually it is turning everything into a junk heap.

It is said you know that Americans who are in the forefront of technological progress are materialists. Nothing is further from the truth. American culture is dedicated to the hatred of material and to its transformation into junk. Look at Los Angeles. Does it look as if it was made by people who love the material? It's all made out of ticky-tacky, which is a combination of plaster of Paris, paper maché, and plastic glue and comes in any flavor. The important lesson in other words is technology and its power must be handled by true materialists and true materialists are people who love

material. Who cherish wood and stone and wheat and eggs and animals. And above all they treat it with a reverence that is due to one's own body.

Taoist Way

The philosophy of the Tao is one of the two great principal components of Chinese thought. There are of course quite a number of forms of Chinese philosophy, but there are two great currents which have fairly molded the culture of China and they are Taoism and Confucianism. And they play a curious game with each other. Let me start by saying something about Confucianism originating with confluence of Confucius who lived approximately a little after six hundred thirty B.C.. He's often supposed to have been a contemporary of Lao Tzu, who is the supposed founder of the Taoist way, but it seems more likely that Lao Tzu lived later than four hundred, according to most modern scholars. Confucianism is not a religion. It's a social ritual. And a way of ordering society. So much so that the first great Catholic missionary to China Matteo Ricci was a Jesuit found it perfectly consistent with his Catholicism to participate in Confucian rituals because he saw them as something of a kind of national character as one might pay respect to the flag or something of that kind in our own times. But he found that Confucianism involved no conflict with Catholicism no commitment to any belief or dogma that would be at variance with the Catholic faith.

So Confucianism is an order of society and involves ideas of human relations including the government and the family based on the principle of what is called in Chinese *ren*, although Joshua will notice that I never get my tones right. Which is an extraordinarily interesting word. I'm going to put some of these things on the whiteboard. This is the word *ren* in Chinese, and it's often translated benevolence, but that's not a good translation at all. This word means human heartedness. That's the nearest we can get to it in English. And it was regarded by Confucius as the highest of all virtues but one that he always refused to define. It's above righteousness and justice and propriety and other great Confucian virtues and it involves the principle that human nature is a fundamentally good arrangement. Including not only our virtuous side, but also our passionate side also our appetites in our way witness. The Hebrews have over a term which they call the *yetzer hara* Y E

T Z E R H A R A. Which means the wayward inclination, or what I like to call the element of irreducible rascality, that God put into all human beings. And put it there because it was a good thing it was good for humans to have these two elements in them and so a truly human hearted person is a gentleman with a slight touch of rascality just as one has to have salt in a stew. Confucius said the goody good is other thieves of virtue. And Meaning that to try to be wholly righteous is to go beyond humanity. To try to be something that isn't human. So this gives Confucian approach to life and justice and all those sort of things a kind of queer humor. Sort of boys will be boys attitude which is nevertheless a very mature way of handling human problems. It was of course for this reason that the Japanese Buddhist priests who visited China to study Buddhism especially as zen priests, introduced Confucianism into Japan, because despite certain limitations that Confucianism as and it needs it always needs the Tao philosophy as a counterbalance. Confucianism has been one of the most successful philosophers in all history for the regulation of governmental and family relationships. But of course it is concerned with formality. Confucianism prescribes all kinds of formal relationships; linguistic, ceremonial, musical, in education, in all the spheres of morals, and for this reason has always been treated by the Tao for being unnatural. You need these two components, you see and they play against each other beautifully in Chinese society. Roughly speaking mostly they confusion in the way of life is for people involved in the world. The Taoist way is to a of life is for people who get disentangled.

Now as we know in our own modern times there are various ways of getting disentangled from the regular lifestyle say of the United States. If you want to go through the regular lifestyle of the United States you go to high school and college and then you go into a profession or a business and you own a standard house and you raise a family and you have a car or two cars and do all that jazz. But a lot of people don't want to live that way and there are lots of other ways of living besides that. So you could say that those of us who go along with the pattern correspond to the Confucians, and those who are Bohemians or bums or beatniks or whatever and don't correspond with the pattern they are more like the Taoists. Because the Tao is really, actually in Chinese history, Taoism is a way of life for older people in. Lao Tzu, the name given to the founder of the Tao and means the old

boy, and the legend is that he when he was born he was already had a white beard.

So, it's sort of like this that when you have contributed to society when you've contributed children and brought them up, and you have assumed a certain role in social life. You then say Now it's time for me to find out what it's all about, who am I ultimately behind my outward personality. What is the secret source of things? And the latter half of life is the preeminently excellent time to find this out it's something to do when you are finished with the family business. I am not saying that that is sort of unavoidable strict rule of course one can study the Tao when very young. Because it contains all kinds of secrets in it as to the performance of every kind of art or craft or business or any occupation whatsoever. But it does in in in China in a way it plays that role of a kind of safety valve. For the more restricted way of life that Confucianism prescribes. And there is a sort of type in China who is known as the old rogue. He's a sort of intellectual bum, often found among scholars who is admired very much and who had a type of character which had an influence on the development of the ideals of Zen Buddhist life. He is one who goes with nature rather than against nature.

Well now, first of all I'm going to talk about ideas which come strictly out of Lao Tzu's book the Tao Te Ching And of course the basic thing in the whole philosophy is the conception of Tao. This word has many meanings and the book of Lao Tzu starts out by saying that the Tao which can be spoken is not the eternal Tao. Or you can, there's a pun in there, but you can't quite put into English. You can't give all the meanings because the word Tao means both. The way for course of nature. Or of everything. It also means to speak.

So the actual opening phrase of the book. Following this word Tao is this. And the character is repeated again. You see and this this character means can be or can, able, something like that. So the way which can be then give it its second meaning spoken. Described out of. But it also means the way that can be weighed not W E I G H But W A Y E D. You know, you'd have to invent that word. The way that can be traveled perhaps is not the eternal way. In other words there is no. Way in which the Tao or following the Tao,

there's no recipe for it. I can't give you any do it yourself instructions A.B.C. D. as to how it's done. It is like when Louis Armstrong was asked What is jazz? he said "If you have to ask you don't know." Now that's awkward, isn't it. But we can gather what it is by absorbing sudden atmospheres and attitudes connected with those who follow it and from the art and the poetry and all the expressions and the anecdotes and stories. That illustrate the philosophy of the way. So this word, then, the way or the course of things is not you must understand there's some Christian missionaries translate as the logos. Taking as their point of departure the opening passage of some John's Gospel in the beginning was the word. Now if you look up the Chinese translation of the Bible it says in the beginning was the Tao. And the Tao was with God and the Tao was God. The same as in the beginning with God all things were made by it and without it was not anything made that was made.

So they have substituted Tao there, now that mimic a very funny effect on a Chinese philosopher, because the idea of things being made by the Tao is absurd but the Tao is not a manufacturer and it's not a governor. It doesn't rule as it were in the position of a king. Although the book without it being is written for many purposes, but one of its important purposes is as a manual of guidance for a ruler. And what it tells him is essentially ruled by not ruling. Don't lauded over the people and so he says the great Tao flows everywhere both to the left and to the right. It loves and nourishes all things but does not lord it over them. And when good things are accomplished. It lays no claim to them. In other words, the Tao doesn't stand up and say I have made all of you, I have filled this earth with its beauty and glory, fall down before me and worship. The Tao, having done anything you know always escapes. And is not around to receive any thanks or acknowledgement. Because it loves obscurity. And Lao Tzu said the Tao is like water. It's always seeks the low level which human beings abhor. So it's a very mysterious idea. Tao then is not really equivalent with any Western or Hindu idea of God because God is always associated with being the Lord. Even in India, the Brahman is often called the supreme lord although that with the term are strictly applicable to ishtar, the manifestation of Brahman in the form of a personal god. But rather than the Lord Krishna as his his son is the Bhagavad-Gita the song of the Lord of

there's always the idea of the king and the ruler attached but not in the Chinese Tao philosophy.

The Tao is not something different from nature, from ourselves, from our surrounding trees and waters and air. The Tao is the way all that behaves. And so the Chinese, the basic Chinese idea of the universe is really that it's an organism. And as we shall see when we get on to Huang Tzu, or who is the sort of elaborator on Lao Tzu. He sees everything operating together. So that nowhere can you find the controlling center there isn't any. The world is a system of interrelated components none of which can survive without each other. Just as in the case of bees and flowers. You will never find these around in a place where there aren't flowers and you will never find flowers around in a place where there aren't bees or insects that do the equivalent job. And what that tells us secretly is that although bees and flowers look different from each other they're inseparable. They, to use a very important Taoist expression, they arise mutually. This is one of the great phrases from the second chapter of Lao Tzu's book where, he says this character means to have or to be, and this next one is a very important character in Taoist philosophy it means no negative will in Chinese not to be, and then this curious expression for which we don't have a really good corresponding idea in traditional Western thought. So, to be and not to be, mutually arise. This character is based on the picture of a plant. Something that grows out of the ground. So you could say, positive and negative, to be and not to be, yes and no. Light and dark arise mutually come into being. There's no cause and effect, it's not that relationship at all, it's like the egg and the hen. So as the bees and the flowers co-exist, in the same way as high and low back and front and long and short, loud and soft. All those experiences are experience of all only in terms of their polar experience. So the Chinese idea of nature is that all of areas species arise mutually because they into depend and this total system of interdependence is the Tao. It involves certain other things that go along with Tao but this is this is this mutual arising is the key idea toe whole thing and it is, if you want to understand Chinese and Oriental thought in general it is the most important thing. To grasp. Because you see we think so much in terms of. Cause and effect we think of the universe today. In Aristotelian and Newtonian ways, and in that philosophy the world is all separated. It's like a huge amount of nation of billiard balls. And they don't move until struck

by another or by a cue. And so everything is going to talk talk talk talk talk talk talk talk talk talk talk all over the place one thing starting up another in a mechanical way. But of course from the standpoint of twentieth century science we know perfectly well now that that's not the way it works. We know enough about relationships to see that that mechanical model which Newton devised was all right for certain purposes. But it breaks down now because we understand relativity, and we see how things go together in a kind of connected net, rather than in a chain of billiard balls banging each other around.

So, in in the philosophy of the Tao, it is said, it's always being said this is, you read this in every art book about Chinese art, that in Chinese painting, man is always seen as in nature, rather than dominating it. You'll get a painting entitled, poet drinking by moonlight. And you see a great landscape and after some search with a magnifying glass at last you see the poet, stuck in a corner somewhere drinking wine. Whereas if we painted the subject poet drinking by moonlight the poet would be the most obvious thing in the picture there he would be dominating the whole thing the landscape of somewhere behind it, but of all the Chinese painters put man, I mean the painters of the great classical tradition. There are Chinese painters who specialize in family portraits and do these very formal paintings of someone's ancestor sitting on a throne it's quite a different category but the Taoist inspired painters, Zen inspired painters, have this view of man as an integral part of nature. Something in it just as everything else is in it flowers and birds. And not they're sent into this world commissioned by some sort of supernatural being to come into this world and find it dominated it.

So then, the whole conception of nature is as a self regulating, self-governing, indeed democratic organism. But it has a totality, it all goes together and this totality is the Tao. So then we move to a second term that is extremely important. That the, expression. *Tsu-ran*, is the Bickley the term that we translate nature. When we translate Chinese. But this term expresses this whole point of view it doesn't say nature, *natura*, which means in a way, class of things. It means literally self-so. What is so obvious itself what happens of itself and the spontaneity. And in the doubt edging early on Lao Tzu says the Taoist method is to be so of itself. Now we might translate that automatic where it not that the word automatic has a

mechanical flavor. Tsu-ran, or [shizen?] as is called or she's an in Japanese means spontaneous. Yes, it happens as your heart beats, you don't do anything about it you don't force your heart to beat you don't make it beat it does it by itself. Now figure out a world in which everything happens by itself it doesn't have to be controlled it's allowed. The whereas you might say the idea of God involves the control of everything going on. The idea of the Taoist, is the ruler who abdicates and lets all the people trust all the people to conduct their own affairs to let it all happen. So this doesn't mean you see that there isn't a unified organism and everything is in chaos it means that the more liberty you give the more love you give the more you allow things in yourself and in your surroundings to take place, the more order you will have.

It is believed generally in India that when a person sets out on the way of liberation, his first problem, is to become free from his past karma. The popular theory of Karma, of the word that literally means action or doing in Sanskrit, so that when we say that something that happens to you is your karma It's like saying in English it's your own doing. But in popular Indian belief, karma is a sort of built in moral law or a law of retribution. Such that all the bad things you do and all the good things you do have consequences which you have to inherit and so long as karmic energy remains stored up you have to work it out. And what the sage endeavors to do is a kind of action which in Sanskrit is called Nish karma Karma. Nish karma means without passion or without attachment karma, action. And so, in whatever action he does he renounces the fruits of the action so that he acts in a way that doesn't generate future karma because future karma continues you in the wheel of becoming, Samsara, the round, and keeps you being reincarnated. Now then, in that case, when the time comes that you start to get out of the chain of Karma. All the creditors that you have start presenting themselves for payment, in other words, does a person who begins say to study yoga this felt that he will suddenly get sick or that his children will die he loses money all sorts of catastrophes will occur because. The karmic debt is being cleared up. And it is in no hurry to be cleared up if you're just living along like anybody but if you embark on the spiritual life a certain hurry occurs and therefore since this is known. It's rather discouraging to start these things. The Christian way of saying the same thing is that if you plan to bet, or change your life, shall we say to turn over a new leaf, you mustn't let the devil know, because he will oppose you

with all his might if he suddenly discovers that you're going to escape from his power. So for example, if you have a bad habit say you drink too much and you make a New Year's resolution that during this coming year you'll stop drinking that's a very very dangerous thing to do because the devil will immediately know about it. And what will happen will be this. See he will confront you with the prospect of three hundred sixty five drinkless days, and that will be awful, you know, just overwhelming and you won't be able to make much more than three days on the wagon.

So in that case you compromise with the devil and say just today I'm not going to drink you see but tomorrow maybe you know we'll go back. Then when tomorrow comes you say Oh just another day and it's trial that's all and the next day you say one more day won't make much difference so you only do it for the moment and you don't let the devil know that you have a secret intention of going on day after day after day after day.

But of course there's something still better than that. And that is not to let the devil know anything. And that means of course not to let yourself know. One of the many meanings of that saying Let not your left hand though watch or write and do it is just this. And that was why in the Zen discipline, the great deal of it centers around. Acting without premeditation, as those of you know who read Harry Gold's book, Zen in the art of archery it was necessary to release the bowstring without first saying now. There's a wonderful story it may also have read by a German writer Von Kleist, about a boxing match with a bear. The man can never defeat this bear because the bear always knows his plans in advance. And is ready to deal with any situation. The only way to get through to the bear would be to hit the bear without having first intended to do so. That would catch him. And so this is one of the great great problems in the spiritual life or whatever you want to call it, is to be able to have intention and act simultaneous. By this means you escape karma and you escape the devil. So you might say that the Taoist is exemplary in this respect. That this is getting free from karma without making any previous announcement of simply; supposing we have a train and we want to unload the train of its freight cars. You can go to the back end and you can unload them one by one and shunt them into the siding, but the simplest of all ways of unloading is to uncouple between the engine in the first car and that gets rid of the whole bunch at once. And it is

in that sort of way you see that the Taoist gets rid of karma without challenging it. And so it has the reputation, you see, of being the easy way. There are all kinds of yogas and ways for people who want to be difficult. And one of the great gambits of a man like Gurdjieff, was to make it all seem as difficult as possible, because that challenged the vanity of his students. If some teacher Some guru says really this isn't difficult at all it's perfectly easy. Some people will say oh he's not really that the real thing. We want something tough and difficult when when we see somebody starts out giving you a discipline they're a very weird and rigid people think there is a thing that that man means business, see and so they flatter themselves by going to such a guy that they are serious students, whereas the other people are only dabblers and so on. All right if you have to do that way that's the way you have to do it, but the Taoist is the kind of person who shows you the shortcut, and shows you how to do it by intelligence rather than effort, because that's what it is. Taoism is in that sense what everybody is looking for. The easy way in the shortcut. Using cleverness instead of muscle. So the question naturally arises isn't it cheating. When in any game, somebody really starts using his intelligence he will very likely be accused of cheating. And to draw the line between skill and cheating is a very difficult thing to do. You see the the inferior intelligence will always accuse a superior intelligence of cheating. That's its way of saving face. You beat me by means that weren't fair. We were originally having a contest to find out who had the strongest muscles and you know we were pushing against it like this does this that this. And this would prove who have the strongest muscles, but then you introduce some gimmick into it, some judo trick or something like that we see and you're not playing fair. So in the whole domain of ways of liberation. There are roots for the stupid people and roots for the intelligent people. And the latter are faster. This with perfectly clearly explained by Wua Nung, the six patriarch of Zen in China. And it's sutra where he says the difference between the gradual school and the Sudden School is they both arrive at the same point but the gradual is for slow-witted people and the suddenness for fast witted people, can you in other words find a way that sees into your own nature but sees into the doll. Immediately, and at the end of this morning's talk I pointed out to you the immediate way, the way through now. When you know that, this moment is that all. And this moment is by it's considered by itself. That without past and without future eternal. Neither coming into being or going

out of being. There is nirvana. And there is a whole Chinese Philosophy of time based on this. It hasn't, to my knowledge been very much discussed by Taoist writers. It's been much discussed by zen writers, but it's all based on the same thing. Dogan the great thirteenth century Japanese Zen Buddhist started in China, and he wrote a book called Shobo Genzo. A roshi recently said to me in Japan, that's a terrible book. Because it tells you everything. It gives the whole secret away. But in the course of this book he says, you don't there is no such thing as a progression in time. The spring does not become the summer. There is first spring and then there is summer. So in the same way, you now do not become you later. This is T.S. Eliot's idea, in Four Quartets, where he says that the person who has settled down in the train to read the newspaper, is not the same person who stepped onto the train from the platform. And therefore, also you who sit here and not the same people who came in at the door. These states are separate, each in its own place. There was the coming in the door person. That there is actually only the here and now sitting person. And the person sitting here and now is not the person who will die. Because we are all a constant flux, and the continuity of the person from past through present to future is as illusory, in its own way, as the upward movement of the red lines on a revolving barber pole. You know, it goes round and round and round and the whole thing seems to be going up or going down. But actually nothing is going up or down. So when you throw a pebble into the pond and you make a con centric rings of waves, there is an illusion that the water is flowing upwards, and no water is flowing outwards at all. Water is only going up and down what appears to move outward is the wave not the water. So this kind of philosophical argument says that our seeming to go along in a course of time. It doesn't really happen. The Buddhists say suffering exists but no one who suffers. Deeds exist but no doers are found. A path there is, but no one who follows it and Nirvana is but no one who attains it. So, in this way they look upon the continuity of life, as the same sort of illusion that is produced when you take a cigarette and in the dark wallet, it and the illusion of a circle is created whereas there is only the one point of fire.

The argument then is, so long as you're in the present, there aren't any problems. The problems exist only when you allow presence to amalgamate. There's a way of putting this in Chinese, it is rather interesting

they have a very interesting sign. This. It's pronounced nyin. And Japanes, nin. And the top part of the character means now, and the bottom part means the mind-heart machine. And so, this is as it were an instant of thought. In Sanskrit they use it they use this character as the equivalent for the Sanskrit word Shannah. Then if you put if you double this character but it twice, or three times, and I write the Chinese word for ditto.. Nan Nan Nan. Means thought after thought after thought. Now the Zen master JoShu was once asked "What is the mind of a child?" And he said a ball in a mountain stream. What do you mean by a ball in the mountain stream? He said, thought after thought after thought, with no block. So, he was using of course, the mind of the child as the innocent mind. The mind of a person who was enlightened. One thought follows another without hesitation. The thought arises it doesn't wait to arise, as when you clap your hands, the sound issues without hesitation. When you strike Flint, the spark comes out, it doesn't wait to come out. And that means that there's no block. So I thought Sod thought nin nin nin and describes what we call in our world the stream of consciousness. Blocking consists in letting the stream. Become connected chained together in such a way that when the present thought arises it seems to be dragging its past or resisting its future. Saying I don't want to go.

When then the connection, the dragging, it's better to call it, of these thoughts, drops. You've broken the chain of karma. If you think of this, in comparison with certain problems in music it's very interesting. Because when we listen to music we hear melody only because we remember the sequence. We hear the intervals between the tones but more than that. We remember. The tones that led up to the one we are now hearing and we are trained musically to anticipate certain consequences. And to the extent that we get the consequences we anticipate we feel that we understand the music, but to the extent that the composer does not adhere to the rules and gives us unexpected consequences, we feel that we don't understand the music. And if he gives us harmonic relationships which we are not trained to accept, that is to say to expect. We say well this man is just writing garbage. But of course, it becomes apparent that the perception of music, the ability to hear a melody, will depend upon a relationship between past present and future sounds. And you might say well you're talking about a way of living that would be equivalent to listening to music with a tone

deafmind. So that you would reduce and you would eliminate the melody and have only noise and so in your Taoist way of life. You would eliminate. All meaning and have only senseless present moments. Up to a point that's true. That is in a way what Buddhists and also mean by seeing things in there suchness.

What is so bad about dying for example. It's really no problem. When you die, you just drop dead, there that's all there is to it. But what makes it a problem is that you're dragging a past. And all those things you've done all those achievements you've made, all these relationships and people that you've accumulated as your friends all that has to go see it isn't there now. Meath a few friends might be around you but all that past that identifies you as who you are, which is simply memory, all that has to go. And we feel just terrible about that. But if we didn't if we were just dying that's all death wouldn't be a problem.

And so likewise the chores of everyday life they become intolerable when everything ties together all the past in the future you feel it dragging at you in every way. Supposing you wake up in the morning and it's a lovely morning let's take today right here and now here we are in this paradise of the place. Big Sur. And some of us have got to go to work on Monday. Is that a problem? For many people it is. It spoils the taste of what's going on now. When we wake up in bed on Monday morning and think of the various hurdles we've got to jump that day. Immediately we feel sad bored, and bothered. Whereas actually we're just lying in bed. And so the Taoist trick says. Simply live now and there will be no problems. That's the meaning of the Zen saying. When you are hungry, eat, when you are tired, sleep when you walk, walk, when you sit, sit. Rinzai the great Tang Dynasty master said, in the practice of Buddhism there is no place for using effort. Sleep when you're tired, move your bowels, eat when you're hungry. That's all. The ignorant will laugh at me but the wise will understand. And so also the meaning of this wonderful Zen saying. They have the character of the sun. That is good day. Every day is a good day. On condition and see that day-day is like nyin nyin. They come one after another and yet there's only this one you don't link them.

This as I said into intimated just a moment ago seems to be an atomization of life. Things just do what they do. The flour goes poof, and people go this way go that way and so on and that's that's where that's what's happening. It has no meaning it has no destination, it has no value, it's just like that. And when you see that, you see, it's a great relief that's all it is. But then when you are firmly established in suchness, in that it's just this moment. You can begin again to play with the connections. Only you've seen through them, but now you see that they don't haunt you. Because you know that there isn't any continuous You running on from moment to moment who originated at some time in the past and will die at some time in the future. All that's disappeared. So you can have enormous fun, anticipating the future, remembering the past, and playing all kinds of continuities. This is the meaning of that famous Zen saying about mountains are mountains. To the naive man mountains are mountains, waters are waters. To the intermediate student mountains are no longer mountains waters in the longer waters now the words they've all dissolved into the point instant to the Shana. But for the perfected student, mountains are again mountains and waters are again waters.

In the philosophy of the Tao, it is said, it's always being said this is. You read this in every art book about Chinese art that in Chinese painting, man is always seen as in nature rather than dominating it. You get a painting in titled poet drinking by moonlight. And you see a great landscape and after some search with a magnifying glass at last you see the poet, stuck in a corner somewhere drinking wine. Whereas, if we painted the subject poet drinking by moonlight, the poet really the most obvious thing in a picture. There he would be, dominating the whole thing the landscape out somewhere behind it. But of all the Chinese painters, I mean, the painters of the great classical tradition there are Chinese painters who specialize in family portraits and do these very formal paintings of someone's ancestor sitting on a throne it's quite a different category but the Taoist inspired painters Zen inspired painters, have this view of man as an integral part of nature. Something in it, just as everything else is in it flowers and birds and not they're sent into this world, commissioned by some sort of supernatural being to come into this world and find it and dominated.

The whole conception of nature is as a self regulating self-governing, indeed democratic organism. But it has a totality it all goes together and this

totality is that our. When we can speak. In Taoist and of following the course of nature following the way. What it means is more like this. Doing things in accordance with the grain. It doesn't mean you don't cut wood, but it means that you cut wood, along the lines where wood is most easy to cut, and you interact with other people along lines which are the most genial. And this, then is the great fundamental principle which is called wu-wei, which is not to force anything. I think that's the best translation . Not doing, not acting, not interfering, but not to force seems to me to hit the nail on the air. Like don't ever force a lock while you bend the key or break the law you jiggle until it revolves. So wu-wei, is always to act in accordance with the pattern of things as they exist. Don't impose on any situation act a kind of interference that is not really in accordance with the situation.

For example, we have a slum, and that people are in difficulty and so on and they need better housing. Now if you go in with a bulldozer and bulldoze the slum, and you were put in its place by some architects imaginative notions of what is a super efficient high rise apartment building to stop people you create a total mess. Utter chaos. A slum has what we would call an ecology It has a very complex system of relationships going in it. By which the thing is already a going concern even though it isn't going very well. Anybody who wants to alter that situation must first of all become sensitive, to all the conditions and relationships going on there. It's terribly important than to have this feeling of the interdependence of every form of life upon every other form of life. How we for example cultivate animals that we eat, and look after them and build them up and see that they breed in reasonable quantities. We don't do it too well, as a matter of fact. Troubles arising about supplies of fish in the ocean. All sorts of things.

But you have to see that life that the so called conflict of various species with each other is not actually a competition. It's a very strange system of interrelationship. Of things feeding on each other and cultivating each other the same time the idea of the friendly, the necessary adversary who is part of you. You have conflicts going on in your own body all kinds of microorganisms are eating each other up and if that wasn't happening you wouldn't be healthy. So all those interrelationships, whether they appear to be friendly relationships, as between bees and flowers or conflicting relationships as between birds and worms, they are actually forms of

cooperation. And that is mutual arising. You have to understand this. As the basis, apply this, not forcing anything and you get spontaneity, a life which is so of itself, which is natural, which is not forced. Which is not unduly self-conscious.

Now, another term that is important although I'm not aware that this word because in lots of the book it's found in greater use at a much later time in Chinese thought in philosophy that is called neo-Confucian. And it's also used in Buddhism. But it is a very useful word for understanding. The sort of order that all this constitutes it's the word Li. And this means originally the markings in Jade. Or perhaps the graining would all the fiber and muscle. It is translated nowadays in most dictionaries as a reason for principle. But this isn't a very good translation. Joseph Needham suggested that organic pattern was an ideal translation of this word. Now you see the markings in Jade are always regarded as beautiful. You might say so you look down at the water here when you see the waves break that are patterns in the foam.

Now if you watch those patterns you know they never make an aesthetic mistake. Never. But they're not symmetrical and they're very difficult to describe. They're wiggly. So the markings in Jade's I was the Great in wood but we love the grain wood and you see a judge who has done these paintings of rocks based on exams. I think in the Chinese book called The Mustard Seed Garden. These all exhibit li. That is to say they are forms which we know are orderly. And we can distinguish them from messes quite clearly. And so in the same way the phone patterns the rock patterns, the patterns of vegetation, are at once extraordinarily orderly, but they don't have an obvious order, nobody can ever pin it down. That's what I'd like to say you know that there is order there something quite different from a mess but there's no way of really getting it.

Now in order to be able to paint that sort of way. Or to live that sort of way or to deliver justice that way if you were a judge. You have to have it innately. You have to have an essential sense of Li, and there's no way prescribing it. This is the very devil for teachers. Because you see all our university of them schools now trying to teach creativity. That's the great thing these days now and they are here at Esalen, all of the people are

giving courses and workshops and creativity. Now the trouble is that if we found out a method whereby we could teach creativity., and everybody could just explain how it was done it would no longer be of interest. What always is an essential element in the creative is the mysterious. The dark. It's like the black in lacquer. The impenetrable. And yet the profound depth out of which glorious things come but nobody can see why. There's a poem which says that when the bird calls. The mountain becomes more mysterious. You imagine for example you're in a mountain valley and everything is very silent. And suddenly a crow. Squawks somewhere. You don't know where that crow is, and the little sound emphasizes the silence. Now, all those things have in them, you see, an element of mystery. There's a Chinese poem which puts it this way. It is a poem written by a man who has gone to find a sage in the mountains and the Sage has a little hut at the foot of the mountain and a boy there who is his servant. I asked the boy beneath the pines he said the master's gone alone herb-gathering somewhere on the Mount. Cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown.

In so many athletic and artistic skills you will find a teacher who teaches you how to do it without forcing it. I once started the piano. I am absolutely no good at it now because I don't practice. I'm involved in other things. But I had an absolutely superb teacher for a while. He was a very very great musicologist you know. There was nothing sloppy about his standards, they were of the highest perfection. But when I went to him, he said "Let me see what you can do so", so I played him a scholarly Sonata. He said "Yeah but the trouble with you is you're trying too hard. You're hitting the piano when you should never hit a piano." He said actually all you've got to do in order to play a piano is to drop your hands on it and you need to have relaxed arms so he made me practice for a while he felt my muscles to see what I was relaxed got not and he's not just dropping out on the piano I don't care what notes you get but just drop your hand let it fall so there's enough energy in the weight of your arm to play as loud as you will, or as soft as you will, but just let it drop, he said that's all you have to do, drop your hands, and kept feeling my arms. He said no no you're getting too tense you must pretend you are Lao Tzu. And he was a very educated man he knew about these things, then he said Now after dropping your hands all you've got to do is hit the right notes. And he said you know, the same thing is involved in making a very complex trill. And he demonstrated, he just

dropped his hand on the piano and at the same time his fingers went for a loop like that and there was this magnificent on a mentation. And then we went on with practices for some time he said Now let's get around it in the right notes and. He found immediately I had a block on reading music, because when I was a small boy started piano at the age of roughly eight, I had a pestiferous teacher who was the mistress in this private school I went to in England. And she used to sit beside you would hit your fingers with a pencil every time you made a wrong note. Gregory Bateson, I think was taught piano and as a child in such a way and he has a total block on reading music. He really has got a brilliant mind you know he's a mathematician and great anthropologist, ethnologist and so on the other total block to reading music. And so this man had to teach me to overcome my block. And he said now, first of all, feel perfectly free to make mistakes, if everybody's going to make some mistakes and it doesn't matter if you make a mistake and if you do make a mistake don't don't go back and do it over again but just go on. So play as slowly as you like don't hurry it just along as you keep the relative rhythm the relative values of thing go slow and take it easy.

Another thing is to not to pay so much attention to the notes but to the distances or intervals between because that is the significant jump. And this sort of overcomes to the difficulty of key signatures where we start out with as we started out learning music with this weird system that the lines on the staff really represent the major scale of C., and that therefore when you put a key signature at the beginning you remember that every time you exposing your playing F. every time you hit B. It should be B. flat. Well that's extremely tedious way of learning music, and we would just have to think in different keys that's the only way to adjust to a key signature and play in the thing according to the intervals appropriate for that. But you see in this instance this man although he was a great perfectionist and was highly skilled in music he used intelligence first of all to give you a shortcut and then he also used relaxation to enter into a difficult thing by the easiest route.

In Zen training, in its initial stages, the master discourages intellectualization. You know, you come in with a lot of ideas but this difficulty you have is not going to be solved by ideas it's not going to be

solved by talk and intellectualization. So in the same way this is discouraged because intellectualization sets up a kind of interval or lack of rapport between you and your life. You think about things so much that you get into the state where you're eating the main you head of the dinner. We all valuing the money more than the wealth. You are confusing as Korzybski would say, the map with the territory.

And what they want to do is to get you into the territory to get you into a relationship with what is as distinct from ideas about what is. And this is an important preliminary discipline. But later on you can realize that the process of thinking is also what is. Thoughts, in their own domain are as real as rocks. Words have their own reality, as much as the sky and water. Thoughts about things are in them their own turn things, and so they lead you eventually to the point where you intellectualize and think in an immediate way. Let's go on and ask then a further problem. How about thinking about thinking? Wouldn't that be pretty far off? Here is a person removed from life because he's in the intellectual world, and he's all in a living in symbols is a kind of or a kind of a living book. Now what about a librarian? A person who writes books about books, a bibliographer. A classifier of classifications that's a pretty dusty occupation and as we know. Sometimes librarians seem to be very dusty people they. Seem away removed from life all tied up in their categories and catalogues and musts. That, you see, is also its level of reality. And thinking about thinking. Can be lived with just as much direct fresh spontaneity as just living without thinking, but in order to live it with full spontaneity. You have to be in a position where you no longer feel the symbol before the idea of the words as a block to Life. No longer feel it as something you are using as a sort of means of escape. To be able to use the symbol not as a means of escape, you have to know in the first place that you can't escape, and not only that you can't escape but there is no one to escape. There is no one to be delivered from the prison of life. That then the liberation of the mind from identifying itself with symbols. Is the same process exactly as breaking up the links between the successive moments. The illusion of a self, a continuing self that travels. From moment to moment and picks them all up, corresponding to the illusion of the moving water in the wave, and the moving lion, the solid circle created by the moving cigarette point in the dark.

This is the meaning then, that there is no one who perceives anything, no one who experiences anything there is simply seeing, and experiencing. Then we introduce all these redundancies through talk. We talk about seeing sights hearings sounds, feeling feelings, all that is irrelevant. There are sights. There are sounds, there are feelings. You don't feel a feeling the feeling itself already contains the feeling of it. They see, it is very simple. To have sight of you don't need something to be seen on the one hand and a sea of something to be seen on the other and then some some mysterious way they come together. The see-er and the seen, the knower and the known are what we call terms. Terms mean ends. And they are what in mathematical language are called limits. Now when we take a stick, the stick has its two ends. They are the terms of the stick, but the ends of the stick do not exist as sort of separate points which encounter each other on the occasion of meeting at a stick. They are actually abstract points, the ends themselves considered as themselves, they're purely geometrical, they're Euclidean imaginations their reality is the stick in thing. So in the same way with that phenomenon called experience the reality is not an encounter of the know and the known. The reality is an experience which can be termed as having two aspects to end the know and the known. But that's only a figure of speech neurologically.

This is true. Everything that you see is yourself. What you are aware of is a state of your nervous system. And there is no other knowledge whatsoever. That doesn't mean that your nervous system is the only existing reality, and that there is nothing beyond your nervous system. But it does mean that all knowledge is knowledge of you, and that therefore in some mysterious way, you are not different from the external world that you know. If you see then, that what you experience, and you, are the same thing. Then realize also, going beyond that, that you are in the external world you're looking at. You see, I'm in your external world, you're in my external world. But I'm in the same world you are. My inside is not separable from the outside world it's something the so-called outside world is doing. Just as it's doing the tree and the ocean and everything else that is in the outside world. Now isn't that great, you see. We've completely got rid of the person in the trap. The one who either dominates the world or suffers under it. It's vanished. It never was there. And when it's when that happens you see. You can play any life game you want to. Link the past and the present in the future

together. Play roles. But you know you've seen through this great. They call it the great social lie that one accumulates owns experiences, memories, sights, sounds and from that, other people. Possessions, so on, and building up always this idea of oneself as the haver of all of this. If you think that you've been had.

Intellectual Yoga

The word yoga, as most of you doubtless know, is the same as our word yoke. Y-O-K-E. And the Latin word iungere, to join. Join, junction, yolk, union, all these words are basically from the same root. And so likewise when Jesus said my yoke is easy he was saying really my yoga is easy. And the word therefore basically denotes. The state that would be the opposite of what our psychologists call alienation. Or what Buddhists call psychiatrist. The view of separateness the feeling of separateness the feeling of being cut off from being. And most civilized people do in fact feel that way. Because they have a kind of myopia attention. Focused on their own boundaries and what is inside those boundaries and they identify themselves with the inside. And they don't realize that you cannot have an inside without an outside. That would seem Wouldn't it be extremely elementary logic that we could have no sense. Of being ourselves. Of having a personal identity without the contrast of something that is not ourselves that is to say other.

But the fact that we don't realize that Self and Other go together is the root of an enormous and terrifying anxiety. Because what will happen when the inside disappears? What will happen when the so-called comes to an end as it seems to. Because if it didn't. I mean if things did not keep moving and changing appearing and dissolving. The universe would be a colossal ball. And therefore you are only aware that the things are all right for the moment I mean I hope most of the people in this gathering have a sort of genial sense inside them that for the time being things are going on more or less OK Some of you may be very miserable. And then your problem may be just a little different but it's essentially the same one but you must realize that that sense of life being fairly All right is inconceivable and unfeeling unless there is way way way in the back of your mind the glimmer of a possibility that something absolutely unspeakably awful might happen. Doesn't have to happen because you'll die one day. But there always has to

be the vague apprehension the hint to get down that the awful awful are possible. It gives spice to life. Now these observations are in line with what I'm going to talk about tonight the intellectual approach to yoga. There are basically certain principle forms of yoga. Most people are familiar with hotter yoga. Which is a psycho physical exercise system and that's the one you see demonstrated most on television because it has visual value. You can see all these exercises with Lotus positions and people curling their legs around their necks and doing all sorts of marvelous exercises and they're good exercises the most honest yoga teacher I know is a woman who teaches hatha yoga and doesn't pretend to be any other kind of guru and she does it very well.

Then there is, back to yoga, Bhakti means devotion. And I suppose in general you might say that Christianity is a form of back to yoga. Because it is yoga practice through extreme reverence for love for. Some being felt more or less external to one's self who is the representative of the divine. Then there is karma yoga. Karma means action and incidentally that's all it means. It does not mean the law of cause and effect when we say that something that happens to you is your karma all it saying is it's your own doing. Nobody's in charge of karma except you. Karma Yoga is the way of action. Of using one's everyday life one's trade or unathletic discipline like sailing or surf riding or track running as your way of yoga as your way of discovering who you are. Then there's Raja Yoga. That's the Royal yoga, and that's sometimes also called can do. And that involves very complicated psychic exercises having to do with awakening the serpent power. That is. As to lie at the base of one's spiritual spine. And raising it up through certain chakras or centers until it enters into the brain there's a very profound symbolism involved in that. But I'm not going into that.

And then finally there is there are several others as mantra yoga Montrealeer go which is the practice through chanting of humming either out loud or silently certain sounds. Which we've come supports for contemplation of what is in Sanskrit called Yana. And Yana. Is the state in which one is clearly awake and aware. Of the world as it is. As distinct from the world as it is described. In other words in the state of jhana you stop thinking. That is to say you stop talking to yourself and figure into yourself and symbolizing to yourself what is going on. You simply are aware of what is and nobody

can say what it is because as courtship ski well said the real world is unspeakable. Lovely double taken. But. That's Jana that's. Where one practice is to sit absolutely wide awake with eyes open. But not thinking. That's a very curious state incidentally. I knew a professor of mathematics at Northwestern University. Who one day said you know it's amazing how many things there are that aren't so. Now I know he was talking about old wives tales and scientific superstitions and so on but when you practice Jana you are amazed how many things there are that answer. Because when you stop talking to yourself and you are simply aware of what is. That is to say of what you feel. What you sense even that saying too much you suddenly find that the past and the future completely disappeared. So also have disappeared the so-called differentiation between the no and the known the subject in the object the feel around the feeling the thinker in the thought they just aren't there because you have to talk to yourself to maintain those things. They are purely conceptual their ideas their phantoms ghosts.

So when you allow thinking to stop. All that goes away. And you find you're in an eternal here or now. And there's no way you're supposed to be there's nothing you're supposed to do is know what you exposed to go because in order to think you're supposed to do something you have to think. And so it's incredibly important to on. At least once a day. For the very preservation of the intellectual life. So if we stop that. Temporarily. And get our mind clear of thoughts. We become as Jesus said again as children. And get a direct view of the world. Which is very useful once here and I doubt it's not much you can do with it when you're a baby. Because everybody pushes you around and you know they pick you up and sit with the city of there and you can't do much except practice contemplation. Only if you can tell anyone what it's like. But when as an adult you can recapture the baby's point of view you will know what all child psychologists have always wanted to know how it is that a baby feels. And the baby according to Freud at least has the oceanic experience. That is to say a feeling of complete inseparability from what's going on. The baby is unable to distinguish between the Universe and his or her action upon the universe. And most of us if we got into that state of consciousness might be inclined to feel extremely frightened. And being beginning to ask. Who's in charge. I mean. Who controls what happens next we would ask that because we are

used to the idea that the process of nature consists of controllers and control ease. Things that do and things that are done to. This is purely mythological. So many spiritual teachers and gurus will look at their disciples and say. I am God. I have realized. But the important thing is that you are. Whether I am or not is that now. Of no consequence to you whatsoever. I could get up and say I have realized I put on a turban and yellow robe and whatever. You come and have Darshan on. I'm going to you need the grace of guru in order to realize and so on and that would be a wonderful hoax if you like picking your pockets and selling you your own watch. But the point is you are. And what are we saying when we say that. We are obviously saying something very important. Alas and alack there is no way of defining it. That is to say going any further into words about it. See when a philosopher hears such a statement as to I must see you or it. Or there is only the eternal now. The Philosopher says I did see where I was so excited about it what do you mean by that. And then he asked that question because he wants to continue in a word game. He doesn't want to go on into an experience will dimension he wants to go on arguing because that's his trip. And all these great mystical statements mean nothing whatsoever. There are alternate statements. Just as you know the trees in the clouds in the mountains and the stars have no meaning because they're not words words have meaning because they're symbols because they point to something other than themselves. But the stars like music. Music only bad music has any meaning. Classical music never has a meaning and to understand. It humans simply listen to it and observe its beautiful patterns go into its complexity.

So when your mind that is to say your verbal systems get to the end of their tether that is to say when they arrived at the meaningless statement. Here is the critical point. And the method of Indiana yoga is to exercise one's intellect to its limits. So that you get to the point where you have no further questions to ask. You can do this in philosophy study. If you got the right kind of teacher. Who shows you that all philosophical opinions whatsoever are false. Or at least if not false extremely partial. And so you feel a kind of intellectual vertigo. Which is called in a Zen Buddhist poem. Above not a tile to cover the head below not an inch of ground to stand on. Well where you where are you then. Of course you where you always were. You discovered your it and that's very uncomfortable because you can't grab it.

So yeah I've discovered that whatever it is that I am. Now is not something inside my head. It is just as much out there as it is in here but whatever it is I cannot get hold of it. Well that gives you the heebie jeebies you get butterflies in the stomach. Anxiety traumas and all kinds of things. But this was all explained by Shankara who the great Hindu commentator on the Upanishads adds the great master of the non-dualistic doctrine of the universe when he said. That which knows which is in all beings the knower is never an object of its own knowledge. So that to everyone who is in quest. Of the supreme kick. The great experience. The vision of God. Whatever you want to call it liberation. When you think that you are not it. Any old guru can sell you on a method to find it. And that may not be a bad thing for him to do. Because as Blake said a fool who persists in his folly will become wise. And a clever girl who is a person who leads you on here kitty kitty kitty kitty I've got something very good to show you. You just wait but you've got to go through a lot of stages yet. He said. I'm Can I get that island together. You know all the time it's you. I was talking of the Zen master the other day. And he said. You should be my disciple. I looked at him and said who was Buddhist teacher. And he looked at me in a very odd way and said. So he burst into laughter and he gave me a piece. Of clover. It's. So. You can you see. So long as you can be persuaded there's something law that you ought to be than you are. You've divided yourself from. Reality from the universe from God or whatever you want to call that the tat and tat. And you will find constantly if you if you're interested in anything like this in psychoanalysis in just out therapy in sensitivity training in any kind of yoga or what have you. That there will be that. Funny sensation of what I'll call spiritual greed. That can be aroused by somebody indicating to you. There are still higher stages for you to attain. You should meet my go. The so you might say then and now it to be truly realized you have to get to the point where you are not seeking anymore.

So then you begin to think well, the way we will we will now be non seekers. In the light disciples of Krishnamurti who because he says he doesn't read any spiritual books they can read anything with mysteries the heart it's. You know becoming spiritually and spiritual. Well you find that that too is what is called In Zen legs on a snake. It's irrelevant you don't need not to see. This you don't need anything. And I mean it's like crawling into a hole and pulling the hole in after you. And of the great master of this

technique was a Buddhist scholar. Lived about two hundred a day. Invented a whole dialectic he had old school called mechanica where the as it were leader of the students would simply destroy all their ideas. Absolutely abolish their philosophical notions. And they get the heebie jeebies. They see he didn't have the B.G.. He seemed perfectly relaxed in not having any particular point of view. But as a teacher how can you stand. We have to have something to hang on to. Who does. Who are you. And eventually you discover of course that it's not necessary to hang on to anything. To rely on and there's nothing to rely on because here it is. Is like the universe it's like asking the question where is the universe. And by that I mean the whole universe. Who care about says it in space. Everything in it is falling around everything else but there's no concrete floor underneath. With the thing to crash. Because the space. You can think of infinite space if you like you don't have to think of space. The space that goes out and out and out forever and ever and has no end what is there. Of course it's you what else could it be. Only the universe is delightfully arranged. So that it as it looks at itself. In order not to be one sided and prejudiced It looks at itself from. An uncountable number of points of view. We thus avoid solid them. With as if I were to have the notion that it's only me that's really here and you're all in my dream. Of course it's that point of view cannot really be disputed. Except by imagining a conference of solipsists arguing as to which one of them is the one that was really the. Now you see if you understand what I'm saying with your intelligence. And then take the next step and say I understood it now but I didn't feel it then next I raise the question. Why do you want to feel it. You say I want something more because that's again that spiritual green. And you can only say that because you didn't understand. There is nothing to pursue because you're it and if you don't know that you always were it. And if you don't know that.

In other words, to put it in Christian terms, or Jewish terms, if you don't know that your god from the beginning what happens is that you try to become God by force. Therefore you start being violent and obstreperous and this and that and the other. All our violence all our competitiveness all our. Terrific anxiety to survive is because we didn't know from the beginning that we were it. Well then you would safe we didn't know from the beginning as in fact you did. When you were a baby. Then everybody says well nothing would ever happen. But it did happen. And it's some of

it's pretty messy. But what people don't realize is they say well take take the Hindus it's basic to Hindu religion that we're all God in disguise. And that the world is an illusion. All that is. Sort of half truth. But if that is the case if Hindus and really awaken Hindus by the knowledge of their union with the Godhead. Would simply become inert. Why then Hindu music. The most incredibly complex marvelous technique. When they sit and play they laugh at each other. They're enjoying themselves enormously with very complicated musical games but when we come in the symphony orchestra gets up everybody dresses in evening dress in a serious expression and all the audience is down on us like it's in a kind of church. And there's none of that to. Records rest well the drama of the tabla player laughs at the sorrow as they compete with each other in all kinds of marvelous improvise ations.

So if you do find out by any chance. Who you really are. You instead of becoming merely lazy. You know you start laughing and laughing leads to dancing and dancing needs music and we can play with each other. For a change.

Myth and Religion

Images of God

Now I'm sure that most of you know the old story about the astronaut who went far out into space and was asked on his return whether he had been to heaven and seen God and he said yes. And so they said to him, "Well, what about God?" And he said "She is black." And although this is a very well known and well worn story, it is very profound.

Because, I tell you, I knew a monk who started out in life as pretty much of an agnostic or an atheist, and then he began to read Henri Bergson, the French philosopher who proclaimed the vital force, the *elan vital*, and so on, and the more he read into this kind of philosophy the more he saw that these people were really talking about God. And I've read a great deal of theological reasoning about the existence of God and they all start out on this line: If you are intelligent and reasonable, you cannot be the product of a mechanical and meaningless universe. Figs do not grow on thistles, grapes do not grow on thorns. And therefore, you as an expression of the universe, as an aperture through which the universe is observing itself, cannot be a mere fluke.

Because if this world peoples, as a tree brings forth fruit, then the universe itself, the energy which underlies it, what it's all about, 'the ground of being' as Paul Tillich called it, must be intelligent.

Now when you come to that conclusion you must be very careful. Because you may make an unwarranted jump. Namely, the jump to the conclusion that that intelligence, that marvelous designing power which produces all this, is the biblical God. Be careful. Because that god, contrary to his own commandments, is fashioned in the graven image of a paternal authoritarian, beneficent tyrant of the ancient Near East. And it's very easy to fall into that trap. Because it's all institutionalized in the Roman Catholic Church, in the synagogue, in the Protestant churches, all there ready for you to accept. And by the pressure of social consensus and so on and so on, it is

very natural to assume that when somebody uses the word God it is that father figure which is intended, because even Jesus used the analogy the Father for his experience of God. He had to. There was no other one available to him in his culture.

But nowadays, we are in rebellion against the image of the authoritarian father. Especially this should happen in the United States, where it happens that we are a republic and not a monarchy. And if you, as a loyal citizen of this country, think that a republic is the best form of government, you can hardly believe that the universe is a monarchy. But to reject the paternalistic image of God as an idol is not necessarily to be an atheist. Although, I have advocated something called atheism in the name of God. That is to say, an experience, a contact, a relationship with God, that is to say, with the ground of your being, that does not have to be embodied or expressed in any specific image.

Now, theologians on the whole don't like that idea, because I find in my discourse with them that they want to be a little bit hard-nosed about the nature of God. They want to say that God has indeed a very specific nature. Ethical monotheism means that the governing power of this universe has some extremely definite opinions and rules to which our minds and acts must be conformed. And if you don't watch out you will go against the fundamental grain of the universe and be punished in some way. Old fashionedly, you will burn in the fires of hell forever. More modern fashionedly [sic], you will fail to be an authentic person. It's another way of talking about it.

But there is this feeling, you see, that there is authority behind the world and it's not you. It's something else. Like we say about something else, that's far out. And therefore, this Jewish, Christian, and indeed Muslim approach makes a lot of people feel rather strange-estranged- from the root and ground of being. There are a lot of people who never grow up, and are always in awe of an image of a grandfather. Now, I'm a grandfather. I have five grandchildren and so I'm no longer in all of grandfathers. I know I'm just as stupid as my own grandfathers were, and therefore I'm not about to bow down to an image of God with a long white beard.

Now naturally of course, we intelligent people don't believe in that kind of a God, not really. I mean, we think that God is Spirit, that God is very undefinable and infinite and all that kind of thing. But nevertheless, the images of God have far more powerful effect upon our emotions than our ideas. And when people read the Bible and sing hymns; "Ancient of Days who sittest throned in glory. Immortal Invisible God, only wise in light inaccessible hid from our eyes," they still got that fellow there with a beard on its way in the back of the emotions. And so we should think, first of all, in contrary imagery, and the contrary imagery is: she's black. Imagine instead of God the Father, God the Mother. And imagine that this is not a luminous being, blazing with light but an unfathomable darkness. Such as is portrayed in India mythology by Kali. K A L I, the Great Mother, who is represented in the most terrible imagery. Kali has a tongue hanging out long, drooling with blood. She has fang teeth, she has a scimitar on one hand and a severed head in the other, and she is trampling on the body of her husband who is Shiva. Shiva represents also furthermore the destructive aspect of the deity, wherein all things are dissolved so that they be reborn again, and here is this blood sucking terrible mother as the image of the supreme reality behind this universe. Imagine, it's the representative of the octopus, the spider, the awful awful, the creepy crawlies at the end of the line which we're all terrified of.

Now that's a very important image. Because let us suppose just for the sake of argument that all of you sitting here right now are feeling fairly alright. But I mean you're not in a hospital. You're not you don't have the screaming meemies, you have a sense you probably had dinner and a feeling pretty good. But you know that you feel that you're fairly good because in the background of your mind's very far off in the background of your minds you've got the sensation of something absolutely ghastly that simply mustn't happen. And so against that, which is not happening which doesn't necessarily have to happen but by comparison with that, you feel pretty all right. And that absolutely ghastly thing that must happen at all is Kali.

And therefore, at once we begin to wonder whether the presence of this Kali is not in a way very beneficence. I mean, how would you know the things were good unless there was something that wasn't good at all. Now

this is I'm not putting this forward as a final position and money putting it forward as a variation, as a way of beginning to look at a problem. And getting our minds out of their normal ruts. She's black. Well she, first of all, feminine, represents what is called philosophically the negative principle. Now of course people who are women in our culture today and believe in women's lib don't like to be associated with the negative, because the negative is acquired very bad connotations. We say accentuate the positive, that's a purely male chauvinist it added to it. How would you know that you were outstanding and less by contrast there was something in-standing. You cannot appreciate the convex without the concave. You cannot appreciate the firm without the yielding. And therefore, the so-called negativity of the feminine principle. Is obviously life giving and very important. But we live in a culture which doesn't notice it. You see a painting, a drawing, of a bird, and you don't notice the white paper underneath it. You see people a printed book and you think that what is important is the printing, and the page doesn't matter. And yet, if you reconsider the whole thing how could there be visible printing without the page underlying it.

What is called substance, that which stands underneath, sub, underneath stands to be substantial is to be underlined. To be the support. To be the foundation of the world. And of course, this is the great function of the feminine. To be the substance. And therefore the feminine is represented by space which is of course black at night. But were it not for black and empty space there would be no possibility whatsoever of seeing the stars. Stars shine out of space and astronomers, very high powered astronomers are beginning to realize that stars are a function of space.

Now that's difficult for our common sense. Because we think that space is simply inert nothingness. Then we don't realize. That space. Is completely basic to everything. It's like your consciousness. Nobody can imagine what consciousness is. It's the most elusive whatever it is that there is, it all because it's the background of everything else that we know therefore we don't really pay much attention to it. We pay attention to the things within the field of consciousness to the outlines to the objects that the so-called things that are in the field of vision the sounds that are in the field of hearing and so forth. But what it is that ever it is that embraces all that. We don't pay much attention to it, we can't even think about it, it's like trying

to look at your head. And you know, you try to look at your head and what you find. You don't even find a black blob in the middle of things you just don't find anything. And yet that is that out of which you see, just as space is that out of which the stars shine.

So there's something very queer about all this. That that which you cannot put your finger on, that which always escapes you that which is completely elusive, the blank seems to be absolutely necessary for there to be anything whatsoever Now let's take this further. Kali also is a principle of death because she carries a scimitars in one hand and a severed head in the other. Death. This is tremendously important to think about. We put it off. Death is swept under the carpet in our culture in the hospital they try to keep you alive as long as possible in utter desperation. They won't tell you that you're going to die. When their relatives have to be informed that it's a hopeless case they say, "Don't tell this to the patient." And all the relatives come around with hollow grins and say, "Well, you'll be all right in about a month, and then we'll go and have a holiday somewhere and sit by the sea and the birds and whatnot." And the dying person knows that this is mockery. Well of course we've made death how with all kinds of ghouls. We've invented dreadful afterlives. I mean, the Christian version of heaven is abominable as the Christian version of hell. I mean, nobody wants to be in church forever. Children are absolutely horrified when they hear these hymns which say "Prostrate before they are thrown to law and gaze and gaze on thee." They can't imagine what this imagery means. I mean, in a very subtle theological way, I could wangle that statement around to make it extremely profound. I mean, to be prostrate at once and to gaze on the other hand, see, is a *Coincidentia oppositorum*, a coincidence of opposites, which is very very deep. But to a child it is a crick in the neck. And that's a sort of imagery we're brought up with.

So the idea what might happen after death. Well, you're going to be faced with your judge. The one who knows all about you, this is Big Papa, who knows you're a naughty boy and a very naughty girl especially girl from the beginning of things. He's going to look right through to the core of your inauthentic existence. And what kind of heebie jeebies may come up or you may be believe in reincarnation, and you think that your next life will be the rewards and the punishments for what you've done in this life, and you

know you got away with murder in this life and of us also all things are going to happen next time around do you look upon death as a catastrophe. Then there are other people who say, well when you're dead you're dead. Just done nothing going to happen at all. So what have you got to worry about?

Well we don't quite like that idea, because it spooks us. You know, what's to be like to die to go to sleep and never never never wake up. But a lot of things it's not going to be like. It's not going to be like being buried alive. It's not going to be like being in the darkness for other. I tell you what, it's going to be like as if you never had existed at all, not only you but everything else as well. There was never anything and there's no one to regret it. And there's no problem. But I'll think about it for a while. It's kind of a weird feeling you get when you really think about that, you really imagine just to stop altogether. You can even call it stop, because you can't have stopped without start. And there wasn't any stop. There's just, no thing. Well then when you come to think of it that's the way it was before you were born. And if you go back in memory as far as you can go you get to the same place. As you go forward in your anticipation of the future as to what it's going to be like to be dead. Anyway it is a funny ideas, that this blankness is the necessary counterpart of what we call being. Now we all think we are alive, don't we? I mean we're really here, that there is something called existence. You know, the existentialist, dasein, thrownness, you know, here we are.

But how could you bring it experiencing that as a reality unless you would once been dead? What gives us any ghost of a notion that we are here except by contrast with the fact that we once weren't? And later on we won't be, but this thing is a cycle. Like positive and negative poles and electricity. So this then is the value of the symbolism of she is black. She, the womb principle. The receptive. The in-standing. The void. And the dark. And so that is to come into the presence of the God who has no image. Behind the father image, behind the mother image, behind the image of Light inaccessible and behind the image of profound and abysmal darkness. The something else, which we can't conceive it all. Dionysus the Areopagite called it the luminous darkness. Nagarjuna called it shunyata, the void. Shankara called it Brahman. That which nothing at all can be said,

neti neti. Beyond all conception whatsoever. And you see that is not atheism in the formal sense of the word. This is a profoundly religious attitude. Because what it corresponds to practically is an attitude to life of total trust. Of letting go. When we form images of God. They're all really exhibitions of our lack of faith. Something to hold on to, something to grasp. How firm a foundation, what lies underneath us, the Rock of Ages or whatever. Ein feste Burg.

But when we don't grasp we have the attitude to face. If you let go of all the idols you will of course discover that what this unknown is which is the foundation of the universe is precisely you. It's not the you you think you are. Now it's not your opinion of yourself, it's not your idea or image of yourself, it's not the chronic sense of muscular strain which we usually call I. You can't grasp it of course not. Why would you need to suppose you could what would you do with it. And who would do what with it. You could never get it it is others that profound central mystery and the attitude of faith is to stop chasing it. Stop grabbing it, because if that happens the most amazing things follow. But all these ideas of the spiritual, the godly, as this attitude of must. And we have been laid down the laws which we are bound to follow, all this jazz, is not the only way of being religious and of relating to the ineffable mystery that underlies ourselves in the world.

Jesus: His Religion

Some years ago, I had just given a talk on television in Canada when one of the announcers came up to me and said, "You know, if one can believe that this universe is in the charge of an intelligent and beneficent God, don't you think He would naturally have provided us with an infallible guide to behavior and to the truth about the universe?" Of course I knew he meant the Bible. I said, "No, I think nothing of the kind, because I think a loving God would not do something to His children that would rot their brains." Because if we had an infallible guide we would never think for ourselves, and therefore our minds would become atrophied. It is as if my grandfather had left me a million dollars, and I am glad he didn't. And we have therefore to begin any discussion of the meaning of the life and teachings of Jesus with a look at this thorny question of authority, and especially the authority of Holy Scripture.

Because in this country in particular, there are an enormous number of people who seem to believe that the Bible descended from heaven with an angel in the year 1611, which was when the so-called King James, or more correctly, [the] Authorized Version of the Bible was translated into English. I had a crazy uncle who believed that every word of the Bible was literally true, including the marginal notes. And so, whatever date it said in the marginal notes – for instance, that the world was created in 4004 B.C. – he believed as the word of God. Until one day he was reading, I think a passage in the Book of Proverbs and found a naughty word in the Bible, and from that time on he was through with it. You know, how Protestant can you get?

Now, the question of authority needs to be understood because I am not going to claim any authority in what I say to you except the authority, such as it is, of history, and that is a pretty uncertain authority. But from my point of view, the four Gospels are to be regarded, I think, on the whole, as historical documents. I will even grant the miracles, because speaking as one heavily influenced by Buddhism, we're not very impressed by miracles. The traditions of Asia – Hindu, Buddhist, Taoist, and so forth – are full of miraculous stories, and we take them in stride. We don't think they are signs of anything in particular except psychic power. We in the West have, by scientific technology, accomplished things of a very startling nature. We could blow up the whole planet, and Tibetan magicians have never promised to do anything like that. And I really am a little scared of the growing interest in psychic power, because that's what I call psychotechnics. And we have made such a mess of things with ordinary technics that heaven only knows what we might do if we got hold of psychotechnics and started raising people from the dead and prolonging life insufferably and doing everything we wished.

The whole answer to the story of miracles is simply: imagine that you are God, and that you can have anything you want. Well, you'd have is for a quite long time. And after a while you would say, "This is getting pretty dull because I know in advance everything that is going to happen." So you would wish for a surprise, and you would find yourself this evening in this church as a human being. So I mean that is the miracle thing. I think miracles are probably possible. That doesn't bother me, and as a matter of

fact, when you read the writings of the early fathers of the church, the great theologians like Saint Clement, Gregory of Nyssa, Saint John of Damascus, even [Saint] Thomas Aquinas, they are not interested in the historicity of the Bible. They take miracles for granted, but forget it. They are interested in it's deeper meaning. And therefore they always interpret all the tales like Jonah and the whale tale. They don't bother even to doubt whether Jonah was or was not swallowed by a whale or rather big fish, but they see in the story of Jonah and the whale the prefiguration of the resurrection of Christ. And even when it comes to the resurrection of Christ they are not worrying about the chemistry or the physics of a risen body. What they are interested in is that the idea of the resurrection of the body has something to say about the meaning of the physical body in the eyes of God. The physical body, in other words, is not something worthless and unspiritual but something that is an object of the Divine Love. Therefore, I am not going to be concerned with whether or not miraculous events happen. It seems to me entirely beside the point.

So I regard the four Gospels, as, on the whole, as good a historical document as anything we have from that period, including the Gospel of John, and that is important. It used to be fashionable to regard the Gospel of Saint John as late. In other words, at the turn of the century, the higher critics of the New Testament assigned the Gospel of John to about 125 A.D., and the reason was simple. Those higher critics at that time just assumed that the simple teachings of Jesus could not possibly have included any complicated mystical theology. Therefore they said, "It must be from a later time." But as a matter of fact, in the text of the Gospel of Saint John, his knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem and his knowledge of the Jewish calendar are more accurate than that of the other three writers, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And it seems to me perfectly simple to assume that John recorded the inner teachings which He gave to his disciples, and that Matthew, Mark, and Luke recorded the more exoteric teaching, which he gave to people at large.

Now, what about then the authority of these Scriptures? We can take this problem in two steps. A lot of people don't know how we got the Bible at all. We Westerners got the Bible thanks to the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church and members of the church wrote the books of the New

Testament, and they took over the books of the Old Testament, which even by the time of Christ had not been finally decided upon by the Jews. The Jews did not close the canon of the Old Testament until the year 100 A.D., or thereabouts, at the synod of Jamnia and they finally decided which were the canonical books of the Hebrew scriptures, and embodied them Masoretic text, the earliest copy of which dates from early in the 10th century A.D. The books to be included in the New Testament were not finally decided upon until the year 382 A.D. at the synod of Rome and the pope Damasus. So it was the Catholic Church that promulgated the Bible and said, "We are giving you these Scriptures on our authority, and by the authority of the informal tradition that has existed among us from the beginning, inspired by the Holy Spirit." So, you receive, historically, the Bible on the church's say-so.

And the Catholic Church insists, therefore, that the church collectively, speaking under the presumed guidance of the Holy Spirit, has the authority to interpret the Bible, and you can take that or leave it. Because obviously the authority of the Bible is not, first of all, based on the Bible itself. I can write a bible and state within that book that it is indeed the word of God which I have received, and you are at liberty to believe me or not. Hindus believe that the Vedas are divinely revealed and inspired, with just as much fervor as any Christian or any Jew. Muslims believe that the Koran is divinely inspired, and some Buddhists believe that their sutras are also of divine, or rather, Buddhic origin. The Japanese believe that the ancient texts of Shinto are likewise of divine origin. And who is to be judge? If we are going to argue about this, as to which version of the truth is the correct one, we will always end up in a dispute in which the judge and the advocate are the same person, and you wouldn't want that if you were brought into a court of law, would you? If I were to say that I find Jesus Christ to be the greatest being who ever came onto this earth, by what standards do I judge? Why, obviously, I judge by the sort of moral standards that have been given to me as somebody brought up in a Christian culture. There is nobody impartial who can decide between all the religions because, more or less, everybody has been, in one way or another, influenced by one of them. So, if the church says the Bible is true, it finally comes down to you. Are you going to believe the church or aren't you? If nobody believes the church, it will be perfectly plain, won't it, that the church has no authority? Because

the people are always the source of authority. That is why Tocqueville said that “people get the government [they] deserve”.

And so you may say, “God Himself has the authority.” Well, how are we to show that? That’s your opinion. So you say, “You wait and see. The Day of Judgment is coming, and then you will find out who is the authority.” Yes, but at the moment there is no evidence for the Day of Judgment. And it remains until there is evidence simply your opinion that the Day of Judgment is coming. And there is nothing else to go on except the opinion of other people, who hold the same view and whose opinion you bought. So really, I won’t deny anybody’s right to hold these opinions. You may indeed believe that the Bible is literally true and that it was actually dictated by God to Moses and the prophets and the apostles. That may be your opinion and you are at liberty to hold it. I don’t agree with you.

I do believe, on the other hand, that there is a sense in which the Bible is divinely inspired. But I mean by inspiration something utterly different from dictation, receiving a dictated message from an omniscient authority. I think inspiration comes very seldom in words. In fact, almost all the words written down by automatic writing from psychic input that I have ever read strike[s] me as a bit thin. When a psychic begins to write of deep mysteries – instead of telling you what your sickness is or who your grandmother was – he begins to get superficial. And psychically communicated philosophy is never as interesting as philosophy carefully thought out.

But divine inspiration is not that kind of communication, divine inspiration is for example to feel, for reasons that you cannot really understand, that you love people. Divine inspiration is wisdom, which is very difficult to put into words. Like mystical experience, that’s divine inspiration. A person who writes out of that experience could be said to be divinely inspired. Or inspiration might come through dreams, through archetypal messages from the collective unconscious, through which the Holy Spirit could be said to work. But since inspiration always comes through a human vehicle, it is liable to be distorted by that vehicle. In other words, I am talking to you through a sound system, and it’s the only one now available. Now if there’s something wrong with this sound system, whatever truths I might utter to you will be distorted. My voice will be distorted, and you might mistake the

meaning of what I said. So therefore, anybody who receives divine inspiration – and I'm using that in a very loose way, you can mean anything you like by divine, that's your option – anybody who receives it will express it within the limits of what language they know. And by language here I do not only mean English, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, or Sanskrit. I mean language in the sense of what sort of terms are available to you, what kind of religion were you brought up with.

Now, you see, if you were brought up in the Bible Belt, you came out of Arkansas or somewhere, and that's all the religion you knew, and you had a mystical experience of the type where you suddenly discovered that you are one with God. Then you are liable to get up and say, "I am Jesus Christ." And lots of people do. Well, the culture that we live in just cannot allow that. There're only one Jesus Christ. People would say, "You don't look like you're Jesus Christ coming back again, because it says in the Scripture that when he comes back, he will appear in the heavens with legions of angels, and you are not doing that. You are just old Joe Dokes that we knew years ago, and now you're saying you are Jesus Christ." "Well," Joe Dokes says, "when Jesus Christ said he was God, nobody believed him, and you don't believe again." You know, you can't answer that argument.

But you see, he says it that way because he is trying to express what happened to him in terms of a religious language that is circumscribed by the Holy Bible. He has never read the Upanishads. He has never read the Diamond Sutra. He has never read the Tibetan Book of the Dead or the I-Ching or Lao-tzu. And therefore, there is no other way in which he can say this. But if he had read the Upanishads he would have had no difficulty, and nor would the culture, the society in which he was talking, have any difficulty. Because it says in the Upanishads, we are all incarnations of God; only they do not mean by the word God, in fact they don't use that word, they use Brahman, they don't mean the same thing that a Hebrew meant by God. Because the Brahman is not personal. Brahman is, we would say, suprapersonal. Not impersonal, because that is a negation. But I would say suprapersonal. Brahman is not he or she, has no sex. Brahman is not the creator of the world – as something underneath and subject to Brahman – but is the actor of the world, the player of all the parts. So that everyone is in mask, which is the meaning of the word person in which the Brahman

plays a role. And like an absorbed actor, the divine spirit gets so absorbed in playing the role as to become it, and to be bewitched. This is all part of the game, to be bewitched into believing “I am that role.”

When you were babies, you knew who you were, psychoanalysts refer to that as the oceanic feeling. They do not really like it, but they admit that it exists, where the baby cannot distinguish between the world and the way it acts on the world. It is all one process, which is of course the way things are. But we learned very quickly, because we were taught very quickly what is you and what is not you. What is voluntary and what is involuntary, because you can be punished for the voluntary but not for the involuntary. So, we unlearn what we knew in the beginning. And in the course of life, if we are fortunate, we discover again what we really are, that each one of us is what would be called in Arabic, or Hebrew, the Son of God. And the word “Son of” means “of the nature of,” as when you call someone a “son of a bitch.” Or in Arabic you say abn alkalb which means ‘son of a dog’, abn hamar ‘son of a donkey’. So ‘son of beel’ means an evil person. “Son of God” means a divine person, human being who have realized union with God.

Now my assumption, my opinion, is that Jesus of Nazareth was a human being, like Buddha, like Shri Ramakrishna, like Ramana Maharshi etc. who, early in life had colossal experiences of what we call cosmic consciousness. Now you do not have to be of any particular kind of religion to get this experience. It can hit anyone, anytime, like falling in love. There are obviously a number of you in this building who’ve had it, in greater or lesser degree. But it is found all over the world, and when it hits you, you know it. Sometimes it comes after long practice of meditation and spiritual discipline, and sometimes it comes for no reason that anybody can determine. We say it’s the grace of God, that there comes this overwhelming conviction that you have mistaken your identity. That what you thought, what I thought was just old Alan Watts – who I know very well is just a big act on the show. But what I thought was me, was only completely superficial. That I am an expression of an eternal something or other, a name that cannot be named, as the name of God was taboo among the Hebrews. I am. And that, I suddenly understand exactly why everything is the way it is. It is perfectly clear. Furthermore, I no longer feel any

boundary between what I do and what happens to me. I feel that everything that is going on is my doing, just as my breathing is. Is your breathing voluntary or involuntary? Do you do it or does it happen to you? See you can feel it both ways. But you feel everything like breathing. And it isn't as if you had become a puppet. There is no longer any separate you. There is just this great happening going on. And if you have the name in your background you will say that this happening is God, or the will of God, or the doing of God. Or if you do not have that word in your background, you will say with the Chinese, "It is the flowing of the Tao." Or if you are a Hindu, you will say, "It is the Maya of Brahman." The Maya means the magical power, the creative illusion, the play.

So you can very well understand how people to whom this happens feel genuinely inspired. Because very often there goes along with it an extremely warm feeling, because you see the divine in everybody else's eyes. When Kabir, the great Hindu-Muslim mystic was a very old man, he used to look around at people and say, "To whom shall I preach?" Because he saw the beloved in all eyes. Sometimes I look into people's eyes and see that same beloved in the depth of those pools, and yet the expression on the face is saying, "What, me?" It is the funniest thing. But there is everybody, in its own peculiar way, playing out an essential part in this colossal cosmic drama. And it's so strange that one can even feel it in people you thoroughly dislike.

So let's suppose that Jesus had such an experience. And they're of all ranges, as I have said, and his could have been a very strong one indeed. From the sayings of Jesus, especially in the Gospel of Saint John, anybody who studied the psychology of religion can easily detect that that experience must have taken place, or something very like it. But, you see, Jesus had a limitation, in that he did not know of any religion other than those of the immediate Near East. He may have known something about Egyptian religion, and perhaps a little bit about Greek religion, but mostly about Hebrew. There is no evidence whatsoever that he knew anything about India or China. And we, people who think that Jesus was God assume that he must have known because he would have been omniscient. No, Saint Paul makes it perfectly clear in the Epistle to the Philippians that Jesus renounced his divine powers so as to be Man.

So, let's suppose then that Jesus had such an experience. But, you see, Jesus has a limitation, that he doesn't know of any religion other than those of the immediate Near East. He might know something about Egyptian religion, and perhaps a little bit about Greek religion, but mostly about Hebrew. There is no evidence whatsoever that he knew anything about India or China. And people who think that Jesus was God assume that he must have known because he would have been omniscient. No, Saint Paul makes it perfectly clear in the Epistle to the Philippians that Jesus renounced his divine powers so as to be Man.

“Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought not equality with God a thing to be hung on to, but humbled himself and made himself of no reputation and was found in fashion as a man and became obedient to death.” Theologians call that kenosis, which means self-emptying. So obviously, an omnipotent and omniscient man would not really be a man.

So even if you take the very orthodox Catholic doctrine of the nature of Christ, that he was both true God and true man, you must say that, for true God to be united with true Man, true God has to make a voluntary renunciation, for the time being, of omniscience, and omnipotence and omnipresence, for that matter.

Now therefore, if Jesus were to come right out and say, ‘I am the son of God’, that's like saying ‘I'm the boss's son’. Or ‘I am the boss’. And everybody immediately says that is blasphemy. That is subversion. That is trying to introduce democracy into the Kingdom of Heaven! That is, you are a usurper of the throne. No man has seen God.

Now, Jesus in his exoteric teaching, as recorded in the synoptic gospels, was pretty cagy about this. He didn't come right out there and say ‘I and the Father are one’. Instead he identified himself with the messiah described in the second part of the prophet Isaiah, the suffering servant who was despised and rejected of man. And that this man is the non-political messiah, in other words, it was convenient to make that identification, even though it would get him into trouble. But to his elect disciples, as recorded in Saint John, he come right out and said: “Before Abraham was, I am. I am

the way, the truth, and the life. I am the resurrection and the life. I am the living bread that comes down from heaven. I and the Father are one, and he who has seen me has seen the Father.” And there can be no mistaking that language.

So the Jews found out what he said and they put him to death, or had him put to death, for blasphemy. This is no cause for any special antagonism to the Jews. We would do exactly the same thing, it's always done. It happened to one of the great Sufi mystics in Persia who had the same experience.

Now, what happened? The apostles did not quite get the point. They were awed by the miracles of Jesus, they worshiped him as people do worship gurus, and you know to what lengths that can go, if you've been around guru land. So the Christians said, “Okay, okay, Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God. But let it stop right there! Nobody else.” So what happened was that Jesus was pedestalized. He was put in a position that was safely upstairs, so that his troubles and experience of cosmic consciousness would not come and cause other people to be a nuisance. Those who had this experience, and expressed it during those times when the church had political power, were almost invariably persecuted. Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake. John Scotus Eriugena was excommunicated. Meister Eckehart's theses were condemned, and so on and so on. A few mystics got away with it, because they used cautious language.

But you see what happens. If you pedestalize Jesus, you strangle the Gospel at birth. And it has been the tradition in both, the Catholic Church and in Protestantism, to pass off what I would call an ‘emasculated gospel’. Gospel means “good news,” and I cannot for the life of me think what is the good news about the gospel as ordinarily handed down. Because, look here, here is the revelation of God in Christ, in Jesus, and we are supposed to follow his life and example without having the unique advantage of being the boss's son. Now the tradition, both Catholic and Protestant fundamentalists represents Jesus to us as a freak, born of a virgin, knowing he is the Son of God, having the power of miracles, knowing that basically it's impossible to kill him, because he is to rise again in the end. And we are asked to take up our cross and follow him, when we don't know that about ourselves at all.

So what happens is this: We are delivered therefore a gospel which is in fact an impossible religion. It is impossible to follow the way of Christ; many a Christian has admitted it. "I am a miserable sinner. I fall far short of the example of Christ." But do you realize, the more you say that, the better you are? Because what happened was, that Christianity institutionalized guilt as a virtue. [applause] You see, you can never come up to it, never, and therefore you will always be aware of your shortcomings. And so, the more shortcomings you feel, the more, in other words, you are aware of the vast abyss between Christ and yourself.

So, you go to confession, and if you have a nice, dear, understanding confessor, he will not get angry with you. He will say, "My child, you know you have sinned very grievously, but you must realize that the love of God and of our Lord is infinite, and that naturally you are forgiven. As a token of thanksgiving say three Hail Mary's." You may have committed a murder and robbed a bank and fornicated around and so on, the priest is perfectly patient and quiet. Well, you feel awful "I have done that, to the love of God I've wounded Jesus, grieved the Holy Spirit!" and so on. But you know in the back of your mind that you are going to do it all over again. You won't be able to help yourself. You will try, but there is always a greater and greater sense of guilt.

Now, the lady objected that I was putting out the straw man and knocking it down; this is the Christianity of most people. Now there is also a much more subtle Christianity of the theologians, the mystics, and the philosophers. But it is not what gets preached from the pulpit, grant you. But the message of Billy Graham is approximately what I'm giving you, and of all what I would call fundamentalist forms of Catholicism and Protestantism. What would the real gospel be? The real good news is not simply that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, but that he was a powerful Son of God who came to open everybody's eyes to the fact that you are too. This is perfectly plain if you go to the tenth chapter of Saint John, verse thirty, there is the passage where Jesus says, "I and the Father are one." There are some people around who are not intimate disciples around, and they are horrified. They immediately pick up stones to stone him. He says, "Many good works I have shown you from the Father, and for which of these do you stone me?" And they say, "For a good work we

stone you not, but for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God.” And he replied, “Isn’t it written in your law, ‘I have said you are Gods?’ – he is quoting the eighty-second Psalm – ‘Is it not written in your law I have said you are Gods?’ If God called those to whom He gave His word Gods – and you cannot deny the scriptures – how can you say I blaspheme because I said I am a son of God?”

There is the whole thing in a nutshell. Because if you read the King James Bible – that descended with the angel – you will see in italic in front of these words “Son of God,” “the Son of God,” “because I said I am the Son of God”. And most people think the italics are for emphasis, but they are not. The italics indicate words interpolated by the translators, you will not find that in the Greek. In the Greek [it] says “a son of God.” So it seems to me here perfectly plain that Jesus has got it in the back of his mind and that this is not something peculiar to himself. So when he says, “I am the way. No man comes to the Father but by me”, this “I am,” this “me,” is the divine in us, which in Hebrew would be called the Ruah Adonai. A great deal is made of this by the esoteric Jews, the Cabalists and the Hasidim. The ruah is the breath, which God breathed into the nostrils of Adam. It is different from the soul, the individual soul in Hebraism is called nefesh. So we translate the ruah into the Greek [penafma], and the nefesh in to psike or psyche, the spirit. And you ask the theologians what’s the difference between the soul and the spirit and he won’t be able to tell you. But it’s very clear in Saint Paul’s writings. So the point is that the ruah is the divine in the creature by virtue of which we are ‘sons of’ or ‘of the nature’ of God. Manifestations of the divine. This discovery is the gospel that is the good news.

But this has been perpetually repressed throughout the history of Western religion, because all Western religions have taken the form of celestial monarchies and therefore have discouraged democracy in the kingdom of heaven. Until, as a consequence of the teaching of the German and Flemish mystics in the fifteenth century, there began to be such movements as the Anabaptists, the Brothers of the Free Spirit, and the Levelers and the Quakers. A spiritual movement which came to this country and founded a republic and not a monarchy. And how could you say that a republic is the best form of government if you think that the universe is a monarchy?

Obviously if God is on top in a monarchy, monarchy is the best form of government. But you see, ever so many citizens of this republic think they ought to believe that the universe is a monarchy, and therefore they are always at odds with the republic. It is from principally white, racist Christians that we have the threat of fascism in this country, because, you see, they have a religion which is militant, which is not the religion of Jesus, which was the realization of divine sonship, but the religion about Jesus, which pedestalizes him, and which says that only this man, of all the sons of woman, was divine. And you had better recognize it. And so it speaks of itself as the church militant. The onward Christian soldiers marching, as to war. Utterly exclusive, convinced in advance of examining the doctrines of any other religion, that it is the top religion. So it becomes a freak religion, just as it has made a freak of Jesus, an unnatural man.

It claims uniqueness, not realizing that what it does teach would be far more credible if it were truly Catholic. That is to say, restated again, the truths that have been known from time immemorial, which have appeared in all the great cultures of the world. But even very liberal Protestants still want to say somehow, so I suppose to keep the mission effort going or to pay off the mortgage; “Yes, these other religions are very good. God has no doubt revealed Himself through Buddha and Lao-tzu, but ...”

Now, obviously, it is a matter of temperament, you can be loyal to Jesus, just as you are loyal to your own country, but you are not serving your country if you think that it’s necessarily the best of all possible countries. That is doing a disservice to your country; it is refusing to be critical where criticism is proper. So of religion. Every religion should be self-critical. Otherwise it soon degenerates into a self-righteous hypocrisy. If then we can see this, that Jesus speaks not from the situation of a historical *deus ex machina*, a kind of weird, extraordinary event, but he is a voice which joins with other voices that have said in every place and time: “Wake up man! Wake up and realize who you are.”

I do not think, you see, until church is get with that, that they’re going to have very much relevance. Popular Protestantism and popular Catholicism will tell you nothing about mystical religion. The message of the preacher, fifty-two Sundays a year, is “Dear people, be good.” We have heard it ad

nauseam. Or believe in this, he may occasionally give a sermon on what happens after death, or on the nature of God, but basically the sermon is “Be good.” But how? As Saint Paul said: “To will is present with me, but how to do that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would do, I do not, and the evil that I would not do, that I do.” How’re we going to be changed? Obviously, there cannot be a vitality of religion without vital religious experience. And that something much more than emoting over singing “Onward Christian Soldiers.”

But you see, what happens in our ecclesiastical goings-on is that we run a talking shop. We pray, we tell God what to do or give Him advice, as if He didn’t know. We read the Scriptures. And remember talking it the Bible, Jesus said, “You search the Scriptures daily, for in them you think you have life.” Saint Paul made some rather funny references about “the spirit which giveth life and the letter which kills.” I think the Bible ought to be ceremoniously and reverently burned every Easter. We need it no more because the spirit is with us. It’s a dangerous book, and to worship it is of course, a far more dangerous idolatry than bowing down to images of wood and stone. Because nobody in his senses can reasonably confuse a wooden image with God, but you can very easily confuse a set of ideas with God, because concepts are more rarefied and abstract.

So in this endless talking in church we can preach, but by and large preaching does nothing but excite a sense of anxiety and guilt. You can’t love out of that. No scolding or rational demonstration of the right way to behave is going to inspire people with love. Something else must happen. Well but you say, “Well, what are we going to do about it?” Do about it? Have you no faith? Then be quiet. Even Quakers are not quiet. They sit in meeting and think, at least some of them do. But supposing we are really quiet, we do not think, be are absolutely silent through and through. We say, “You will just fall into a blank space.” Oh? Ever tried?

I feel then, that it is enormously important that churches stop being talking shops. They must become centers of contemplation. What is contemplation? Con-templum; it’s what you do in the temple. You don’t come to the temple to chatter but to be still and know that “I am God.” This is why, if the Christian religion, if the gospel of Christ is to mean anything at all – instead

of just being one of the forgotten religions, along with Osiris and Mithra, we must see Christ as the great mystic, in the proper sense of the word mystic. Not someone who has all sorts of magical powers and understands spirits and so on. A mystic, strictly speaking, is one who realizes union with God, by whatever name. This seems to me the crux and message of the gospel. Summed up in the prayer of Jesus which Saint John records as he speaks over his disciples, praying that they may you be one, even as the Father and I are one, that you may be all one. May we all realize this divine sonship, or oneness, basic identity with the eternal energy of the universe, and the love that moves the sun and other stars.

Spiritual Authority

I may take the liberty of beginning by saying something about myself and my role in talking to you about philosophical matters, because I wanted to be understood perfectly clearly that I'm not a guru. In other words, I talk about what we call these things and that comprises a multitude of interests concerning oriental philosophy, psychotherapy, religion, mysticism, et cetera. I talk about these things because I'm interested in them and because I enjoy talking about them. And every sensible person makes his living by doing what he enjoys doing, and that explains me.

Now in saying, therefore, that I am not a guru, that means also that I'm not trying to help you or improve you. I accept you as you are. I am not out there to save the world. Of course, when a stream, a bubbling spring flows out from the mountains it's doing it's thing. And if a thirsty traveler helps himself, well that's fine. When a bird sings, it doesn't sing for the advancement of music. But if somebody stops to listen and is delighted, that's fine.

And so I talk in the same spirit. I don't have a group of followers. I'm not trying to make disciples, because I work on the principle of a physician rather than a clergyman. A physician is always trying to get rid of his patients and send them away healthy to stand on their own feet, whereas a clergyman is trying to get them as members of a religious organization so that they will continue to pay their pledges, pay off the mortgage on an expensive building, and generally belong to the church, boost its

membership, and thereby prove by sheer weight of numbers the veracity of its tenants. And my objective is really to get rid of you so that you won't need me or any other teacher. I'm afraid some of my colleagues would not approve of that attitude, because it is widely believed and said that in order to advance in the spiritual life, whatever that is, it is essential that you have a guru, and that you accord to that guru perfect obedience.

And so I'm often asked the question, is it really necessary to have a guru? I can answer that only by saying, yes, it is necessary if you think so. In the same spirit as it is said that anybody who goes to a psychiatrist ought to have his head examined. Of course, there is more in that saying than meets the ear, because if you really are sincerely concerned with yourself and are in such confusion that you feel you have to go to a psychiatrist to talk over your state, then of course you need to go. Likewise, if you are in need of someone to tell you what to do to practice meditation or to attain a state of liberation, nirvana, moksha, or whatever it may be called, and you feel that necessity very strongly, then you must have it, because as the poet William Blake said, "The fool who persists in his folly will become wise."

However, I do want to point this out. What is the source of a guru's authority? He can tell you that he can speak from experience. That he has experienced states of consciousness which have made him profoundly blissful or understanding or compassionate or whatever it may be. And you have his word for it. You have the word of other people who likewise agree with him. But each one of them and you in turn, agree with him out of your own opinion and by your own judgment. And so it is you that are the source of the teacher's authority. And that is true whether he speaks as an individual or whether he speaks as the representative of a tradition or a church. You may say that you take the Bible as your authority or the Roman Catholic Church. And the Roman Catholic following very often says that the individual mystical experience is not to be trusted because of its liability to be interpreted in a whimsical and purely personal way, and that it has to be guarded against excess by the substantial and objective traditions of the church. But those traditions are held to be substantial and objective, only because those who follow believe it to be so. They say so. And if you follow it, you say so.

So the question comes back to you. Why do you believe, why do you form this opinion? Upon what basis does all this rest? Well of course, almost everybody is looking for help, and thus when I was younger, so much younger than today, I never needed anybody's help in any way. But there is this feeling of a certain helplessness of being alone and somewhat confused in an unpredictable wayward external world of happenings. And this world of happenings includes an enormous amount of suffering, tragedy, and we wonder why we're here, how we got here, and in short, what to do about the capital "P" Problem of capital "L" Life, to which should be added death. Because it seems to be certain that we are all going to die and that death may be a painful process. That those we love are going to die and so what about it? Is there anyway in which we can become masters of the situation?

Well there are all sorts of ways of trying to escape from the human predicament of being a lonely, isolated consciousness in the midst of this enormous and wayward not-self. We can of course, try to beat the game on a material basis by becoming very wealthy or very powerful. We may resort to all kinds of technology to get rid of our sufferings, hunger, pain, sickness, and so forth. But it will be noticed that as we succeed in these enterprises, we're not satisfied. In other words, if you feel at this moment that an increase in income would solve your problems, and you got an increase in income, this would give you a pleasant feeling for a few weeks.

But then, as you well know if that's ever happened to you, the feeling wears off and you may stop worrying about paying your debts and start worrying about whether you will get sick. There is always something to worry about. And if you are very rich indeed, you've still got the anxiety about sickness and death and also anxieties about revolution and about whether the Internal Revenue Service will take it all away from you or catch you for cheating on your taxes, or put you in prison for no good reason. Now there is always this worry. And so you realize that the problem of life does not really consist in your external circumstances, because you worry whatever they are. The problem consists rather in what you call your mind.

Could you by some method control your mind so that you won't worry, and how on Earth would you do that? Well, there are those people who tell you that the best answer is to think positive thoughts, to be peaceful, to breathe

slowly, and hum gently, and get yourself into a peaceful state of mind by repeating affirmations such as all is light, all is God, all is good, or whatever it may be. But unfortunately, it doesn't always work because you have a nagging suspicion in the back of your mind that you're simply hypnotizing yourself and whistling in the dark. What the Germans call a "hintergedachte", which is the thought concealed way, way back behind your intellect, but has annoying persistence. What if?

And so you realize that this matter of controlling the mind is no superficial undertaking, because although you may be able to smooth the ruffles of your consciousness, there is beneath that a vast area of unconsciousness which erupts as unpredictably as events in the external world. And so you consider seriously the possibilities of psychoanalysis, to go down and get into those depths and see if oil can be put on those troubled waters. And then of course, you get into the guru business. You have to go to someone against who's mirror you can reflect those aspects of yourself of which you are not directly aware.

So as the process goes on, you find there is something awkward about all this, and this awkwardness can be expressed in many different ways. One of them is this. How on Earth are you to get at yourself to do something about yourself? Because it's a project not unlike trying to pierce the point of the pen with the point of the same pen. In other words, if you feel that you could do with some sort of psychological or spiritual improvement, obviously you are the character who's going to have to bring this about. But if you are the one who needs to be improved, how are you going to accomplish the improvement? You're in the predicament of trying to lift yourself up off the floor by pulling at your own boot straps, and as you all know, that cannot be done. And if you attempt to do so, you are likely to land with a bang on your fanny and be lower down than you were in the first place.

So that problem continually arises and it has arisen historically in all the great religious traditions. We find it in Christianity, in the debate between St. Augustine and Pelagius. And Pelagius said that if God had given us a commandment to love him and to love our neighbors, he would not have done so unless we could obey it. St. Augustine countered and said, "Yes,

but the commandment was not given in order for it to be obeyed, God never expected that it would be obeyed, because we were incapable of loving anyone but ourselves. The commandment was therefore given to convince us of our sinfulness from which we could be rescued only by divine grace, that is to say by the infusion of our souls with a power beyond them.” And that was more or less the doctrine of which the judge settled.

The puzzle has always been therefore, how to get grace, because grace is apparently freely offered to all, but some people seem to get it and some don't. With some the medicine takes, and with others it doesn't. Why? Well, apparently you have the power to resist grace, but if you do, you also have the power not to resist it. We would like therefore to know how not to resist it and to be open. And there you see we are back at exactly the same problem with which we began. It's like saying you must relax damn you. Let go. Give in. And I know I ought give in. I know I ought to let go and abandoned my will to the divine will, but his son Paul put it so well, “The will is present with me. But how to do that which is good, I find hard, for the good that I would I do not and the evil that I would not, that I do.”

In other words, we all come down to a basis in ourselves which we will call, so first of all since we are in a Jewish Temple, the Yetzer HaRah, or the wayward spirit which God is supposed to have put into the soul of Adam or in my translation, our element of the irreducible rascality, where we're all basically scamps. And if you haven't found that, you're very unconscious. I know all sorts of people who are full of outward love, but of course, it always turns out that they need money. And when it comes to money, virtue flies out of the window. So we do have the element in ourselves. We know it very well. And the question is therefore once again, how can it be transformed.

But if the transformer is the one who's inflicted, who transforms the transformer, it's the old problem of who guards the guards, who polices the policeman, who governs the governor? And it seems perfectly insoluble for the reason alone that it is a vicious circle.

There's a great deal of talk about two-selves. We love ourselves (called ego), the higher self called the spirit or the atman, and the duty of the atman seems to be to transform the wretched little ego. Well sometimes it does,

but a lot of times it doesn't. So we ask why doesn't so and so's atman succeed in getting through? Is his ego too strong? If so, who will weaken it? Is his atman too weak? And if so, why for surely aren't all atmans the same? The puzzle remains.

So let's take a look at what we're trying to accomplish. We're trying to get better. We are out after that type of experience which we will call the positive, the good, the light, the living, and to get away from the negative, the evil, the dark, and the dead. Unfortunately, however, human experience, human consciousness knows by contrast— we are equipped with a nervous system where the neurons either fire or don't fire. All that we are aware of, is made up of an extremely complicated arrangement of yes and no. And by a recording on magnetic tape it impulses there are areas where there is a pulse and there are areas where there's not a pulse. And by so doing, we can tape almost any form of human experience.

In other words, we can put colored television on the tape so that it is all reduced to a matter of yes and no. And you will understand of course, that that is the philosophy of the Chinese book of changes, the I-Ching, which represents all the situations of life in terms of combinations of the yang, or positive principle, and the yin, or the negative principle. Interestingly enough, a Latin translation of the I-Ching was read by the philosopher Leibniz and from this he invented binary arithmetic wherein all numbers can be represented by zero and one. And that is the number system used by the digital computers, which lies behind all our electronic ingenuity. This great extension of the number system which is based on the same principle.

But you see what we are trying to do. We are trying to have yang without yin. We are trying to arrange a life game in which there is winning without losing. Now how can you arrange such a state of affairs? A game in which everybody wins would end up as W.S. Gilbert put it, "When everybody's somebody, then no one's anybody." If we are all equally happy, it is impossible to know that we are happy because a certain flatness comes over everything. If we lifted up all valleys and lowered all mountains, we should have the sort of thing they're attempting to do with bulldozers in the Hollywood Hills to the destruction of the ecology, in ghastly fulfillment of

the Biblical prophecy that every – every valley should be exalted and every mountain laid low and the rough places made plain.

And I'm sorry to say it was Isaiah whom was tempted – was dedicated – who made that remark. But the same Isaiah also said something that at least Christians do not often quote, which is this following sentence, "I am the Lord and there is none others. I form the light and create the darkness. I make peace and I create evil. I the Lord, do all these things." In spite of which everybody is busy trying to be good, not realizing that we would not recognize saints unless there were sinners, or saviors unless there were fools.

And there is no way out of that dilemma. That is why Buddhism represents existence in terms of a wheel called the Bhavacakra, the wheel of becoming, of birth and death. And on the top of that wheel, there are deva people whom we would call angels. And at the bottom of the wheel, there are Naraka or tormented people in purgatory. And you go round and round, now this way, now that way. It's really like a squirrel cage where you're running and running and running to get to the top and yet you have to run faster and faster to stay where you are. And that's why there is always the sense of the more you succeed in any scale of either worldly or spiritual progress, the more you have the haunting feeling that you're still in the same place.

So you think now, there must be some way out of that. Perhaps there's something ambitious and proud and wrong in aspiring to be enlightened or compassionate. Perhaps there's a great dose of spiritual pride in that I, by my efforts, could make myself into a Buddha or a saint. And therefore, perhaps the thing to do is to try to eliminate all desire, not only the desire for worldly success, but likewise the desire for spiritual success. For the Buddha proposed that desire was the root of suffering and therefore suggested to his arhats that if they eliminated desire or clinging, they might cease from suffering. But you must realize that the so-called teachings of the Buddha are not doctrines in the sense that the Jews and Christians and the Muslims have doctrines. They are proposals. They are the opening steps in a dialogue and if you go away and try not to desire in any way, you will very quickly discover that you are desiring not to desire.

And so we very rapidly come to a situation where you discover that with regard to your own transformation, everything you try to do about it doesn't work. It may have some sort of temporary success to make you feel better, but again and again we come back to the same old gnawing problem and that is why people interested in spiritual things tend to move from one sect to another, from one teacher to another, always hoping that they will meet one who has the answer. Of course, then there are many teachers who say, indeed, there is nothing you can do and therefore you have to practice non-doing as the Taoist call it wu wei, non-striving.

But then you find in turn that it's extraordinarily difficult not to strive. It's like trying not to think of a green elephant and immediately you think of it. And so you come to the dismal conclusion that you can neither achieve what you want to achieve, that is to say liberation from the alternation of the opposites by striving, nor can you achieve it by not striving. And thereby you have learned that you cannot concentrate on purpose. It's like trying to be unselfconscious on purpose or to be genuine on purpose or to love on purpose, when you say I ought to love, well that puts you in a double bind. And we say to the person, well he's trained himself to be deliberately unselfconscious or he has very disciplined spontaneity. What we were looking for was somebody whose spontaneity was genuine, so that the scaffolding didn't show. And we believe that there are such people like children, but they don't know how interesting they are. And when they find out, they become brats.

Imagine for a moment that it was your privilege to have a brief interview with God, in the course of which you were allowed to ask one question. What would you ask? Now you would have to think this over very carefully, because this golden opportunity would come to you only once and you would have to be most careful that you didn't ask a silly question.

Well you might try God out with a Zen Buddhist koan. Such as, beyond the positive in the negative but what is reality? And the law to talk to and say, "My dear child your question has no meaning." And you wouldn't have the opportunity to think up a meaningful one and come back. So perhaps you should've asked, "What question should I ask?" And the Lord would say to

you, “Why do you want to question?” See, it seems you do want one, don’t you? Because you feel that something is wrong if you don’t have a problem. When you’ve got one, that is, the insoluble problem of trying to win without losing it.

Now as long as you can keep that problem, you’ll be busy. Until you see that it can be solved. But there are all sorts of ways of presenting that problem in such a way that you cannot see that it’s meaningless. And the better gurus are very clever at bringing these ways out. You may see for example if you are invited to practice intense concentration, that after awhile you find yourself thinking about concentrating and therefore that your concentration is somewhat divided. Or he may ask you What is your motivation for this activity? And you find out that it’s your element of irreducible rascality. So however, the teacher once he is seeing we’ve mastered that lesson had something still more in jeans. He says now you’ve actually made progress. Because finding out that you could not really concentrate. Lets value on because it began to prick at the illusion of your ego.

But you’ve only got your foot in at the door. Beyond this, are many many higher things to be learned and you must redouble your efforts. And so of course you apply yourself all the more again and again on all sorts of tricks that these old gentlemen can come out with, and you will keep at it just as long as he can make you fall for it, that in the end, you see that it was all tricks. That as the great Zen master Rinzai says “Well after all ,there was nothing much in Obaku’s Buddhism.” And he went on to explain to his students that they art of Zen, or teaching Zen, is like deceiving a child with an empty fist. You know how you can intrigue a child by pretending you’ve got something very precious in your fist. And you can play a game for an hour, provoking a child to ever great enthusiasm to find out what you got. And in the end the revelation is that there was nothing there.

So many people say in the course of there Zen training, I realized there was nothing to realize. It was all there from the beginning. Because you see standing up as to the realisation that you can’t do anything about it. Equivalently that you can do nothing about it. Comes to costly awakening that the reason for that is there is no you separate from you. In other words,

when you try to control your thoughts, or control your feelings there is no difference between the thoughts and the controller. Because what you call the thinker is simply your thought of yourself, the thinker is a sort of monks was and the feeler is a feeling among feelings. And trying to control thoughts the thoughts just like trying to bite your own teeth. So you've found that out. Well then the other side of the picture is of course, that if you do find that out, you discover that the project of controlling yourself was unnecessary. Because you were, yourself, a Buddha from the very beginning. That's what the Upanishads mean when they say quite simply tat tvam asi. You're it. You, as you are. Now how can you conceive that? Supposing you let your imagination go and really think through what you would like to happen. Imagine the most gorgeous state of bliss that you can conceive. Where there are no worries, no anxiety, no haunting future with unpleasant consequences. You're in control of the whole works. And you're sitting on your lotus, perfectly content. And I ask you seriously, "Is that really what you want?" You're quite sure that's what you want. Imagine now, let's get this situation straight. You've got everything you want, you're in the highest possible spiritual state that you can conceive. And yet, I haven't really surrendered myself. Because I know it all. Something I don't know. So please the surprise you know what would happen. You would find yourself sitting here, in this building tonight, feeling exactly the way you feel. There's your answer. Because after all, don't you have it all? You have the feeling of yourself. But the feeling of yourself depends on there being, at the same time, a contrast, the feeling of other. The self has a certain sensation of being in control of life to some extent. Through voluntary action, the Will seems to have a certain freedom, and yet on the other hand there are limits to that and it seems in the end life sweeps us away, and we are overwhelmed by the involuntary. And yet the voluntary keeps popping up new voluntaries come into the world with every baby.

So you see, you couldn't have the experience you call being a voluntarily acting self without the contrast of the involuntary happening. Now do you want to be without the involuntary happening? You want to get rid of that? Alright, if you get rid of it, you won't have the experience of the voluntary self. Or would you like to turn it the other way around? Would you like to have the experience of no voluntary self, and on the other hand everything just happen?

But then you say well I'm not sure about that. Because then I would feel at first that I was floating, that I had no further responsibilities, that I was walking on air. And we do get that feeling sometimes. If you take the ideas of determinism and fatalism to their final conclusion, you do have that sense of freedom from more responsibility, freedom from worry and care. And you float along for a while whereas off. You don't somehow seem to be able to follow that philosophy consistently. Especially if you have children. And somehow society begins to push on you to be responsible, as it pushes on children to be responsible.

And so this nagging duality keeps coming back, that I cannot realize this nice irresponsible condition of involuntary behavior unless I have the contrast to the possibility of the voluntary, and vice versa. And what does that mean? Obviously it means these two aspects, or sides of our experience, which we can call the voluntary and involuntary the knower and the known, the subject and the object, the self and the other, although appearing to be two, are indeed one. Because you can have one without the. And when that state of affairs arises you know at once that this is a conspiracy. That two things which lose different is different can be, are for that very reason the same.

Now, you can detect even under those actions of yours which we call voluntary, the voluntary movement of the muscles or of the mind, that there are processes which are not voluntary. You do not will your blood to circulate, you do not control by intention the synapses in your nervous system, and yet you would be incapable of any voluntary action unless those involuntary processes were going on. So you see these two things go together. And you begin to realize something which is rather difficult to describe, that what you call your experience is a do- happening. We don't have good words for this. We have some words which have a sort of sense like the word cleave, which means to stick together or to hold together and also to split. And the words sacer, in Latin, means holy or accursed.

And so I would like to propose we all should find some word for a do-happening, because it's all a do-happening. That's what the Buddhists mean when they talk about karma. The word karma means action. And when something happens to you, be it good or bad, they say it is your karma. That

means quite simply it is your doing. But you say I didn't mean to do that. No. One school of thought will explain it by saying, but you see you did something in a former life or a former time which now has this consequence, but that's a very superficial understanding of God. You don't need to believe in reincarnation to believe you understand karma.

Karma is simply, that you don't let your left hand know what your right hand is doing. That is one where you are doing what you call the environment. And with the other aspect you are doing what you call the organism, the me, this living body, but as you cannot conceive possibly the existence of a living body with no environment, that is the clue that the two are basically one. Likely to poles of a magnet, north is quite different from South and yet it's all one match so it precisely the same way. You are both what you do and what happens to you. So that you have a little game in which you play that what happens to you that you're not responsible for. That's not you doing your own or responsible for this side of it. And then you can compete with the other side. What it's like is this. Get two knitting pins, one in each hand, and have a fencing match with yourself. And really sincerely try to stick the other hand but that other hand is really sincerely trying to stick the first one and also to defend itself. It's like playing chess with yourself, you see. Now it won't work. You'll come to a sort-of standstill, unless you decide for your right hand that's the one through to going to win. But then you've broken the rule of the game see. But that's what we do. That's what is called by both the Hindus and the Buddhists avidya, ignorance, which really better means ignore-ance.

So what it comes down to, you see is basically this. Just in the same way that the authority of the guru is your authority, you did it. So in the place where you live life. It's where you've put yourself. And just as on the surface of the sphere, every point may be regarded as the center of the surface, so every place may be regarded as the true place. And everyone's in his true place. Everybody, in other words, put it in what language you will, is a manifestation of the divine. Playing this game, that game, the other game. And your not knowing it, if you don't know it, is part of the game. It makes it all the more fun. Get lost, you say to yourself. And lost you get, like children love to play hide and seek. To get lost. Like we all like to go to a play, or see a horror movie. And have the cold shivers, because we think

something awful is going to happen, something is going to be seen on the screen which we can't stand to see. Woo, won't that be a thrill if that happens.. We all expose ourselves to that this is children and young people are always exposing themselves to dreadful things. And the parents get absolutely, they get the heebie-geebs. If it isn't getting drunk, or driving hot rods, they take drugs. And that may ruin their sanity for life. How hard can it be? If they don't take drugs, they will do something else always to see how close to the point of danger you can get. And those people who go in for the racing cars usually end up in a crash. And their life is all the sweeter, for being played dangerously.

So I would say to those among you who are the most dead-heads, in the sense of unspiritual and square, if there's any here, real stuffy people: congratulations. You see, you're playing a very far-out game. You see you're so lost you don't even know where you started, and that's taking a most gorgeous risk. Why, because of you, we might even blow up the planet. How close are we going to get to that one?

Well, just in the same way as that car racer watching is the needle going up, up, up, up, there are these people more and more and more righteous, determined that good will prevail watching that needle go up it's getting hotter and hotter and hotter and finally they go out in a blaze of glory. And then when the dust settles, they say, "that was a close squeak." I mean, that was quite a dream we've woken up from. Where will we go next? Because that's the point, it's simple. That's why I would say that my function is liberative, I want you to see that it's you. It's not me, it's not Swami so-and-so, it's not Buddha so-and-so, it's not Saint so-and-so, it's you. You're doing it.

As Sir Edwin Arnold put the words into the mouth of the Buddha, "Ye suffer from yourselves. None else compels. None other holds you that ye live and die. And whirl upon the wheel, and hug and kiss its spokes of agony, its tire of tears, its nave of nothingness." And when one of the old Zen masters went to his teacher and said "What is the way to liberation?" The teacher said "Who is restraining you?" He said "no one." If so, why should you ask for liberation? See it all bounces back to you. What do you want? Do you know? Can you think it through? Say exactly what you want.

And invariably, you'll get back to the place where you are. Because what you say you want is always the symptom, the expression of what you are now.

If that is the case, that it's all because you are doing. Why meditate? Why do anything of a so-called spiritual nature? People don't understand really what meditation is. They take it up, like they take up psychotherapy or a course in weight reduction. In order to be better. But if you do that. You are not practicing what is called jnana or yoga or Zen. That's not it at all. Meditation is the one human activity which has no purpose. Buddhas, or those who are supposed to have attained anything, are invariably shown in some sort of meditation posture, why should they meditate any more? Because that just happens to be the way that a Buddha sits when he sits. When he sits, he sits. When he walks, he walks. He's not going anywhere, he's just going for a walk. Because he digs it. See to dig, the very word is not merely to appreciate but to penetrate. To go to the heart of the matter and to penetrate the moment, to get right to the root of the moment is nowhere else than the center of you where you are, it's where you start this whole thing.

So to get with yourself is to get at the moment where you begin all this question where does the question come from? Where does the desire spring from? Well that's you, and that you is the point from which the whole universe is created, flowing back into the past like the wake of a ship. Wake doesn't drive the ship, the ship that makes the wake. So here you are, producing it. And meditation is just sitting here and watching it happen. And it's not done because it's good for you, it's done for fun. I might even say meditation is a fun thing. And if it isn't you're meditating. There's an awful game the meditators play which is competitive suffering. They go to some place where they sit for hours on end until their legs ache and practically fall off. And then come back and brag about how they sat through all those hours of leg-aching. Now it's very difficult to put down people who are suffering. Because after all, one has a natural sympathy for pain. But I sometimes want to say "For goodness sake, don't throw your suffering at me, in that way and in that spirit. Don't brag about it. Don't one-up me by saying, 'Well I've suffered more than you'." People do things like that, they say, "Well I'm more aware of my shortcomings than you. I'm

more tolerant than you are. I recognize more than you do what a rascal I am.” Every kind of way one upping somebody else in order to play the game in which I always win. So, once we get into that kind of thing with the meditation scene, we get into hierarchies and ranks and degrees, and who has attained number seven, who has attained number nine, and an expert guru will put a stage higher than anyone’s thought of, so as to see how far your ambition will run, and this goes on endlessly, endlessly, endlessly, until you suddenly wake up.

That you do really meditate all the time by virtue of existing all the time. Only, you miss that eternal now, by always looking for something next minute, expecting a result. Now you can say, let me not expect a result. Because one does anyhow. So you may as well just as well sit and enjoy it.

Image of Man

I want to start by giving what may be to many of you, a new definition of the word myth. As normally used the word myth means an idle tale, a fable, a falsehood, or an idea that is out of date, something untrue. But there is another older and stricter use of the word myth, whereby it doesn’t mean something untrue, but it means an image in terms of which people make sense of life and of the world. Supposing for example, you do not understand the technicalities of electricity, and somebody wants to explain it to you, he wants to explain about the flow of currents. Well, to do that, he compares electricity to water, and because you understand water, you may get some idea about the behavior of electricity. Or if an astronomer wants to explain to you what he means by expanding space, will use the metaphor of a balloon, a black balloon with white spots on it. The white spots represent the galaxies, and if you blow up the balloon, they all get farther away from each other at the same speed as the balloon blows up. In neither case we are not saying that electricity is water, or that the universe is the balloon with white spots on it, we are saying it’s something like it. And so in the same way, the human being has always used images to represent his deepest ideas of how the universe works, and what man’s place in it is. And tonight I am going to discuss certain aspects of two of the greatest myths, in this sense of the word, that have influenced mankind’s thinking. First of all the myth of the universe as an artifact, as something made as a carpenter makes tables,

chairs and houses, or as a potter makes pots, or a sculptor makes figurines. And on the other hand the image of the world as a drama, in which all the things in the world are not made, but acted, in the same way as a player acts parts. For these are the two great images that govern respectively the religions of the West descending from Hebraism, that is to say, Hebraism itself, Christianity, and Islam, and on the other hand the myth which governs those religions which have had their origin in India, most particularly Hinduism itself, and to a lesser extent, Buddhism.

And I want to make it perfectly plain, before I go any further, that in talking about these two great religious traditions in terms of images, I am talking about the way they express themselves at a rather popular level. Sophisticated Christians and sophisticated Hindus think beyond images. For example, a Christian may think of God as the father, but a sophisticated and educated Christian does not imagine that God is a cosmic male parent with a white beard sitting on a golden throne above the stars. Nor does a Hindu imagine literally that God is the super showman, the big actor. These images are what it is like, not what it is, and perhaps when I get through with discussing them we will be able to ask the question as to whether any of these images still make sense to us in this twentieth century, when we have a view of the world so powerfully shaped by Western science.

Now let me begin then with a few things about the image of the world, and thus the image of man, as it comes to us from the Hebrew Bible. It says in the Book of Genesis that the Lord God created man out of the dust of the earth, as if He had made of Adam a clay figure. Then he blew the breath of life into its nostrils and the figurine became alive. And it said that the figurine was made in the image of God. For God who is conceived in this particular image as a personal, as a living, intelligent spirit creates in man something like that. But you must know very definitely that this is the creation, as the potter makes a pot out of clay. For the creature that the Lord God has made is not God. The creature is something less than God, something like God but not God.

And you will see some very interesting consequences follow from this idea of the world as an artifact. What follows from it is that the whole universe is seen as a marvelous technical accomplishment. If it is made, there must

be an explanation of how it is made, and the whole history of Western thought has in many ways been an attempt to discover how the creator did it. What were the principles; what were the laws laid down; what, another words, was the blueprint that underlies this creation? This image has therefore persisted throughout Western history, and continues on into a time when very many people do not believe in Christianity, or Judaism, or Islam. They are, you might say, agnostics or atheists, but they still carry on something of the idea of the world as an artifact. If you are a Christian or a Jew, you believe that the world is the artifact of creation of the intelligent spirit called God. But if in this culture you are an atheist or an agnostic, you believe that the world is an automatic machine without a creator, something that made itself.

We might say then that our original model of the universe was the ceramic model. The Bible is full of references to God as the potter who makes the world out of obedient clay. But when Western thinkers in the eighteenth century began to drop the idea of a personal God, they kept the idea of the artifact. So we could say that after the ceramic model of the universe, we got the fully automatic model.

And still you see, underlying our way of thinking about things is the question, 'How are they put together?' And if you want to find out, one of the obvious ways to proceed is to take them to pieces. Everybody knows that if you want to find out how something is made, you unscrew the parts and see what the secret is inside the box. So Western science in its beginnings took everything apart. It took animals apart; it took flowers apart; it took rocks apart.

And then when they got it reduced to its tiniest pieces, they tried to find methods for taking those apart, too, so that we could eventually discover what the very smallest small things were, and so know what building blocks the creator, or the fully automatic model, used in order to put it all together hoping that that would lead us to an understanding of how life works. Man himself in all this was looked upon as a creation, something made. Only there were some difficulties about this, because if you believe in the world in accordance with the idea of the fully automatic model, you really have got to admit that man, too, is fully automatic, another words, he is a

machine rather than a person. Man is something, in other words, doffs his hat and says, “How do you do? I am a person. I am alive. I am sensible. I talk, I have feelings.” But you wonder, “Do you really, or are you just an automaton? Am I real, or am I just an automaton?”

The general result of the Western image of man hasn't been quite that. What it is come down to, under the dispensation of the fully automatic model, is this: we are living beings, we're very sensitive, and inside the human skin, by an extraordinary fluke of nature, there has arisen something called reason. There have also arisen “values,” such as love. But these was a fluke because it happened inside a fully automatic universe which is stupid, because it is merely automatic. You won't, another words, find anything really intelligent outside human skins. And therefore if that is so, the only thing that people can do if they want to maintain reason and love in this universe is to fight nature, and beat the stupid, external world into submission to the human will. So the war against nature is the great project thus far of Western technology, because you see, each one of us has inherited from thousands of years of history a view of man as something made and almost a sort of breath breathed into a pot of clay, or an image of clay. Each one feels himself to be a globule of consciousness or mind living inside a vehicle called “my body.” Since the world outside that body is stupid, we feel estranged from the world.

When we find out how enormous the universe is, that makes us, as individuals, feel extremely unimportant and rather lonely, because you see, we consider ourselves, our basic image of ourselves is of a soul or an ego or a mind, or by itself in its little house, looking out at a world that is strange, and that is not me. I am therefore a brief interval of consciousness between the darkness and the darkness. That is not too happy. I would like to be able to believe that there is more than that. “If I could – so many of us say – if I could only still believe that there is an intelligent and eternal God in whose eyes I am important, and who has the power to enable me to live forever, that would be very nice.” But for many people that is an extraordinarily difficult thing to believe.

Now I want to contrast this image of the world with another, what I call the dramatic image, as distinct from the image of the potter or the ceramic

image. And this will be the presiding image of Hinduism. Their idea is this: that God did not make the world like a technologist, but he acted it. That is to say, every person and every thing for that matter, every tree, every flower, every animal, every star, every rock, every grain of dust is a role or part that the Godhead is playing. You must understand of course, the Hindu image of God is a little bit different from the Jewish, the Christian, and the Islamic. When I was a little boy, I used to ask my mother interminable questions. And when she got sick of it, she said, "My dear, there are some things in life that we are just not meant to know." And I said, "Will we ever know?" She said, "Yes, if you die and then go to heaven, God will explain it all."

And so I used to hope that on wet afternoons in heaven we would all be able to sit around the throne of grace and say to the Lord, "Why did you do this?" and "Why did you do that?" And He would explain.

Every child in the West asks his mother, "How was I made?" And nobody knows, but they know that somebody perhaps does and that would be God, and He will be able to explain. Likewise, if anybody gets mentally deranged and claims to be God, we always humor such people by asking them technical questions, "How did you make the world in six days?" or, "If you are God, why couldn't you change this plate into a rabbit?" That is because, in our popular image of God, God is the supreme technocrat. He knows all the answers. He understands everything in detail and could tell you all about it.

But the Hindus don't think of God that way. If you ask the Hindu God, "How did you create the human body?" He would say, "Look, I know how I did it, but it can't be explained in words because words are too clumsy. In words I have to talk about things slowly. I have to string them out, because words run in a line, and lines add up to books, and books add up to libraries. And if I explain to you how I made the human organism, it will take all eternity for me to tell you. Unfortunately to me I don't have to understand things in words in order to make them happen. Nor do you." You don't have to understand in words how you breathe. You just breathe. You don't have to understand in words how to grow your hair, how to shape your bones, how to make your eyes blue or brown, you just do it. And somebody who

does understand to some extent, maybe physiologist, he can't do it any better than you.

So that you see is the Hindu idea of divine omnipotence, and that is why their images of the gods very often have many arms. You will often see the god Shiva with ten arms, or the Buddhist Avalokiteshvara with one thousand arms. And that is because their image of the divine is of a sort of centipede. A centipede can move a hundred legs without having to think about it, so Shiva can move ten arms very dexterously without having to think about them. And you know what happened to the centipede when it stopped to think how to move a hundred legs; it got all balled up. So in this way the Hindus do not think of God as being a technician in the sense of having a verbal or mathematical understanding of how the world is created. It is just done simple way, just like that. Only if we had to describe this simple way in words it would be very complicated, but God, in their idea, does not need to do so.

But the remarkable difference is that the Hindu does not see any fundamental division between God and the world. The world is God at play; the world is God acting. Now, how could you possibly arrive at such an idea? Very simply. When he tries to think why there is a world at all, because if you think about it is extraordinarily odd that there is anything. It would have been much simpler and would have required a great deal less energy for they're to have been nothing. But here it is. And why? Well, what would you do if you were God? Or let me put it in the simple way. Suppose that every night you could dream any dream you wanted to dream. What would you do? Well, first of all I am quite sure that most of us would dream of all the marvelous things we wanted to have happen. We would fulfill all our wishes. We might go on that way for months, besides we could make it extraordinarily rich by wishing to dream seventy-five years in one night, full of glorious happenings.

But after you had done that for a few months, you might begin to get a little tired of it and you would say, "What about an adventure tonight, in which something terribly exciting and rather dangerous is going to happen? But I will know I am dreaming so it won't be too bad, and I'll wake up if it gets too serious." So you do that for a while; you rescue princesses from

dragons, and all sorts of things. And then when you've done that for some time, you say, "Now let's go a bit further. Let's forget it's a dream, and have a real thrill." Ooh! But you know you wake up. Then, after you have done that for a while, you will get more and more nerves [the courage, strength to do sth] until you sort of dare yourself as how far out you can get, and you end up dreaming sort of life you are living now.

Now why would one do that? The reason the Hindu would say is that the basic pulse of life, the basic motivation of existence, is what we call the game of hide-and-seek. Now you see it, now you don't. You see, everything is based on that; because all life is vibration, pulsing. Light is a pulsation of light-darkness. Sound is a pulsation of sound-silence. Everything is going da, da, da, da at various speeds. It's like the motion of a wave, now a wave consists of two pulses, the crest and the trough. You can't have crests without troughs; you can't have troughs without crests. They always go together. You can't have hide without seek; you can't have seek without hide. Just for example, you can't have here without there; because if you didn't know where there was, you wouldn't know where here was. You can't have is without isn't, because you don't know what you mean by is unless you also know what you mean by isn't, and vice versa.

So in that way they think that hide-and-seek is the fundamental game as if the Lord God, the Brahman, as they call it, said in the beginning, "Get lost, man. Disappear. I'll find you again later." And then when you know the disappearance gets very far out, then the contrary rhythm begins, and the dreamer wakes up and finds out "Whoo, that's a relief." Then after a rest period, in which everything is of course at peace, it starts all over again because the spirit of adventure springs eternal.

The Hindus had extremely vast ideas of space and time for their period in history. They had the theory that the hiding part of the game goes on for 4,320,000 years; a period called a kalpa in Sanskrit. And then the "dreaming" part is followed by the "waking" part. The dreaming is the hiding where the Godhead imagines that it is all of us. Then for another 4,320,000 years there is a period of awakening, and at the end of that begins the dream again. The dreaming period is further subdivided into four stages. The first stage is the longest, and it is the best. During that stage, the dream

is beautiful. The second stage is not quite so long, and is a little unsettling. There is an element of instability in it, a certain touch of insecurity. In the third stage, which is not again so long, the forces of light and the forces of darkness, of good and of evil, are equally balanced, and things are beginning to look rather dangerous. And in the fourth stage, which is the shortest of them all, the negative, dark, or evil side triumphs, and the whole thing blows up in the end. But then that is like the bang in a dream, you know when you get shot in a dream, and you wake up, and see it was after all a dream. So then there is a waking period, before the whole thing starts again.

And so the Hindus feel that behind the scene, that is to say, in reality, under the surface, you are all the actor. But behind the scenes, in the green room, you might say in a very back of your mind, in a very depths of your soul, you always have a very tiny sneaking suspicion which you might not be the you that you think you are.

The dreaming period is further subdivided into four stages. The first stage is the longest, and it is the best. During that stage, the dream is beautiful. The second stage is not quite so long, and is a little unsettling. There is an element of instability in it, a certain touch of insecurity. In the third stage, which is not again so long, the forces of light and the forces of darkness, of good and of evil, are equally balanced, and things are beginning to look rather dangerous. And in the fourth stage, which is the shortest of them all, the negative, dark, or evil side triumphs, and the whole thing blows up in the end. But then that is like the bang in a dream, you know when you get shot in a dream, and you wake up, and see it was after all a dream. So then there is a waking period, before the whole thing starts again.

Shall you notice, if you compute, I haven't gone to the mathematics of it, but if you do, you will find out, that in this drama the forces of the dark side are operative for one-third of the time; the forces of the light side for two-thirds of the time. This is a very ingenious arrangement; because we are seeing here the fundamental principles of drama.

Consider drama. Here is a stage. And over the stage here is what we call a proscenium arch. And out there, there is the audience. Now you're suppose

to be in the world of reality. Let's suppose this is not a lecture tonight but a show. And you come out side into the show and you know you are real people living in the real world. But you're going to see a play, which isn't real. There are actors coming on the stage, but behind the scene here, there are real people like you. But so that you don't see them that way, they are going to put on their costumes and makeup, and then they are going to come out in front here and pretend to various roles. But you know you want to be half convinced that what they are doing on the stage is real. The work of a great actor is to get you sitting on the edge of your chair, in anxiety, or weeping, or roaring with laughter, because he has almost persuaded you that what is on the stage is really happening. That is the greatness of his art, to take the audience in.

And of course, in the same way, the Hindu feels that the Godhead acts his part so well that he takes himself in completely. So that each one of you is the godhead, wonderfully fooled by your own act. And although you won't admit it to yourself, enjoying it like anything. Because you must not admit it, that it give the show away.

Now it's a funny thing, when you say "I am a person," the word person is a word from the drama. You know, when you open a play script, you see the list of the actors, this is called the *dramatis personae*, the persons of the drama. The word person in Latin is *persona*, meaning "through sound," something through which sound comes; because *persona* in Greek or Roman drama was the mask worn by the actors. And because they acted on an open-air stage, the mouth was shaped like a small megaphone that would project the sound. So the person is the mask. Isn't it funny now how we have forgotten that? And so Harry Emerson Fosdick could write a book called *How to Be a Real Person*, which if translated literally is, "How to be a genuine fake," because in the old sense, you see the person is the role, the part played by the actor. But if you forget that you are the actor, and think you are the person, you have been taken in by your own role. You are "en-rolled," you're bewitched, spellbound, enchanted.

So then, look at something else about the drama and its nature, in the drama there has to be a villain, unless of course you are acting some kind of a non-play that does not have any story. But all fundamental stories start out with

the status quo. Everybody is just sort of going along, and then something has to come in to upset everything. The interest of the play lies in, How are we going to solve it? It is the same when you play cards. Supposing you are playing solitaire, you start by shuffling the deck, and then introduce the chaos. The game is to play order against chaos. So in the drama somebody has to be a villain, and play a dark side, and then the hero can play against it. If you go to the theater for a good cry, then you let the villain win and you call it a tragedy. If you go for a thrill, you let the hero win. If you go for laughs, you call it a comedy. There are different arrangements between the hero and the villain, but in all cases, when the curtain goes down at the end of the drama, the hero and the villain step out hand in hand and the audience applauds both. They do not boo the villain at the end of the play. They applaud him for acting the part of the villain so well, and they applaud the hero for acting the part of the hero so well, because they know that the hero role and the villain role are only masks.

And so you see, behind the stage too, there is the green room, where after the play is over, and before it begins, the masks are taken off. The Hindus feel that behind the scene, that is to say in reality, under the surface, you are all the actors, marvelously skilled in playing many parts and in getting lost in the mazes of your own minds and the entanglements of your own affairs, as if this for the most urgent thing going on. But behind the scenes, in the green room, you might say, in the very back of your mind and the very depth of your soul, you always have a very tiny sneaking suspicion which you might not be the you that you think you are.

The Germans call this a *hintergedanke*, a thought way, way back in your head that you will hardly admit to yourself, because of course, you've been brought up, most of you, in the Hebrew-Christian tradition, it would be very wicked indeed to think that you were God. That would be blasphemy; and don't you ever dare think such an idea! Which of course this is all as it should be, because the show must go on until the time does come to stop.

Now you will see that this involves two quite different ways of dealing with the two fundamental questions. One What is man? that is, Who are you? And in the Hebrew-Christian answer, we more or less say, "Well I'm me. I am Alan Watts, I'm John Doe, I'm Mary Smith, and I firmly believe I am,

because I really oughtn't to think anything else, ought I?" And this "me" is a finite ego, or a finite mind, whatever that is. On the other hand, the Hindu will say that the real self, which he calls atman is what there is, it's the works, it's the which than which there is no whicher. The root and ground of the universe and of reality.

The next problem where they differ so sharply is, Why have things gone wrong? Why is there evil; why is there pain; why is there tragedy? In the Christian tradition you have to attribute evil to something besides God. God is defined as good, and He originally created the scheme of things without any evil in it. But there was a mysterious accident, in which one of the angels, called Lucifer, did not do what he was told. And there was the Fall of Man. Man disobeyed, he went against the law of God, and from that point on evil was introduced into the scheme of things and things began to go wrong, that is to say, against the will of the will of the perfectly good creator.

The Hindu thinks in a different way. He feels that the creator or the actor is the author of both – good and evil for the reasons, as I explained it to you, you have to have the evil for there to be a story. In any case, it is not as if the creator had made evil and made someone else its victim. It isn't like saying "God creates the evil as well as the good, and poor little us are his puppets and he inflicts evil upon us." The Hindu says, "Nobody experiences pain except the Godhead." You are not some separate little puppet who is being kicked around by omnipotence. You are omnipotence in disguise. So there is no victim of this, no helpless, defenseless, poor little thing. Even the baby with syphilis is the dreaming Godhead.

Now this makes people brought up in the West extremely uneasy, because it seems to undercut the foundations of moral behavior. They say, "If good and evil are created by God, isn't this a universe in which anything goes? And if I am God in disguise, surely if I realize that, I can get away with murder." But think it through. Didn't I point out that in the game as the Hindus analyze it, the evil part has one-third of the time and the good part has two-thirds? What sort of a game do you want anyway; you will find out, you see, that all good games, games worth playing, that arouse our interest, are constructed like this. If you have the good and the evil equally balanced,

the game is boring; nothing happens, it is a stalemate. The irresistible force meets the immovable object. On the other hand, if it is all good, and it is hardly any evil, maybe just a weeny little bit of a fly in the ointment, it also gets boring. Just in the same way for example, suppose you knew the future, and could control it perfectly. What would you do? You would say, "Let's shuffle the deck and have another deal." Because for example, when great chess players sit down to a match and it suddenly becomes apparent to both of them that white is going to mate in sixteen moves and nothing can be done about it, they abandon the game and begin another. They do not want to know. There would not be any "hide" in the game, any element of surprise, if they did know the outcome. Again with good and evil equally balanced is not a good game; a game with positive or good forces clearly triumphant is not an interesting game. What we want is a game where it always seems that the good side is about to lose, in really serious danger of losing, but manages always to sneak out. You know how it is in serial stories, and they had a hero at the end of installment, in some absolutely impossible position, where it seems he's going to be run over by a train, and he's tied with his girlfriend to the rails. And somehow in the next installment the author is going to get him out of his difficulty, only he mustn't do it too obviously, because you wouldn't keep reading the installments. So what is necessary is a system in which the good side is always winning but never is the winner, where the evil side is always losing but never is the loser. That is a very practical arrangement for a successful, ongoing game that will keep everybody interested.

And you must watch this in practical politics. Every in-group or group of nice people needs an out-group of nasty people, otherwise they wouldn't know who they were. And you must recognize then that the out-group is your necessary enemy, whom you need. He keeps you on your toes. But you mustn't obliterate him, if you do, you are in a very dangerous state of affairs. So you have to love your enemies in this sense, regard them as highly necessary and to be respected chivalrously. We need the communists and they need us. The thing is to cool it and play what I call a contained conflict. When conflicts get out of hand, all sides blow up. Of course I suppose there is another deal, maybe a million years later.

Now, let me see if I can for a moment put these two visions of the world together. It seems that if you believe the Christian, Hebrew, Islamic view, that you can't admit the Hindu view, because if you are a Christian, one thing you cannot believe, let's say if you are an orthodox, you're an orthodox Protestant Bible type, or if you are a Roman Catholic, you can't believe that you are God. So that excludes Hinduism apparently. But let us go back to Judaism for a minute and ask this question, "If Judaism is the true religion, can Christianity be true too?" No, because the one thing in Christianity the Jew cannot admit is that Jesus Christ was God. It is unthinkable for a Jew that any man was indeed God in the flesh.

Or the second question, if Christianity is the true religion, can Judaism be true too? The answer is yes, because all Christians are Jews. That is to say, they have taken in the Jewish religion, lock, stock, and barrel [completely] in the Old Testament, into their own religion. Every Christian is a Jew plus something else, which is his particular attitude to Jesus of Nazareth.

Let's play this game once again, "If Christianity is true, can Hinduism be true?" The answer is no, for the reason we have seen, the Christians will say, "Jesus of Nazareth was God, but you are not, I'm not." Now then, If Hinduism is true, can Christianity be true? The answer is yes, because it can include it. But how? What would be the attitude of a Hindu to a very sincere and convinced Christian? He would say, "Bravo, absolutely marvelous; what an actor! Here in this Christian soul God is playing His most extraordinary game. He is believing and really feeling that He is not Himself, and not only that, but that He is living only one life, and in that life He has got to make the most momentous decision imaginable." In the course of this four score years and ten, he's got to choose between everlasting beatitude and everlasting horror. And he is not quite sure how to do it, because in Christianity there are two sins to be avoided, among others. One is called presumption, that is knowing surely that you are saved. The other is called despair, which is knowing surely that you are damned. There is always a margin of doubt about this, so work out your salvation in fear and trembling.

So you might say this is preeminently the gambler's religion. Imagine you know at some great casino, late at night, that there is some marvelous

master gambler who has been winning, winning, winning all night. Then suddenly he decides to stake his whole winnings on whether the ball lands on red or black. Sensation! Everybody gathers from all over the casino to watch this terrific gamble. So in the same way, the predicament in which the Christian soul finds itself is this colossal gamble, which is saying, this universe can possibly contain within it ultimate tragedy, there could be such a thing as an absolute, final, irremediable mistake. What a horror that thought is! So the Hindu is sitting in the audience fascinated by this Christian's extraordinary gamble. He says, "That's a beautiful game." The Christian does not know it is a game, but the Hindu suspects it is. And he is a little bit admiring of it, but not quite involved.

Now you would say perhaps, you want to be involved, give your whole self to this, make a active commitment, you know "Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide, in the strife twixt truth and falsehood, for the good or evil side. Then it is the brave man chooses while the coward stands aside" ect. That sounds great, doesn't it? Commitment; stand up and be counted. This is a virtue, but on the other hand, you see another virtue, what we call being a good sport. If your enemy in the battle of life is to be regarded as an absolute enemy, who is pure evil, black as black can be, you cannot be a good sport and you can accord him no chivalry, no honors of battle. You have got to annihilate him by any means possible, fair or foul. That leads to some pretty sticky situations, especially when he has the means of annihilating you in just the same way.

If, on the other hand, in all contests you know that while you are going to take it seriously and regard it as very important, in the back of your mind and that little hintegedanka you know it is not ultimately important. Although very important. And this saves you, this enables you to be a good player. You may worry about the word play because we often use the word play in a trivial sense: "You're just playing. This life you mean is nothing but a game." The Hindus indeed call the creation of the universe the lila, or the game, or the play of the divine. But we also use "play" in other senses. When you see Hamlet, which is by no means trivial, you are still seeing a play. In church the organist plays the organ. And in the Book of Proverbs, it is written that the divine wisdom created the world by playing before the throne of God. Play also you see, has a deep sense. When we say music,

even the music of Bach, as a great master of what we call serious music, is still playing. So in the deeper sense of play, the Hindu sees this world as “play,” and therefore that the intense situations, personally, socially, and so on, that we are all involved in, are seen not as bad illusions but as magnificent illusions, so well acted that they have just about got most of the actors fooled, so that they’ve forgotten who they are. And man thinks of himself, when he has been fooled, as a little creature that comes into this world, which is all strange and foreign, and is just a little puppet of fate. He has forgotten that the whole thing has, at its root, the self, which is also your self.

Democracy in Heaven

Now as you know this is the great discussion going on in what we call today the new theology. The revolution within standard brand Christianity. Because you see for years and years the clergy the Ministry of the various churches such as Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist congregational Unitarian even in some cases Disciples of Christ and Lutherans their theological seminaries. Have been discussing religion in terms utterly different than you will normally hear from the pulpit. And every graduate of an intelligent theological school has a sense of intense frustration as he has to get out to work in a community or parish church. Because he does not believe what he is supposed to preach. And this has in the way been true for a long long time. Clergy except in the Roman Catholic Church where the situation is somewhat different are very heavily controlled by the laity because he will pay the piper calls the tune. And therefore they are in a state of constant frustration. Because those who contribute the most heavily and therefore are most interested in the church tend to be conservative minded people and they want that old time religion. Or those a matter of fact what they call the old time religion is really quite modern. But still that’s what they want. And they’re Pete. Will who as I would say would tend to be conservative in their whole attitude to life. Because you see. People of a more liberal disposition couldn’t care less about going to church. In the British army. They have a thing called Church Parade. And there’s a famous story about a drill sergeant who got all the troops up for church parade on a Sunday morning and used to call out can’t Lex to the right Protestants to the late seven legends and nonmetal. And to the degree you see that intelligent people in

our culture have any religion at all it tends to be a fancy religion something in the new kinds of things that may be unity Christian Science Theosophy. Buddhism they downtown. Or some kind of special Protestant. Offshoot such as the Fellowship Church in San Francisco. Or the Community Church in New York and things of that kind. Very liberal very left wing theologically. So the the new theology comes at this time. To a very large extent because a the clergy are fed up. The Christianity has its back to the wall. And the pope knows this better than anybody. And so hand in hand with this if you medical movement there goes a long reconsideration of what on earth it's all about is there a God is there God. And a lot of people are boldly saying that is to be abandoned. As an English priest Father Maskell put it it is the basic assumption of the secularist movement interest in the ology that life. Is a journey between the maternity ward and the climate or him and that is what there is. That's it and that and that is the life that the Christian religion has to do with and to encounter. And therefore more than ever. Being a Christian if it isn't an abandonment of God or of the idea that the universe is supernatural it controlled. The Christian religion and fastens itself therefore with Petunia and increased further to the figure of Jesus of Nazareth. As one whit put it there is no God and Jesus Christ is His only Son. Because you see what otherwise makes you a Christian is something strange about Christianity. In that. It shares with Islam and Judaism what we might call theological imperialism. Christians I've even the most liberal strike. Fervently believe that their religion is the best religion. And they will state it by saying either Jesus Christ is the only Son of God That's an orthodox way it is a matter of fact it isn't really an orthodox way of saying it but it's the way of the dots people do say it or they will say Jesus is the greatest man that ever lived the point is that you make a commitment to the following of Jesus as an historical percentage. And for some reason or other people who commit themselves to this exclusive kind of following of Jesus become exceedingly obstreperous. Because they will either Damn other religions out right off our Mars insidiously damn them with faint praise. Old Buddha taught some very good things you know and we all are indebted to is great and moral principles but. And then comes this pitch you see for the sole following of Jesus as the daughter and master head and shoulders above all. Well the trouble with that as always being that. When you get into a theological argument with a person who is a Christian you get into a situation where the

advocate in the judge or the same person. That is to say that Jesus is judged the best man in the world by the standards of Christianity. Because those are the standards with that with which this kind of person judges. And therefore are. Either And you'll find that people who don't leap to these judgments usually don't know very much about any other kind of religion. The causes and comparative religion in theological schools are shockingly superficial and grossly inaccurate. And. So this is coming to the front now you see in order to be the bit the new to belong to the church really is to be saved and to be saved is to belong to the interest in group. You have to have an in-group you see if you want to know who you are you have to belong to something say if you want to distinguish yourself because you know who you are because of the people who aren't like you there you get a contrast. This is this is the basic arrangement richer. So you see if you want to be in some kind of an in group. You must but everybody else beyond the pale. It's Adama's Aquinas gave the show a actually because he said that the blessed in heaven will often walk to the battlements and look down and delight in the justice of God being properly carried out in it all. So you may not believe in Hell you may be very liberal and after all it's not nice or sophisticated nowadays to believe in everlasting damnation but we have a new word for it. Such as failing to be a real person. Sinking below the human level. Or to entering into final in every media able psychosis. All these are new words either for damnation or heresy. And. So. You Jardine. And you know you are saved only if somebody else isn't. If somebody else is damn. Very difficult to believe or even to imagine a state of affairs where everyone and everything is saved you have to be a mystic even to think about that. Because it requires having a state of consciousness which transcends oppositions and you can't do that along the line of ordinary logic. You have to have a new kind of logic which takes over at a certain point and this logic I'm using at the moment. I pointing out that damned people and saved people needn't bother they are in a symbiotic relationship with. They go together in the same way at the back in the front of something because if something has a front it has to have a back. And so. The very fact that fronts and backs go together. Indicates that there is a unity between these two opposed sides. So also there is a unity between the dammed and the saved. And it's only as you begin to realize that you need the damned people in order to be saved and that the damn people need to save people in order to be damn it you start laughing about it. And that

laughter is very subversive. And it's you know how it is you're not supposed to laugh in church and not in courts of law in their places where laughter makes people nervous. Because it's supposed to be a sign of disrespect Now it may not be so at all. Dante said that the song of the angels in paradise sounded like the laughter of the universe. But in church especially any rather more serious kinds of church laughing is very bad form. Why. Because if you look at the design of a Catholic church. You will notice that it is based upon the design of the court room of a king. And if you look at a Protestant church you will see that it is to based upon the design of a law court. Indeed the Protestant minister whereas exactly the same robes as an American judge. And all those pews and box like stalls are the same or you will find in the old fashioned court with the witness box jury box and all that kind of thing. But you see the original idea of the Christian church these ancient Roman churches are called a basilica. That means the courtroom of the king the throne room the altar is the throne of God. Now in a court room. The king is very nervous. Because anybody who takes it upon himself to govern other people and rule them and better watch out. And therefore he always has his back to the wall. And he is flanked by attending guards and high ministers of state. And just so that nobody will get up and make trouble. He has an either on their knees or flat on their faces when they come into His presence. And of course no one law. That would laughing or miss the big. And so this was the Patton this was the model. Upon which the Judeo Christian idea of God was make it is a political model and the title of God is taken from the supreme emperors of Persia the Diane can the king of kings the lot of Lords and so in the English Church at morning prayer the clergyman gets up and says. Almighty and everlasting God the only ruler of princes King of Kings lot of Lords who dust and die throne behold old well as upon earth most graciously deigned to behold our gracious sovereign Lady Queen Elizabeth and all the royal family. That's the picture and the metaphor you may not believe. Literally that God sits on a throne or even has a body to put on or that he wears a crown or that he has a beer. But the image. Color it's your feeling about the character of God. And imagery is much more powerful. Than intellectual concepts you may know it says in the problem that God is a spirit without body parts or passions omnipresent to all places. Be tunneled to all time and therefore one thinks as he called ours at the gaseous vertebrate. Or else of an enormously diffuse sea of luminous jello. Filling all time and space

everybody uses images but behind it those images. Are the old images that influenced us in childhood. And if you still attend a church and you use that imagery. And you still think emotionally you feel towards God. As one would if you took it literally. So this political model of God has dominated the West. And the world is related to God. As subjects to a king. Or as artefacts to a maker. We have of course a ceramic model of the universe because it said in the book of Genesis that God made Adam out of the dust of the ground in other words he made a clay figurine and then blew the breath of life into the nostrils of the figurine so that it came to life. Now the Hindus. Don't have that model of the universe to cope with. Because they don't look at the universe as God's creation. In the sense of being an artifact they look at it as God's drama. Because they. I see the world as acted not created God is that which is pretending to be all this. And everybody is really God is a mask of God who is playing that he's you but he's doing it so well that he's taken himself in because he is the audience as well as the actor. It's a really successful play. Because the good actor although you know a play is a just a play a good actor is going to try and make you think it isn't and want to get you crying he wants to get you sitting on the edge of your seat in anticipation. And God as the best actor has convinced himself completely that the act was real. The Chinese again have a different model. Their model of the universe is an organic one. It is a great organism. It is alive it grows it is an intelligent order. So those are the three great models of the world. When the west stopped believing seriously in Darwin long time ago they however retained the idea of the world as an artefact and so we graduated from the ceramic model of the universe to the fully automatic model. Which is actual commonsense for most people living today. I return to the point then that the clergy and the church people don't really believe in God in the old fashioned sense of right God at all. If they did believe the Christian religion in some of its orthodox form seriously they would be screaming in the streets. And even the most far out lunatic fringe Jehovah's Witnesses are even more or less polite when they come and call it your house because if they really believe that you were going to hell they would make more fuss about you than if you had to be a bunny. But no. But he really takes it that seriously and. That means they don't believe in it they know they ought to believe in it in fact many sons are exhortations to have more faith. Which means that we all recognize that we don't really believe in this and we ought to we feel very guilty about it

we don't have the moral strength to believe in this but it isn't only a matter of morals it's a matter of being asked to believe what most people feel is nonsense. That the world is run on the lines of a state. How for example can you be a citizen of the United States having taken an oath that a republican form of government is the best form of government and believe that the universe of America. So what has happened is. Intelligent people have always realized. That this political model of other cosmos won't do. Now actually. No seriously Logan ever did believe that God was at the old gentleman with whiskers on the golden throne never. What the bishop willage says in his book Honest to God you know that there isn't some sort of a son when out there. He is very naive in a way because he could have taken huge quotations out of St Thomas Aquinas out of the great fathers of the church from Oregon from Clement of Alexandria Trumpton Gregory nasy ans us from St John of Damascus from some Basil the Great from Saint Augusta and from St Ambrose from Bernard of Clairvaux and Albert the Great he could have quoted all those perfectly orthodox very correctly loaded. And shown that they never believed in a God like that with whiskers. And he could have come forward and said You see this is a perfectly orthodox book and I'm not a revolutionary I'm just going back to the real old time religion. We didn't do that and you know why we told him. He'd never read those writers in theological school. He was entirely confined to biblical studies and never got as far as that it's. So but just as the same with ever so many people. One of the reasons why so many people turned to an Oriental religion was that the level the intellectual level at which oriental religions were first presented in the West was so much higher than the intellectual level at which Christianity was presented at the local church. If you lived in India or so long of course there would be the local Buddhist monastery and it would be just as junky is that stuff was around the local church. They don't tell people about the great void and how to practice meditation and those things. That's for specialists in minority. All they care about is gaining merit mostly by making contributions to the clergy or a better circumstances in your next life. Or getting out of the evil karma. That's the real thing that popular but it isn't about. You. But you see the trouble in the West is that everybody is getting educated. There's a terrific literacy. And therefore. The public. Has to be treated. As if it were intelligent you can't say that publicly down anymore it's too many intelligent people. Now. Let's look at the lineup what sort of a

situation is this really. For my part I would say the God that is dead is this political model god. However conceived the divine paternalistic off Dorothy who rules the universe. And to whom you as an ego are related as a subject to a king by analogy. Now that one. Just isn't holding up. But what's the alternative. Is specially think about what could be an alternative for Western people with a Christian background what other kind of god could we have well one a possibility is not. And this is what people like Al Thais are now discussing and is on the far left of this new theology. It's a man like James Pike is on the right of the new theology. He very definitely believes in God He's a theist but. He doesn't believe in anything with whiskers on it nor does he really believe in the political model. Are we going to settle then for the fact that the universe is just what it appears to be. Or. Are we going to have a very refined conception of God which will be called it instead of he. Makes a lot of difference very powerful the pronoun you use. Or even he she had a Christian Scientist talk about the father mother. It's not a complicated people. Feel as a little bit weird. It is rather simple but then when you say it. Does it mean that God is something like electricity. Which doesn't seem to have any independent intelligence of its own you can use it intelligently is just energy it does something good suit me is that God has got it like that. What. Well it's a funny thing but it's very difficult to be a complete atheist. Related like in the House of Parliament in England when in one thousand twenty eight the Church of England wanted a new prayer book a revised prayer book because the church and the state are inseparable in England. And the Houses of Parliament had to vote on whether this prayer book might be used and somebody got up and said this is perfectly ridiculous and assemblage which contains a number of atheist voting on the in the politics of the Church of England and another member got up and said Oh I don't think there are any atheists here not really we all believe in some sort of something some are. Now a seat in the theological world it just doesn't do to believe in some sort of a something somewhere. Because one thing that the logins detest is they can. Now you should listen to them. Either no god at all because that's clear and precise no beating around the bush and you know it's just. Fuzzy thinking to have that the great universal mind the can and differentiated is that it continuum that's all time thought of a something somewhere. Woolly thinking. Either no god or a god with a definite character and a clear model of will and precise standards that would not be pushed around the biblical god. If you do what

do you do if you put your mind into two watertight compartments one of which you're abreast of science in the modern world and all that kind of thing in the other compartment it's again nothing to do with that is a completely cut off think all religion where you believe in absolutely ludicrous propositions. A lot of people do that but a lot of people want a religion which is difficult to believe in because that's a kind of a test of faith but you can swallow it.

Do you do what do you do do you put your mind into two watertight compartments one of which you're abreast of science in the modern world and all that kind of thing in the other compartment it's again nothing to do with that is it completely cut off think all religion where you believe in absolutely ludicrous propositions. A lot of people do that but a lot of people want a religion which is difficult to believe in because that's a kind of a test of faith but you can swallow it. It's like the story about Abraham being told to sacrifice his son Isaac and he was about to do it because he wouldn't do what you're told to testify if. You. Are people like the security. Of a definite religion I mean you've got to believe in and this is the truth I was once having an argument with a Jehovah's Witness. And he said Don't you think that if there were really a loving God who was concerned about the human race that he would provide us with an infallible textbook that would tell us how to live and I said he would do nothing of the kind it would completely destroy the human mind. You know you never have to think that was the case. And so. While there is that there is then this possibility is it to be no god is a life just this trip around the maternity ward to the crematorium. And that the issue of religion is to improve that trip. That is to say through social concern. Through getting rid of poverty and war and exploitation and disease is that the whole business of religion or is there something else. Those who take this field which we will call the secularist position and reality are parts strongly. Influenced by contemporary philosophy especially in that form which is called scientific imperialism. Or logical positivism. Which maintains that the idea of a god is not a fantasy. But is a meaningless idea. That in other words the proposition that there exists god. And that God is the origin and Creator and governor of everything that is happening they maintain that those sentences are utterly devoid of meaning. As much so as if I were to say everything is up because they will say no logical proposition can be made. About all processes whatsoever because all propositions are

labels on boxes. And you can't have the box containing all boxes because this box would have no outside and therefore it wouldn't be a box.

So all propositions all words must refer. To classes of some kind. And you can't have a class of all classes. And also they would say the notion that there is a God is meaningless because. It doesn't help you to make any prediction. Or they were going to ask it in this plate what evidence supposing somebody could bring it forward would completely satisfy you as disproving the existence of God and no believing in God can think of any evidence. That would conclusively prove that there wasn't a god. Just like psychoanalysts are completely incapable of thinking of any evidence which would. Prove the existence of the Eat at this complex. So they on logical grounds take this position. And so since many theologians are in fact influenced by modern philosophy. Take these arguments seriously. They would like. To move secularized the whole conception of religion or to put it in Bonhoeffer's words have Christianity without religion. Right now. When. You might say there is nothing to life except the trip between a maternity ward incriminatory and that's what Prince I have heard something like that before. When I asked What is the Buddha. The Chinese master replied It's windy again this morning. Another Buddhist master on his deathbed wrote the poem. From the bath tub to the bath tub I have added stuff and nonsense. The bath tub in which the baby is washed at birth and the bath tub in which the corpses washed before burial. All the time between he said I was going yackety yack. Now what about those poems do they mean what they say well not quite. They are something different. Because they are based on. A life devoted. To the discipline of a very particular kind of meditation. Culminating in a complete. Shattering experience. Which is very difficult to talk about. But generally. Speaking. It is the encounter with eternity with the eternal not necessarily in the sense of that which goes on and on on through time but. The A tunnel is the timeless. That which transcends time is beyond measurement in terms of hours and days. And when a person who is. In that state of consciousness or has been through it looks at. The ordinary everyday world it's true he sees the ordinary everyday world as we see it but with a very very extraordinary difference. And if we would have to put that different into some sort of Western Christian influence language he would perhaps a Don't you realize that sitting around here in this room. With our ordinary everyday faces and

clothes and personalities. We are sitting smack in the middle of the Be it if it vision. And that this sitting here in this room. Is infinity and eternity precisely it is it and this is could be a terrific vision. This has got. And it feels that way too. When it does. Something like it. But in this kind of religion. They still have temples they have borders and they chance of tourism after incense and long. I like them. But they're always saying that the highest religion that can get really to get there you have to kill the border. Exposing a clergyman got up one day in court but. And said. Every time you say Jesus Christ you have to wash your mouth out. Or if you meet God the Father kill him. If you meet God the Son killing me God the Holy Spirit killing you meet the pope kill him if you meet St Augustine killing you meet your father and mother kill him. Kill them all right away all right what I've been saying this simply translating into Christian terms a Buddhist. Teacher. Are talking about the eight hundred eighty. What he said and he put it but it's names and where I put the Christian Munden. But I don't think this is what is happening in the movement of the new theology. I think that what's happening there is that they are just getting rid of God. This is not this other thing I'm talking about which could be called the religion of no religion. You see. If you you could take this right into Christianity because it to the extent that every Christian is a Jew. You see we use the Jewish scriptures as the Old Testament so every Christian is that do. You are supposed to believe in the Tenth Amendment among them says. Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven image of anything that is in the heavens above or the earth beneath or the waters that are. Under the earth now shalt not bow to them nor worship. And that is what this thing I've been talking about is it is a destruction of idols because the most dangerous graven images are not those which are made of wood and stone they are those which are made of ideas. And it is well known to the great mystical tradition of the world all over the world. That they have a sort of supreme vision. Can only come. When you have got rid of every idea of God whatsoever. It would be like as I've often used this image cleaning a window. On which somebody has painted blue sky. Well to see the sky you got to scrape up the paint. Well you say my goodness you shouldn't take that nice blue painting up it's very good it was done by a great artist see up at the clouds or you mustn't do that because we won't have in the blue sky anymore. See. So in that spirit the great mystics have always ceased to cling to God that is because the only god you can cling to is the idea of God. In

order to discover God you have entirely to stop clinging. Until you see why does one cling to God. For safety of course. You want to say something you want to save yourself I don't care what you mean by saved whether just means feel happy or feel that life is meaning or you know there's somebody up there who cares. So one claims and if you don't cling to God You cling to something else the state. Money Sex yourself. Power bases are all false gods. But there has to come a state when clinging stops. And only then does the state of faith begin people who believe in God don't have any faith because they want something to hold on to. So real faith is when you do not hold on to anything anymore. In the Christian tradition this is called the Cloud of Unknowing. There is a book of that written by a fourteenth century British monk. Nuns. And he got it from down ISIS the area up a guide. Who assumed the name of St Paul's Athenian convert. He was a Syrian monk living in the sixth century. Those Meister Eckhart and Thomas Aquinas Johns go to Sedona and many other great medieval theologians started down ISIS the very opposite. He wrote a book called The theologian Mystica. In which he explains. That in order to come to a full union with God. You must give up every conception of God whatsoever and he in human rights. Don't think that God is one of three enters or unity or spirit or any kind of anything that the human mind can conceive he is beyond all that. In it what is called This is called Apophatic theology. This is a Greek to contrast it with cataphatic that. When you speak at a phatic. You say what God is like. So in this man down I see us wrote two books one was called The Divine Names and that was can't affect acknowledging the other was called a mystical theology which is Apophatic. Cataphatic what God is like according to analogy he is like a father. We do not say God is a cosmic male parent. But God is in some respects like a father like spirit. Like we say not is like minutes. It's like it's raining you know as an relativity to that statement. So this is the the cat of Atlanta the apophatic says what God is not. And all those theologians in the following of down ISIS said the highest way of talking about God is in negative terms. Just as to use done ISIS's own image when a sculptor makes a figure he does it entirely by removing stone taking something away so in the same way son Thomas Aquinas said because God by. Is infinity. Exceeds every idea to which the human mind can reach that best way to speak of him is by remote. That is to say by removing from our view of God. Every inadequate concept. This is what the Hindus call neti neti saying of the Brahman of the

supreme reality it is not this it is not this. But this intellectual operation. Of destroying concepts must go hand in hand is a it was shall we call it psychological operation. Which is ceasing to cling to any image whatsoever or simply so. You seem to click. Now why. Well because there's no need to. There's no need to claim. Because when you were born you were kicked off a precipice. And it was a big explosion and a lot of other things are falling down with you. Including some pretty large lumps of rock. Once called the Earth. And. It won't help you to cling to the rocks when you're falling off the presidents may give you an illusion of safety. About everything is falling. It's falling apart. That's what the ancients said when all is transient. Plan to pray or flows in the weather had a cloud. And you can cling to anything it's like grabbing a smoke with a nonexistent hand. That's all that clinging will ever achieve only does it make people anxious. So when you come to the realisation that you cannot think of anything that there is nothing to cling to their transpires an inner change of consciousness which we can call either faith or letting go. And then suddenly they think it's. In Sanskrit they put it this way to add to the Massey means literally that after the hour or as we would say you're it. And if you are God. Then you can't have an idea of God any more than you can chew your own teeth. You don't need one the sun doesn't need to shine on itself. Nice don't need to cut themselves. Your eyes don't need to look at themselves. What color is your head. To your eyes. Doesn't black as it. Can't see anything. Matter of fact the way it feels inside your head is what you call what it looks like outside. All these things you see outside our states of the nervous system in the brain. That type peels that's how it looks inside the head and you said what I thought that was what was outside. True. Same way. When the Zen master suddenly discovered that carrying the pail. With water and it was a miracle he discovered that. You realize there isn't anything except God. And boy you don't if you really know that you see you don't need to have a religion. But you can have one because it's a free world I mean if you want to. Try and express this in some way and all religion is pure gravy after that see any outward manifestation of religion. You know it's like a man with lots of money making some more. And it's quite unnecessary. But so in according to the very best the logins it was never necessary for God to create the world. Didn't add anything to him. He didn't have to do it he was under no compulsion. So he did it out of what. Dinosaurs the area up a guy calls. Eat but please. We wouldn't and besides it hyper Cleary's super fullness. In

other words for kicks. I mean you know we don't we don't like using that language but it's completely contemporary because exactly right. That's what the Bible says. And it puts it in a mass a date way it says you His Majesty did it for his pleasure. And that's the way you talk about somebody it was a can't. It's critic talk it said you know we are not amused. And. It says in the book of the products that where the divine wisdom speaks. And speaks you see as an attribute of God standing aside from God. Sort of primitive polity as I'm. And wisdom says that in the beginning of the world how did light was to play before the divine presence. And it's specially to play with the sons of men the word in Hebrew is play but in the King James translation it is rejoice because that is a more sedate. You may rejoice in church but not. You may not have fun but you may rejoice. See the difference. So then. The part of the matter is then there was no reason to make the world. And it was done for making celestial Whoopi that's why the angels a laughing. They just splitting their sides only when you hear it in church or everybody's forgotten what alluvial means. It's lovely. Don't you see Al alone. Hallelujah. It's like but to be you know it's just verbal and it's like birdsong. Birdsong isn't about anything it's just for kicks. Why do you sing. Why do you like dancing what's music for. That's what this hallelujah it's. So when nothing is being tantrum when one gets to that point. Everything blows up. This is what's meant by subtle in Zen sudden. Awakening and you suddenly got heavens. What was I making that up. Because here we are so what we've been looking for old. That's right. And. That's it that's the thing. And you realise that if you any you basically through and through are all this. Only you got into a kind of a funny illusion. I think when we get into that a room. In rather a complicated way. Through our upbringing as children. Because of that many little children know from the beginning what it's all about and if they haven't got words to put it in. The that's the whole problem a child psychologist. What the child psychologist is ideally looking for is an articulate baby who. Can explain what it's like to be a baby you know never get there by the time you teach by teaching the child to speak to you for you to mess it up you give it this language and you can think big thoughts like that with this funny limited language nationally with the words they start children out with. And then finally when they've got the poor thing completely get the tires. They tell it. The most preposterous things they tell it that it must be free. They say to you a huge child are an independent agent and you're responsible see now

therefore we can manage your. Lovett's. And. In other words we require that you do something which will please us only if you do it voluntarily. Now if you want to people of it. So. But I'm afraid you see that the new theology isn't on to this. The new theology really is serious about there not being a God and that the universe is therefore. A rather pitiful predicament in which we caught had some compensation but what all this is a continuation of the nineteenth century philosophy the fully automatic model which is that. It is an essentially stupid universe it's an it's a mechanism it is a gyration of blind energy in which human intelligence and values happens to be a fluke and a rather uncomfortable one because nature doesn't give a damn about us. And so we have to fight it and all that is pure mythology is grossly unscientific. And. But most people believe that it's common sense for today. But what an opportunity that what there is in the new theology and in this whole ferment going on to get them to see this other point of view. And realize that. When you get rid of God. You are all you are doing is you're destroying an idol. And all idols must be destroyed respectfully. Not like those wretched. Puritans who went around destroying all those saints figures in the stained glass in the medieval churches that was disrespectful iconoclasm respectful I. Gods and would be for example every Easter Sunday the Bible should be ceremoniously burned. Because if Jesus is truly risen from the dead you don't need the Bible anymore either run. They'll. Leave the books or burn it up ceremoniously with great respect because certainly God doesn't take himself seriously if he did. I shudder to think what would happen.

Religion and Sexuality

I don't think I need to tell you that in a very special and peculiar way, Western man is hung up on sex. The major reason for this is that he has his religious background, quite unique among the religions of the world. I mean specifically Christianity, and in a secondary way, Judaism, insofar as Judaism in Europe and the United States is strongly influenced by Christianity. Christianity is, of all religions in the world, the one uniquely preoccupied with sex, more so than priapism, more so than tantric yoga, more so than any kind of fertility cult that has ever existed on the face of the earth. There has never been a religion in which sexuality was so important.

And either there is a certain very standards by which this can be judged. In popular speech, when you say of a person that he or she is living in sin, you know very well that you do not mean that they are engaged in a business to defraud the public by the sale of badly made bread, or anything in that kind, setting up a check forgery business, no. People who are living in sin are those who have an irregular sexual partnership. In the same way, when you say something is immoral, it pretty much means something sexually irregular. I remember when I was a boy in school, we used to have a preacher who came to us every year, the same man once a year, and he always talked on the subject of drink, gambling, and immorality. I remember the way he rolled it around his tongue, it was very clear what immorality was. And also I might point out that, present company excepted [za wyjątkiem was], the unitarian church being somehow unusual, most churches in America, England, and other parts of the Western world are, frankly, sexual regulation societies. They occasionally get excited about other moral issues, but really not very much. In other words, when you ask what can people get kicked/be thrown out of a church for, that's supposing you consider important ministers, bishops, priests and so on. They can live in envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness and being perfectly good standing. But the moment anything about their sexual life becomes a little unusual, out you go, and that is about the only thing you can get out for/they can be removed.

You study for example, the Roman Catholic manuals of moral theology, these manuals of moral theology are technical books about sins of all kinds – just exactly what they are, how they are done, how grave they are – mostly for the advice of confessors. They are always arranged according to the Ten Commandments, and when they get to the command “Thou shalt not commit adultery” the volume expands (like this), in fact it occupies two-thirds of the whole book, all the details.

In a very special way, we have got sex on the brain, which is not exactly the right place for it. This needs going into/examination, because it is not as simple as it looks. There are really two roots of the whole problem. One of them is the problem of why sexual pleasure, of all pleasures, as a kind of really supreme pleasure, is singled out for religious people to be particularly afraid of. This is true not only of Christianity. Christianity emphasizes it in

a certain way, but in Asian religions also, especially in India, there is a prevailing view that if you want to attain real heights of spirituality, the one thing you must give up is sexuality, in the ordinary sense of genital sexual relationships with man or woman. This reflects an attitude to the physical world, because it is, after all, through sexuality that we have, along with eating, our most fundamental relationship to materiality, to nature, to the physical universe. It is the point at which we can become most attached to the body, to the physical organism, to material life. That is one reason why sexuality/it is problematic.

The other reason why it's problematic, is more subtle, and is that sexuality is something you cannot get rid of. Do what you may, life is sexual, in the sense for example, that you are either male or female. There are various other gradations, but basically they are all forms of maleness and femaleness. And also, that every one of you is the result of sexual intercourse. This feature of life can be looked at in one of two ways. You can say, on the one hand you can say, that all man's higher ideals, his spirituality and so forth, are simply repressed sexuality; or on the other hand, you can say that human sexuality is a manifestation, a particular form or expression of what is spiritual, metaphysical, divine, or whatever you want to call it. I hold to the latter view. I do not think that religion is repressed sexuality. I think however that sexuality is just one of the many forms in which, whatever all this is, expresses itself. But you see, if it is something you cannot get rid of and if you realize that indeed a way of life in which sexuality is in some way put down or repressed, is nonetheless an expression of sexuality. Then you come to a view of a religion in which sex is a very special taboo, which is rather unusual. It's normally said, you see, the Christianity is a religion in which sex is taboo and there is simply no getting around that. I know, up-to-date ministers today think sex is all right. It's perfectly ok if you are married and you have a mature relationship with a woman, it's all right. And they kind of damn it with faint praise. But if you read anything in Christian writings prior, shall we say, to approximately 1850, you will find that it is not all right, not at all. It is tolerated between married couples and strictly for the procreation of children, but on the whole, to do without it is best. As Saint Paul put it, it is better to marry than to burn, to burn with the fire of lust and automatically to burn in hell. But always consistently, there is no way of getting from it. In all the writings of

the church fathers from Saint Paul himself to Saint Ignatius Loyola to any of the great relatively modern leaders of Catholic spirituality, to Calvin and the great Protestants like John Knox, on the whole sex is sin and sex is dirt.

You can say very simply that this is all bad and something very wrong, but I want to point out that there is another side to all this. There is no way of making a hedge grow like pruning it. There is no way of making sex interesting like repressing it. And as a result of all these centuries of sexual repression and associating it with dirt, the West has developed a peculiar form of eroticism. That is an aspect of this whole problem that I do not think is really very profitable to explore, but I just want to mention in passing that the whole attitude of anti-sexuality in the Christian tradition is not as “anti” as it looks. It is simply a method of making sex prurient and exciting in a kind of dirty way. I suppose it is to be recommended to people who are not feeling very frisky and need to be pepped up.

The other side of the problem is much more interesting. That is to say, the first thing I mentioned, why it is that there has been a problem for human beings about pleasure? We take sexual activity as a supreme pleasure, as a supreme involvement of oneself with the body and the physical world. Why should there be a problem here? Well, the point is simply, isn't it? That the physical world is transient and impermanent; it falls apart. Bodies that were once strong, smooth, and lovely in use begin to wither and become corrupt and turn at last into skeletons. If you cling on to one of those (bodies) and it suddenly turns into a skeleton in your hand, as it will if you speed up your sense of time a little, you will feel cheated. There has been for centuries a lament about this, that life is so short, and all the beauties of this world fall apart. Therefore, if you are wise you do not set your heart on mortal beauty, but you set your heart on spiritual values that are imperishable. Even Omar Khayyam [Khajam] says:

“The Worldly Hope men set their hearts upon

Turns to ashes – or it prospers; and anon

Like snow upon the desert's dusty face

Lighting a little hour or two – is gone.”

So do not bet on that horse.

And read any kind of spiritual literature you want to, Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Taoist, all of them seem to emphasize the importance of detachment from the body, from the physical world, so that you won't be engulfed in the stream of impermanence. The idea is that, to the degree that you identify yourself with the body and with the pleasures of the body, to that degree you are simply going to be something that is sucked away in the course of transience. Therefore hold yourself aloof, as in for example the advice of many Hindus in the practice of yoga, you are advised to look upon all sensory experiences as something out there, that you simply witness. You, yourself identify yourself with the eternal, spiritual, unchanging self—the witness of all that goes on—but who is no more involved in, say, the smoothness or the color of the mirror is affected by the things which it reflects. Keep your mind like a mirror, pure and clean, free from dust, free from flaws, free from stain, and just reflect everything that goes on but don't be attached. You will find this all over the place. But it has always seemed to me that this attitude of essential detachment from the physical universe has underlying it/raises the very serious problem. The problem being why a physical universe at all in that case? If God is in some way responsible for the existence of creation, and if this creation is basically a snare, why did He do it?

And because according to some theologies, the physical universe is looked upon as a mistake, as a fall from the divine state, as if something went wrong in the heavenly domain, causing spirits, such as we are, to fall from their highest state and become involved with animal bodies. There is an ancient analogy of man, which runs right through to the present time, that your relationship to your body is that of a rider to a horse. Saint Francis called his body Brother Ass. That you are a rational soul in charge of an animal body. And therefore if you belong to the old fashioned school, you beat it into submission. I suppose said I beat my body into submission. Or if you are a Freudian you treat your horse not with a whip but with lumps of sugar, kindly; but it is still your horse. Even in Freud there is a very strong element of Puritanism. Read Phillip Rieff's book, on Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer. And how he shows that Freud basically thought that sex was degrading, but nevertheless something biologically unavoidable, something

terribly necessary, which could not just be swept aside but had to be dealt with. But there is you see that heritage of thinking of ourselves as divided, the ego as the rational soul of spiritual origin and the physical body as the animal component. Therefore, all success in life, spiritual success requires the spiritualization of the animal component, the sublimation of its dirty and strange urges. So that is thoroughly cleaned up. I suppose the ideal sexual relationship of such persons would be held on an operating table under disinfectant sprays.

Of course, it is true that the physical world, its beauty and so on is transient. We are all falling apart in some way or other, especially after we pass the peak of youth. But this has never struck me that is something to gripe about. That the physical world is transient seems to me to be part of its splendor. I can imagine nothing more awful than attaining the age of thirty and suddenly being frozen in that age for always and always. You would become a kind of animated waxworks. And you would discover, as a matter of fact that people who have that physical permanence would feel like plastic. And that is as a matter of fact, what is going to be done about us by technology in order to provide/attained perpetual youth. All the parts of our bodies that decay and fold up are going to be replaced by very skillfully manufactured plastic parts, so that in the end we will be entirely made of very, very sophisticated plastic. And everybody will feel like that, and everybody will be utterly bored with each other, because the very fact that the world is always decaying and always falling away is the same thing as its vitality. Vitality is change. Life is death; it is always falling apart.

There are certain supreme moments at which in the body, we attain superb vitality. And that's the time make it then. That's the moment just like when an orchestra is playing, the conductor wants to get a certain group of violinists to come in at a certain moment, and he is conducting and say 'now make it' and they all have to do it, right now, you see? That is the whole art of life, to do it at the right time. To do it in time, like you dance or you play in time. In the same way, when it comes to love, sexuality, or, equally so, in all the pleasures of gastronomy, timing is of the essence. And then it's happened and you've had it. But that is not something that one should look upon with regret. It is regrettable only if you don't know how to take it when it was time.

This is really the essence of what I want to talk about, because to be detached from the world, in the sense that Buddhists and Taoists and Hindus often talk about detachment, does not mean to be non-participative. You can have a sexual life, very rich and full, and yet all the time be detached. By that I do not mean that you just go through it mechanically and have your thoughts elsewhere. I mean a complete participation, but still detached. The difference between the two attitudes is this: On the one hand, there is a way of being so anxious about physical pleasure, so afraid that you won't make it, that you grab it too hard; that you just have to have that thing, and if you do that you destroy it completely. And therefore after every attempt to get it you feel disappointed, you feel empty, you feel something was lost. And therefore you want it again, you have to keep repeating, repeating, repeating, because you never really got there. This is the hang-up. This is what is meant by attachment to this world, in the evil/negative sense.

But on the other hand, pleasure in its fullness cannot be experienced when one is grasping it. I knew a little girl to whom someone gave a bunny rabbit. She was so delighted with it and so afraid of losing it that taking it home in the car she squeezed it to death with love. Lots of parents do that to their children, a lot of spouses do it to each other. They hold on too hard, and so take the life out of this transient, beautifully fragile thing that life is. To have life and to have its pleasure you must, at the same time, let go of it. Then you can feel perfectly free to have that pleasure in the most gutsy, rollicking, earth-shaking, lip-licking way, with one's whole being taken over by a kind of undulative, convulsive ripple, which is like the very pulse of life itself. But, this can happen only if you let go, if you are willing to be abandoned.

It is funny that word – abandoned. We speak of people who are dissolute as being abandoned, but we can also use abandoned as a characteristic of a saint. A great spiritual book by a Jesuit father is called Abandonment to Divine Providence. There are people like that, who just are not hung up. They are the poor in spirit, that is to say they spirituality are poor, in the sense they do not cling to any property. They do not carry burdens around. They are free. Well, just that sort of spiritual poverty, that let-go-ness is

quite essential for the enjoyment of any kind of pleasure at all, and particularly sexual pleasure.

When I was a boy in school, I go back to this because my experience may not be – I do not know how typical it would be of children brought up in the United States in a religious environment – but my experience in England was quite fascinating. About you know, when as one is baptized as a child and you don't know anything about it, and your godfathers and godmothers are yours sponsors, then there comes a time when you are about to enter into puberty, when you are confirmed, when you undertake for yourself your own baptismal vows. And in England confirmation into the Church of England, which is Episcopalian in this country, confirmation is preceded by instruction. And this instruction consisted very largely of lessons in church history, because the British approach to religion is peculiarly archeological, based on the great past, the great Christian saints and heroes. It is really quite interesting, because it somehow associates you, and puts you in the tradition of King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table, and all that sort of thing. But the time comes when every candidate for confirmation has a private talk with the school chaplain. And obviously in every process of initiation into mysteries, from time immemorial, there has been the passing on of a secret. So there is a certain anticipation about this very private communication, because you would think if you being initiated into a religion, what the secret consist of some marvelous information about the nature of God or the fundamental reason for being and so on. But (it is) not so in this case. The initiatory secret talk was a serious lecture on the evils of masturbation. What these evils were was not clearly specified, but it was vaguely hinted that ghastly diseases would result. So, in a perverse sort of way, we used to enjoy tormenting ourselves with imagining what kind of terrible venereal disease, epilepsy, tuberculosis, or the great Siberian itch would result from this practice.

The extraordinary thing about it is this: that the very chaplain who gave these lectures had, in his own upbringing, been given the same lecture by other chaplains, and I imagine this went back some distance in history. And they all knew perfectly well that one of the characteristic behavior patterns of adolescence is ritual defiance of authority. But you have to make some

protest against authority, and in this you are in league with all your contemporaries, your peer group. Nobody would dream of giving anybody else away, because then he would be a tattletale, a skunk, definitely not one of the boys. Therefore, obviously, masturbation provided the ideal outlet for this ritual defiance because it was fun, it was also an assertion of masculinity, and it was very, very wicked.

So I meditated on this sometime as the why the system continued and I came to the realization that the Christian putdown of sex is an extremely mysterious thing. In the religious background of the Western world, we have mainly two traditions, one Semitic, and one Greek. So far as the Semitic tradition is concerned, the material world and sexuality are definitely good things. Both Jews and Muslims think that God's creation of beautiful women was a grand idea. In the Arabic book that is the Islamic version of the Kama Sutra known as *The Perfumed Garden*, the book opens with a prayer to Allah that is a very full, detailed thanksgiving for the loveliness of women, with which Allah has blessed mankind. In the *Book of Proverbs*, we are enjoined to enjoy our wives while they are young. But on the whole it is the Semitic belief that sexuality is justified solely for purposes of reproduction of the species. This makes it good in the eyes of God and sexual energy should not really be wasted for other purposes. That's the limitation put on it.

On the other hand, we have a Greek tradition that is peculiar in that, it is strongly influenced by a dualistic view of the universe, in which material existence is conceived of as a trap, as a fall into turgid clogging matter that is antagonistic to the lightness and freedom of the spirit. Therefore, for certain kinds of Greek religions—among which we must name the Orphic Mysteries, the Neoplatonic point of view, and the late agnostic points of view—being saved means being delivered from material existence into a purely spiritual state. From this point of view, sexual involvement is the very archetype of material environment—martyr, mother, mater, matter, are really the same word. So the love of woman is the great snare. This is, incidentally, a doctrine invented by men. It goes back to the words of Adam, “The woman that thou gavest me, she tempted me, and I did eat.”

In the development of Christian theology, from approximately the time of Saint Paul through the beginning of the Renaissance, it was universally held that sex was a bad thing. You should read Saint Augustine on this; he said that in the Garden of Eden before the Fall, reproduction took place in just the same way and with just the same lack of excitement as one excretes, or passes water and there was no shameful excitation of the sexual parts. The whole attitude of the church fathers in those centuries was that the virgin state was immensely superior spiritually to the marriage state, and that sexual relationships were excusable only within the bonds of marriage and for the sole purposes of reproduction. The manuals and moral penitentiaries of the theologians of the Middle Ages list all sorts of penances that must be said, even by married couples who performed sexual intercourse on the night before attending mass or before receiving Holy Communion. Of course, sex must be avoided completely on certain great church festivals. Although in theory marriage is a sacrament that somehow blesses this peculiar relationship, there is a definite attitude that it is after all dirty and not very nice.

You must realize, also, that in those days the institution of marriage was not what it is today. Marriage at the time of the rise and development of Christianity was a social institution for (creating) alliances between families. You did not marry the person of your own choice except under the most peculiar circumstances. You married the girl your family picked out for you, and they thought it over carefully from its political point of view, as well as from the point of view of eugenics, and whether this was a good healthy girl, and whether this was a good healthy man, they had an economic bargaining about it when you married this girl, you were not necessarily in love with her. And it was perfectly well understood in the secular world that on the side you had other arrangements. You had, if you could afford them, concubines or even second and third and fourth wives. And these subsidiary wives were..., there was someone more choice open to you in getting those than in the first one, first one was definitely a family arrangement. That is the context of it, don't forget that. So what the church were saying was only that woman should be your bedfellow, whose marriage has been arranged by paternal authority.

The idea of romantic love does not arrive in connection with marriage until the troubadour cults of Southern France, of Provence, in the late Middle Ages, when they're begins to be this idea of the idealization of woman as the inspiring goddess almost, of the knight-errant. Dante's Beatrice is the inspiring woman who leads him to heaven. Historians today are not agreed as to whether the ladyloves of the chivalrous knights were in fact their mistresses or whether they were simply idealized women, but the influence of the cult of romantic love on the West was profound. And it brought about a weird combination of ideas: one – the notion of the married state being the only licit relationship in which sexual play might be carried on, and two – the notion that the girl you marry should be the one with whom you have fallen in love. Two more ill-adjusted ideas could hardly be put together, because naturally when you love someone very much indeed, in your enthusiasm of youth, you say things that are hardly logical, or rational. You may stand up before an altar and say, "My darling, my sweetheart, my perfect pet, I adore you so much that I will live with you forever and ever, until death do us part." And that is the way you feel at the time. In a rather similar mood, ancient people would hail their kings and say, "O King, live forever." Obviously this was not meant literally; they were just wishing him a long life. But to live forever? No sir, no mortal does that.

The trouble was that when a certain kind of extravagant poetic expression fell into the hands of people like Augustine and Totalian, who were rather influenced by Roman literalists, they wrote it into the law books. And so this amazing situation came about. But we still have not fully explored the subtlety of it. Let us consider certain periods when this attitude of prudery toward sexuality was in ascendancy. Nearest to our time is the bourgeois revolution in Victorian England and the United States. We all say Victorian as an adjective to indicate grundyism, extreme monogamy, a definite disgust for all things sexual. Yet, when we really go into the history of the Victorian period, we find that it was an extremely lascivious epoch. One has only to look at the lushness of Victorian furniture to realize that chairs were disguised women; even the way piano legs were shaped reflects this influence throughout Victorian art forms, and the conduct of the British aristocracy, during that period, beg a description.

People like Freud and Havelock Ellis made a certain mistake. They said about the church and about religion in general, that it was nothing but a form of sublimated sex. They said, “These people for curious reasons suppressed sex, and therefore it became a very powerful force for them.” You must remember of course that they worked on a hydraulic analogy of human psychology. That they likened it all to a river—if you dammed it up, it could burst the dam. It does not actually follow that human psychology is hydraulic, but this is the metaphor they used. They said, “The church has repressed sex, but if you look at its symbolism, it is nothing but an expression of sex. Everything is reduced to libido as the fundamental reality”. The church replied: “It is nothing of the kind. We deny this. We think that this reduction of everything to sex is just a way of attacking holy things, and on the contrary, we would say that people who are fascinated with sex and make it their god are repressing religion.”

The problem in this debate – everybody has missed the boat. The church should have said to Freud, “Well, of course, thank you very much. Yes indeed, our symbolism is sexual. The steeples of our churches, the vesicle-shaped windows and heraldic shields on which we put images of the crucifix or the Virgin Mother of God, these are all quite plainly sexual. But you see, the sexual biology in its turn, reveals the mysteries of the universe. Sex is not mere sex. Sex is a holy thing, and that’s one of the most marvelous revelations of the divine.” But imagine, the church just could not say that.

If you look at Tibetan Buddhist iconography and their images, or you look at Hindu temples, you will find things that Europeans and Americans have never been able to understand. Here are images of buddhas and of the gods engaged in amazing diversions with their female counterparts. Everybody thinks that these are kinds of dirty sculptures, but they are nothing of the kind. They are saying to the people who look at them that the play of man and woman is, on the level of biology, a reflection of the fundamental play of the cosmos. The play of positive and negative principles, of the light and the dark, of the mental and the material, they all play together. And the function of sexual play is not merely the survival and utilitarian function of reproducing the species, as it is among animals to a very large extent. What peculiarly distinguishes human sexuality is that it brings the partners closer

and closer to each other in an intense state of united feeling. In other words, it is a sacrament, the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, bringing about love. So, if that is peculiar to human beings, it is perfect nonsense to degrade human sexuality by saying it should only be carried on in the way that animals do this, because they have not yet evolved to the place where sex is the sacramental expression of man and woman's love. And a love in that sense is a kind of enthusiasm, which means being possessed by the Divine. Falling in love, although considered by practical people to be a sort of madness, is actually the same sort of thing as the mystical vision, or grace. In its light we see people in their divine aspect. When the song says "Every little breeze whispers Louise," that is a sort of extraordinary state of mystical intoxication in which the ideal woman becomes a goddess. Which is from one point of view, what every woman is, if you see her with the scales off your eyes. Likewise, every man seen with the scales off her eyes. [to see the true reality]

What happened then, as a result of this historical situation, was mutual name-calling, between the proponents of religion and the proponents of scientific naturalism, such as Freud and Ellis, people of that kind. They have never got together because they have never understood, neither the church nor the opponents of the church, has clearly understood that the secret of unconscious motivation of sexual repression is to make it all more interesting. And on the other side, it has never been clearly understood that sexual biology and all that goes with it, is a triggering forth, on the level of biology, of what the whole universe is about – ecstatic play. So as a result, there has been a kind of compromise. Today in ecclesiastical circles, sex is being damned with faint praise. People are saying, "After all, sex was made by God, and we should remember the Jewish point of view, and perhaps it is for something more than reproduction, it may bring about the cementing of the marriage ties between husband and wife," but still in practice it remains the frightening taboo.

On the other hand, the opposition to Christian prudery goes overboard and always moves in the direction of total license. You see, what's going on is a contest between the people who want the skirt pull down to the floor and the people who want them pulled up to the neck. And you have got to draw the line somewhere. But the play between these forces is: where we're

gonna draw the line. That is very exciting (play), providing neither side wins. I mean, imagine what it would be like if the libertines won and they took over the church, so that on Wednesday evenings the young Presbyterian group could meet for prayer through sex. Every child would go to the school physician for a course in hygienics, they would have classes and plastic models, and all the children would do it in class in very clean, hygienic circumstances all sprayed with rubbing alcohol. Imagine how boring it would all become. So you see, the people who say: 'no, modesty is important' have something right about it. But they must not be allowed to get away with it, but they must not be obliterated. You see, life works that way.

Let's take an entirely different analogy, let's take a given biological group, a species we will call A. It has a natural enemy, B. One day A gets furious at its natural enemy B and says, "Let us obliterate B." They gather their forces and knock out their natural enemy. Suddenly, after a while, they begin to get weak, they get overpopulated. There is nobody around to eat up their surplus members, and they do not have to keep their muscles tensed against any enemy. They begin to fall apart because they have destroyed their enemy. What they should do is cultivate the enemy. That is the real meaning of "Love your enemy." There is such a thing as a beloved enemy. And if you don't have a beloved enemy, another words if the flies and the spiders don't go together, there would be too many spiders or too many flies. These balances keep the course of nature going, what is exactly the same thing as between the libertines and the prudes. They need each other. And you should thank, if you have a prudish father and mother, you should be very grateful to them for having made sex so interesting. So don't defy them completely, don't go to your own campus with signs bearing four letter words, because that's going to spoil the show. But every generation must react to the one before it, to this keeps this tension going. It is by this tension, this play of the opposites that we have the love that makes the world go round.

Philosophy and Society

Veil of Thoughts

The subject of this seminar is The Veil of Thoughts, and following out the theme that somebody once suggested by saying that thought is a means of concealing truth, despite the fact that it's an extraordinarily useful faculty. But in quite recent weeks we've had an astounding example of the way mankind can be bamboozled by thoughts. There was a crisis about gold. And the confusion of money—in any form whatsoever—with wealth is one of the major problems from which civilization is suffering. Because, way back in our development, when we first began to use symbols to represent the events of the physical world, we found this such an ingenious device that we became completely fascinated with it. And in ever so many different dimensions of life we are living in a state of total confusion between symbol and reality. And the real reason why, in our world today—where there is no technical reason whatsoever why there should be any poverty at all—the reason it still exists is people keep asking the question: “Where's the money going to come from?” Not realizing that money doesn't come from anywhere and never did, except if you thought it was gold. And then, of course, if to increase the supply of gold and use that to finance all the world's commerce, prosperity would depend not upon finding new processes for growing food in vast quantities, or getting nutrition out of the ocean, or getting water from atomic energy—no, it depends on discovering a new gold mine.

And you can see what a nonsensical state of affairs that is, because when gold is used for money it becomes, in fact, useless. Gold is a very useful metal for filling teeth, making jewelry, and maybe covering the dome of the Capitol in Washington. But the moment it is locked up in vaults in the form of ingots it becomes completely useless. It becomes a false security, something that people cling to, like an idol, like a belief in some kind of Big Daddy Oh God with whiskers who lives above the clouds. And all that kind

of thing diverts our attention from reality, and we go through all sorts of weird rituals. The symbol, in other words, gets in the way of practical life.

So it was—you remember the Great Depression? I expect a number of you here, looking around, are old enough to remember the Great Depression—when, one day, everybody was doing business and things were going along pretty well, and the next day there were bread lines. It was like someone came to work and they said to him, “Sorry, chum, but you can’t build today. No building can go on. We don’t have enough inches.” He’d say, “What do you mean, we don’t have enough inches? We’ve got wood, haven’t we? We got metal, we even got tape measures!” They say, “Yeah, but you don’t understand the business world. We just haven’t got enough inches! Just plain inches. We’ve used too much of them.” And that’s exactly what happened when we had the Depression. Because money is something of the same order of reality as inches, grams, meters, pounds, or lines of latitude and longitude. It is an abstraction. It is a method of bookkeeping to obviate the cumbersome procedures of barter. But our culture, our civilization is entirely hung up on the notion that money has an independent reality of its own.

And this is a very striking, concrete example of what I’m going to talk about: of the way we are bamboozled by our thoughts which are symbols. And what we can do to become un-bamboozled, because it’s a very serious state of affairs. Most of our political squabbles are entirely the result of being bamboozled by thinking. And it is to be noted that, as time goes on, the matters about which we fight with each other are increasingly abstract, and the wars fought about abstract problems get worse and worse. We are thinking about vast abstractions, ideologies called communism, capitalism—all these systems—and paying less and less attention to the world of physical reality, to the world of earth, and trees, and waters, people, and so are in the name of all sorts of abstractions busy destroying our natural environment. Wildlife, for example, is having a terrible problem continuing to exist alongside human beings.

Another example of this fantastic confusion is that, not so long ago, the Congress voted a law imposing stern penalties upon anyone who should presume to burn the American flag. And they put this law through with a

great deal of patriotic oratory, and the quoting of poems and so on about Old Glory, ignoring the fact entirely that these same congressmen—by acts of commission or omission—are burning up that for which the flag stands. They're allowing the utter pollution of our waters, of our atmosphere, the devastation of our forests, and the increasing power of the bulldozer to bring about a ghastly fulfillment of the biblical prophecy that "every valley shall be exalted, every mountain laid low, and the rough places plain." But—you see—they don't see, they don't notice the difference between the flag and the country. Or, as Korzybski pointed out, the difference between the map and the territory.

Now, however, I think we should begin by talking a little bit about when we use the word "physical reality"—as distinct from "abstraction"—what are we talking about? Because, you see, there's going to be a fight about this, philosophically. If I say that the final reality that we're living in is the physical world, a lot of people will say that I'm a materialist, that I'm unspiritual, and that I think too much of an identification of the man with the body. Any book that you'll open on yoga or Hindu philosophy will have in it a declaration that you start a meditation practice by saying to yourself, "I am not the body. I am not my feelings. I am not my thoughts. I am the witness who watches all this and is not really any of it." And so, if I were to say, then, that the physical world is the basic reality, I would seem to be contradicting what is said in these Hindu texts. But it all depends on what you mean by the "physical world." What is it?

First of all, it must be pointed out that the idea of the "material world" is itself philosophical. It is in its own way a symbol. And so, if I take up something that is generally agreed to be something in the material world, and I argue that this is material—of course, it isn't. Because nobody has ever been able to put their finger on anything material—that is to say if, by the word "material," you mean some sort of basic stuff out of which the world is made. By, say, analogy with the art of ceramics, pottery: we use clay and we form it into various shapes, and so a lot of people think that the physical world is various forms of matter. And nobody has ever been able to discover any matter. They've been able to discover various forms, yes—there is patterns, but no matter. You can't even think how you would describe matter in some terms other than form, because whenever a

physicist talks about the nature of the world he describes a form, he describes a process which can be put into the shape of a mathematical equation. And so, if you say, “ $A + B = B + A$,” everybody knows exactly what you mean. It’s a perfectly clear statement, but nobody needs to ask, “What do you mean by ‘A’?” or “What do you mean by ‘B’?” Or, if you say, “ $1 + 2 = 3$,” that’s perfectly clear, but you don’t need to know one what, two what, or three what.

And all our descriptions of the physical world have the nature of these formulae: numbers. They’re simply mathematical patterns. Because what we’re talking about is pattern. But it’s pattern of such a high degree of complexity that it’s very difficult to deal with it by thinking. In science we really work in two different ends of the spectrum of reality. We can deal with problems in which there are a very few variables, or we can deal with problems in which there are almost infinitely many variables. But in between we’re pretty helpless. In other words, the average person cannot think through a problem involving more than three variables without a pencil in his hand. That’s why, for example, it’s difficult to learn complex music. Think of an organist who has two keyboards—or three keyboards—for work with his hands, and each hand is doing a different rhythm. And then his feet on the pedals: he can be doing a different rhythm with each foot. Now, that’s a difficult thing for people to learn to do, just like to rub your stomach in a circle and pat your head at the same time takes a little skill.

Now, most problems with which we deal in everyday life involve far more than three variables. And we’re really incapable of thinking about them. Actually, the way we think about most of our problems is simply going through the motions of thinking. We don’t really think about them, we do most of our decision-making by hunch. You can collect data about a decision that you have to make, but the data that you collect has the same sort of relation to the actual processes involved in this decision as a skeleton to a living body. It’s just the bones. And there are all sorts of entirely unpredictable possibilities involved in every decision, and you don’t really think about it at all. The truth of the matter is that we are as successful as we are—which is surprising, the degree to which we are successful in conducting our everyday practical lives—because our brains do the thinking

for us in an entirely unconscious way. The brain is far more complex than any computer. The brain is, in fact, the most complex known object in the universe. Because our neurologists don't understand it. They have a very primitive conception of the brain and admit it. And therefore, if we do not understand our own brains, that simply shows that our brains are a great deal more intelligent than we are. Meaning—by “we”—the thing that we have identified ourselves with. Instead of being sensible and identifying ourselves with our brains, we identify ourselves with a very small operation of the brain, which is the faculty of conscious attention, which is a sort of radar that we have that scans the environment for unusual features. And we think we are that, and we're nothing of the kind. That's just a little trick we do. So, actually, our brain is analyzing all sensory input all the time: analyzing all the things you don't notice, don't think about, don't have even names for. And so it is this marvelous complex goings on which is responsible for our being able to adapt ourselves intelligently to the rest of the physical world. The brain is, furthermore, an operation of the physical world.

But now, you see, though, we get back to this question: “physical world.” This is a concept. This is simply an idea. And if you want to ask me to differentiate between the physical and the spiritual, I will not put the spiritual in the same class as the abstract. But most people do. They think that $1 + 2 = 3$ is a proposition of a more spiritual nature than, say, for example, a tomato. But I think a tomato is a lot more spiritual than $1 + 2 = 3$. This is where we really get to the point. That's why, in Zen Buddhism, when people ask, “What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism?” you could very well answer “A tomato.” Because, look how—when you examine the material world—how diaphanous it is. It really isn't very solid. A tomato doesn't last very long. Nor, for that matter, do the things that we consider most exemplary of physical reality, such as mountains. The poet says, “The hills are shadows, and they flow from form to form, and nothing stands.” Because the physical world is diaphanous. It's like music. When you play music it simply disappears, there's nothing left. And for that very reason it is one of the highest and most spiritual of the arts: because it is the most transient.

And so, in a way, you might say that transiency is a mark of spirituality. A lot of people think the opposite: that the spiritual things are the everlasting things. But, you see, the more a thing tends to be permanent, the more it tends to be lifeless. Nothing is so dead as a diamond, and yet, this imagery—the idea of the most mineral objects being the most permanent, and so they get associated with the spiritual. Jesus Christ is called the Rock of Ages. And even the Buddhists have used the diamond—the vajra—as an image of the fundamental reality of the universe. But the reason why they used the diamond was not that it was hard, but that it was completely transparent and, therefore, afforded a symbol of the void which everything fundamentally is. Not meaning that there simply is nothing there, but the void means that you cannot get any idea which will sufficiently define physical reality. Every idea will be wrong. In that sense, it will be void.

So then, the physical world: we can't even find any stuff out of which it's made. We can only recognize each other, and I say "Well, I realize that I met you before, and that I see you again. But the thing that I recognize is not anything, really, except a consistent pattern." Let's suppose I have a rope, and this rope begins by being manila rope, then it goes on by being cotton rope, then it goes on with being nylon, then it goes on with being silk. So I tie a knot in the rope, and I move the knot down along the rope. Now, is it—as it moves along—the same knot or a different knot? We would say it is the same because you recognize the pattern of the knot. But at one point it's manila, at another point it's cotton, another point it's nylon, and another it's silk. And that's just like us. We are recognized by the fact that, one day, you face the same way as you did the day before, and people recognize your facing. So they say that's John Doe or Mary Smith. But, actually, the contents of your face—whatever they may be; the water, the carbons, the chemicals—are changing all the time. You're like a whirlpool in a stream. The stream is doing this consistent whirlpooling and we always recognize—like at Niagara: the whirlpool is one of the sights, but the water is always moving on. And we are just like that, and everything is like that.

So there's nothing in the physical world that is what you might call substantial. It's pattern. And this is why it's so spiritual. To be non-spiritual is not to see that; in other words, it is to impose upon the physical world the idea of thing-ness, of substantiality. That is to be—in the sense that the

Hindus use it—that is “to be involved in matter;” to identify with the body. To believe—in other words—that the body is something constant, something tangible. The body is really very intangible. You cannot pin it down; it’s all falling apart, furthermore. And we’re aging, getting older, and so, therefore, if you cling to the body you will be frustrated. So the whole point is that the material world—the world of nature—is marvelous so long as you don’t try to lean on it, so long as you don’t cling to it. And if you don’t cling to it you can have a wonderful time with it.

Let’s take a very controversial issue: all spiritual people are generally against lovemaking. Ramkr̥ṣṇa used to speak about the evils of woman and gold—I’ve already demonstrated the evils of gold. But what about the evils of woman? In my point of view, yes, women can be a source of evil if you attempt to possess them. I mean, if you can say to another person, “I love you so much I want to own you, and really tie you down, and call you”—well, it’s like that poem of Ogden Nash, where someone claimed that he loved his wife so much he climbed a mountain and named it after her. Called it Mount Mrs. Oswald Tregennis! And so, in other words, if you try to possess people and you make your sexual passion possessive in that way, then, of course, you are trying to cling to the physical world. But, you see, women are—in a way—much more interesting if you don’t cling to them, if you let them be themselves and be free. And, in my opinion, you can have a very spiritual sex life if you are not possessive. But if, on the other hand, you are possessive, then you’re in trouble.

But, you know, the average svāmī won’t agree with that because he confuses—by thinking that the body (the body that I touch) is something evil—he’s hung up with it. It’s like the story of the two Zen monks who were crossing the river, and the ford was very deep because of the flood. And there was a girl trying to get across, and one of the monks immediately picked her up, threw her over his shoulder and carried her across. Put her down on the other side, and then the monks went one way and she went another. And the other monk, who had been in a kind of embarrassed silence and which he finally broke, he said, “You realize that you broke a monastic rule by touching and picking up a woman like that?” And he said, “Oh, but I left her on the other side of the river, and you’re still carrying her!”

So the whole question, then, you see, is that even—you can find this to some extent in some rather irritable saint (Paul), where he speaks of the opposition of the flesh and the spirit. Now, this word—σάρξ (sarx) in Greek; “the flesh”—as he uses it, is really—as Bogaev points out—it’s a spiritual category. For the Christian, you see, the word is made flesh in Christ, and there will be the resurrection of the body in the final consummation of the universe. So you cannot really, as an orthodox Christian, take an antagonistic attitude to the flesh. Why, then, does St. Paul take an antagonistic attitude to the flesh?

Well, you can only save the situation and make the New Testament consistent with itself by saying that he meant by “the flesh” a certain kind of spiritual category. He didn’t mean this [Alan slaps his own arm], because this isn’t flesh. Flesh is a concept, this is not. And so the flesh—or, you might talk about the sins of the flesh—they have entirely to do with certain hangups that we have about our bodies. And that, again, is what I would call leaning on the world, exploiting it.

When you take, as a Buddhist, you take the Third Precept: *Kāmesumicchācāra veramaṇī sikkhāpadaṃ samādiyāmi*. And it’s usually translated “I undertake the precept to refrain from adultery.” It doesn’t say anything of the kind. *Kāma* is “passion.” *Kāmesumicchācāra*, therefore, is “I undertake the precept not to exploit the passions.” So, in other words, you may be bored—see?—and you’re feeling sort of empty and at a loose end, and you think, “Well, I dunno, let’s go and commit adultery. It might liven things up.” See? And that would be what they call in Zen “raising waves when no wind is blowing.” It would be quite a different matter if, in a perfectly spontaneous and natural way, you fell in love with some woman. You wouldn’t be going out of your way to get in trouble. It would be appropriate and natural at the time. Or, in the same way, a lot of people—instead of saying “let’s commit adultery”—when they feel sort of bored they say, “Let’s go and eat something.” And so they become fatter and fatter and fatter because they’re filling the spiritual vacuum in their psyche with food, which doesn’t do the job. It’s not the function of food to fill spiritual vacuums. So, in this way, one exploits the appetites or the passions.

So, likewise, also the Fifth Precept: Surāmerayamajjapamādaṭṭhānā is a list of intoxicating substances. And it doesn't say that you are not going to take them, it says you're not going to be intoxicated by them. In other words: a Buddhist may drink, but not to get drunk. I don't know how that applies to psychedelics, but that's another story.

So one might say, then, that we are confused, through and through, about what we mean by the "material world." And what I'm first of all doing is I'm just giving a number of illustrations which show how confused we are. And let me repeat this to get it clear, because it is rather complicated: in the first place, we confuse abstract symbols—that is to say, numbers and words and formulae—with physical events as we confuse money with consumable wealth. In the second place, we confuse physical events—the whole class and category of physical events—with matter. But matter, you see, is an idea; it's a concept. It's the concept of stuff, of something solid and permanent that you can catch hold of. Now, you just can't catch hold of the physical world. The physical world is the most evasive, illusive process that there is. It will not be pinned down and, therefore, it fulfills all the requirements of spirit.

So what I'm saying, then, is that the non-abstract world—which Korzybski called "unspeakable," which is really a rather good word—is the spiritual world. And the spiritual world isn't something kind of gaseous, abstract, formless (in that sense of "shapeless"), it's formless in another sense: the formless world is the wiggly world. There really is no way that the physical world is. In other words, the nature of truth—I said in the beginning that somebody had said thoughts were made to conceal truth—this is a fact because there is no such thing as the truth that can be stated. In other words, ask the question "What is the true position of the stars in the Big Dipper?" Well, it depends where you're looking at them from. And there is no absolute position. So, in the same way, a good accountant will tell you that any balance sheet is simply a matter of opinion. There's no such thing as the true state of affairs of a business.

But we're all hooked on the idea that there is, you see, an external, objective world which is a certain way, and that it really is that way. History, for example, is a matter of opinion. History is an art, not a science.

It's something constructed, which is accepted as a more or less satisfactory explanation of events which, as a matter of fact, don't have an explanation at all. Most of what happens in history is completely irrational. But people always have to feel that they've got to find a meaning. For example: you get sick, and you've lived a very good life, and you've been helpful to other people and done all sorts of nice things. Then you get cancer. And you say to the clergyman, "Why did this have to happen to me?" And you're looking for an explanation—and there isn't one. It just happened that way. But people feel if they can't find an explanation they feel very, very insecure. Why? Because they haven't been able to straighten things out. The world is not that way.

So the truth—in other words: what is going on—is, of course, a lot of wiggles. But the way it is is always in relation to the way you are. In other words, however hard I hit a skinless drum, it will make no noise, because noise is a relationship between a fist and a skin. So, in exactly the same way, light is a relationship between electrical energy and eyeballs. It is you, in other words, who evoke the world. And you evoke the world in accordance with what kind of a you you are; what kind of an organism. One organism evokes one world, another organism evokes another world. And so everything—reality is a kind of relationship.

So once one gets rid of the idea of "the truth" as some way the world is in a fixed sense—say "it is that way," see?—then you get to another idea of the truth altogether: the idea of a truth that cannot be stated, the truth that cannot be pinned down. And then, that is the kind of truth that is God when we speak of God as the reality that exceeds all thoughts, that surpasses all definitions, that is infinite, unbounded, eternal, immeasurable in terms of time. That's what we're talking about. We're not talking about a gaseous vertebrate or a huge, vast void without any wiggles in it. All gas. We'll put it another way altogether: the truth that cannot be pinned.

Well now, in the first talk I was explaining that the theme of this seminar was the problem of how thoughts protect us from truth and what to do about it, and showing various ways in which the symbolizing process—which we call thinking; the use of signs, words, symbols, numbers to represent what's

going on in the external world or the world of nature—leads us into a curious confusion that we confuse the symbolic process with the actual world. And the temptation to do this arises from the extraordinary relative success that we have had in controlling the world of nature with the power of thought. But I don't know if it's ever struck you that we really don't know whether we have successfully controlled it or not. It could be argued—a very strong case could be made—that the entire intellectual venture of civilization has been a ghastly mistake, and that we are now on a collision course, and that all the vaunted benefits of intelligence (technology and all that) is simply going to draw the human race to an extremely swift conclusion.

Of course, that might not be a bad thing. I've sometimes speculated on the idea that all stars have been created out of planets. And that these planets developed high civilizations which eventually understood the secrets of nuclear energy and, naturally, blew themselves up. And in the process these stars flung out lumps of rock as they blew up, which eventually spun around them and became planets all over again. And that this is the actual method of genesis of the universe which would accord, of course, with the Hindu cosmology where time and the events in time are invariably looked upon as a process of progressive deterioration through the cycles of each kalpa, in which things get worse and worse as time goes on until it can't stand itself anymore, and it blows up and, after a period of rest and recuperation, begins all over again.

Why do we somehow have a distaste for a theory of time which runs in that direction? I mean, would you rather have a rhythm that goes nyeeaw-zhip, nyeeaw-zhip, or one that goes neeiyp-pow-neeiyp? See? I mean, which is it? Or you want one that's going up always? You see? Always getting better. You can't even imagine such a state of affairs because, you know, it's relative. As you succeed in life you simply... well, there was a communist—a Russian, not a communist—a Russian philosopher who accused the communists in their various five-year plans and progressive notions (wherein people were always preparing for tomorrow) of converting all human beings into caryatids. Now, you know, a caryatid is a pillar, shaped in a human form, which supports a roof. And he said “You are turning all men into caryatids to support a stage upon which others will dance.” But, of

course, you know they never will. You have one row of caryatids supporting a floor, and very soon your children are the next row of caryatids supporting another floor: so that it gets higher and higher, and we don't really know where we began and we're always in the same place. Always hoping, always thinking that the next time will be it. And this, of course, is an eternal illusion. It's much better—actually, one would be much happier—to think that the future is simply deteriorating. I can explain that very simply.

Human beings are largely engaged in wasting enormous amounts of psychic energy in attempting to do things that are quite impossible. You know—as the proverb says—you can't lift yourself up by your own bootstraps. But recently, I've heard a lot of references in just general reading and listening where people say, "We've got to lift ourselves up by our own bootstraps!" And you can't! And you can struggle, and tug, and pull until you're blue in the face, and nothing happens except that you've exhausted yourself. All sensible people therefore begin in life with two fundamental presuppositions: you are not going to improve the world, and you are not going to improve yourself. You are just what you are. And once you have accepted that situation, you have an enormous amount of energy available to do things that can be done. And everybody else, looking at you from an external point of view, will say, "My God, how much so-and-so has improved!" But I know—I mean, hundreds of my friends are at work on enterprises to improve themselves—by one religion or another, one therapy or another, this system, that system—and I'm desperately trying to free people from this. And I suppose that makes me a messiah of some kind.

But the thing is that you can't do it for one very simple reason—which, I think, most of you are by now familiar with—is that the part of you which is supposed to improve you is exactly the same as that part of you which needs to be improved. In other words, there isn't any real distinction between 'bad me' and 'good I,' between the 'higher self' which is spiritual and the 'lower self' which is animal. It's all of a piece; you are this organism, this integrated, fascinating energy pattern. And as Archimedes said: "Give me a fulcrum and I will move the Earth." But there isn't one. It's like—you know—betting on the future of the human race. If I were really smart I would lay a bet that the human race will destroy itself,

because (in practical politics) one realizes that nothing is going to work out right. No candidate I've ever voted for ever won the election. But the trouble is there's nowhere to place the bet! And so, since I can't place the bet anywhere, I'm involved in the world and must perforce try to see that it doesn't blow itself to pieces.

But the thing—I once had a terrible argument with Margaret Mead. She was holding forth one evening on the absolute horror of the atomic bomb and how everybody should immediately spring into action and abolish it. But she was getting so furious about it that I said to her, “You know, you scare me. Because I think you're the kind of person who will push the button in order to get rid of the other people who were going to push it first.” And she told me that I had no love for my future generations, no responsibility for my children, and I was a phony swami who believed in retreating from facts. But I maintain my position. Robert Oppenheimer, a little while before he died, said that it's perfectly obvious that the whole world is going to hell. The only possible chance that it might not is that we do not attempt to prevent it from doing so.

Because, you see, all the troubles going on in the world now are being supervised by people with very good intentions. They're attempts to keep things in order, to clean things up, to forbid this and prevent that possible horrendous damage. And the more we try, you see, to put everything to rights, the more we make fantastic messes. And it gets worse. And maybe that's the way it's got to be. Maybe I shouldn't say anything at all about the folly of trying to put things to right. But simply, on the principle of Blake, let the fool persist in his folly so that he will become wise.

Audience:

Would this be an argument against conservationists?

This is an argument against all kinds of do-gooding. In other words, it's simply—it's the... what I'm saying is: don't take me too seriously. I'm pitching a case for the fact that civilization has been a mistake; that it would be much better to leave everything alone. That the wild animals are wiser than we in that they—putting it in our crude and not very exact language—they just follow their instincts. And if a moth mistakes a flame for the signal

on which it gets a mating call and flies into the flame, so what? That just keeps the moth population down. And a moth doesn't worry. You know, it doesn't go buzzing around in a state of anxiety, wondering whether this sex call is the real thing or just a flame. It doesn't think consciously about the future—at least, we suppose this is so. Maybe it does. But we suppose that it doesn't and, therefore, it isn't troubled. But the species of moths goes on and on and on, and so far as we know it's been around for an incredibly long time, and may be even longer than we have. Bees, ants—creatures of this kind—they have long since escaped from history, so far as we can see. In other words, they live a settled existence which you might consider rather boring because it doesn't have constant change in the way that we do. They live the same rhythm again and again and again, but because they don't bother to remember it consciously it never gets boring. And because they don't bother to predict, they're never in a state of anxiety. And yet they survive.

Now we—who “look before and after,” as Emerson says, and predict, and are always concerned whether this generation is gonna be better or worse than the one that came before—we are tormented. And we just don't realize—because of this tremendous preoccupation with time—we don't realize how beautiful we are, in spite of ourselves. Because, you see, the conscious radar is a troubleshooter: it's always on the watch out for variations in the environment which may bring about disaster. And so our consciousness is, from one day's end to another, entirely occupied with time and with planning, and with what has been and with what will be. And since troubleshooting is its function, we then get the general feeling that man is born to trouble. And we ignore in this preoccupation with conscious attention how marvelously we get on, how—for most of the time—our physical organs are in a fantastically harmonious relationship, how our body relates by all sorts of unconscious responses to the physical environment. So that if you became aware of all the adjustment processes that are being managed spontaneously and subconsciously by your organism, you would find yourself in the middle of great music. And, of course, this occasionally happens.

The mystical experience is nothing other than becoming aware of your true physical relationship to the universe. And you're amazed—thunderstruck—

by the feeling that underneath everything that goes on in this world, the fundamental thing is a state of unbelievable bliss. Well, why not? Why else would there be anything happening? Because if the game isn't worth the candle, if the universe is basically nothing but a tormented struggle, why have one? Hasn't it ever struck you that it would be much simpler not to have any existence? It would require no effort. There would be no problems. So why is there anything going on? Let me say not why, but how is there anything going on? Because if it's all fundamentally a drag, I just don't see any reason for its being. Everything would have committed suicide long ago. And to be at rest.

About Ben Adhem—may his tribe decrease

By cautious birth control and be at peace.

—G.K. Chesterton, *The Philanthropist*

So we might work on this possibility, then—that civilization is a mistake and that we've taken completely the wrong track and should have left things to nature, as it were. And, of course, this is the same problem that is brought up in the Book of Genesis. Actually, the fall of man, in Genesis, is his venture into technology. Because in the Bible, the Hebrew words for the knowledge of good and evil are connected with technics. What is technically expeditious and what is not—words connected with, actually, metallurgy—and to be as God, you see. When you “eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge and you become as God” means you think you're going to control your own life. And God says, “Okay, baby! You wanted to be God! You try it!” But the trouble with you is you've got a one-track mind. And therefore you can't be God. To be God you have to have an infinitely many-tracked mind—which is, of course, what your brain has, you see? The brain is infinitely many-tracked, but consciousness is not—it's one-tracked. As we say: you can only think of one thing at a time. And you cannot take charge of the universe with that kind of a consciousness because there's too much of it. As I explained before: too many variables. And our science can take care of a few variables, or of an enormous number of variables (as in quantum mechanics) by statistical methods—as we can use statistical methods to predict that most people will live to be 65 years old, at least, but we cannot say of any given individual whether he will live

to 65 or not. That's what we wanted to know! But the problem is that the variables on each individual are too complicated. And we have not yet, you see, developed a science which can deal with, say, 50- or 100- or 500-variable systems. It's too complicated to think about. But computers are going to help us. But, as yet, we are either on the low number or the extremely high number. And these are outside the range of the problems with which we are really concerned.

That's why, for example, a lot of people have taken to using the I Ching; the Book of Changes. Because if you're tossing a coin to make your decisions—and everybody does, fundamentally, make their decision by tossing coins—it's better to have a 64-sided coin than a two-sided coin. The I Ching gives you 64 possibilities of approach to any given decision instead of just two: yes or no. It's based on yes or no because it's based on the yang and the yin, but in the same way that digital computers use a number-system which consists only of the figures 0 and 1 out of which you can construct any number. And this was invented by Leibniz, who got it from the Book of Changes. It's amazing how this book is somehow always with us. But this, then, is a way of helping your own multi-variablened brain arrive at decisions, cooperating with your own mind. Because, then again, after you've tossed your 64-sided coin, the oracle that you read—that explains each particular hexagram in the Book of Changes—is a sort of Rorschach blot. It is a very laconic remarks into which everybody reads just exactly what they want to read. But that helps you make a decision by the fact that you don't really have to accept responsibility for it. See? Then you can say, "It told me. I consulted the oracle." The same way when you go to a guru. You say, "My guru is very wise and he's instructed me this, that, and the other." But it was you who decided on this guru. How did you know he was a good one? See? You gave him his authority because you picked him out. It always comes back to you, but we like to pretend it doesn't. But the thing is that one's self is certainly not the stream of consciousness. One's self is everything that goes on underneath that, and of which the stream of consciousness is a mere—well, it has about the same relation to one's self as the bookkeeping does to a business. And if you're selling grocery, there's very little resemblance between your books and what you move over your shelves and counters. It's just a record of it, and that's what our consciousness keeps.

Now supposing, then, we work with the argument that we've made an awful mistake in bringing out civilization and we're not going to survive. Now, there are various things that can be said about this. Just as I made the joke that all stars used to be planets, one could say, "Well, is it such a good thing to survive?" You know T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land* says "this is the way the world ends: not with a bang, but a whimper." But some people would rather end with a bang than a whimper. Some people are stingy and they like to burn up their fire very gradually, conserving the fuel and just keep enough heat going so that they get a long time. Other people prefer a kind of a potlatch situation where they have a huge whiz-bang fire that goes out in a hurry. Now, who is right? Do you want to be a tortoise? You know, a tortoise that lives for hundreds of years but drags itself around all the time very slow, slow, slow sullen? Or would you rather be a little hummingbird—yeah, yeah! Humming bird, that's the thing! See?—that dances and lives at a terrific pace? Well, you can't say one is right and the other's wrong. And so there may be nothing wrong with the idea of a world, a civilization, a culture that lives at a terrific increasing pace of change and then explodes. That may be perfectly okay. My point is that if we could reconcile ourselves to the notion that that is perfectly okay, then we would be less inclined to push that button. It's the anxiety. If you cannot stand anxiety—and if you cannot simply be content for issues to be undecided—you are liable to push the button because you say, "Let's get it over with."

People who have trouble with the law and are manipulating the courts in one way or another always learn to delay everything: put it off, introduce legal red tape managed to—like Ralph Ginzburg, who's been in trouble because of the *Eros Magazine*. He's got a very smart attorney who's simply the—although the case has gone to the Supreme Court—he's simply mumbling away and putting up all sorts of things so that he keeps Ralph out of jail. And that's life! Life is simply a way of postponing death. And that's what we have to do.

So then, let's say, "Well, civilization wasn't really a mistake. It was just as natural as anything else: a being that exists under conditions of illusion that imagines that it's controlling its own destiny, that thinks it's capable of improving itself, and—by virtue of this illusion—destroys itself rapidly in an interesting way." You see? Let's suppose that's what we are. But you still

come back to the point that you are spending an enormous amount of energy in doing things that can't be done—that is to say, tugging at the bootstraps. And if you find this frustrating, if you really don't like it, you don't have to do it! You can stop. And the paradox is that, when you stop, you become happier and more energetic. People always wondered about the Calvinists because Calvinists believed that, from the beginning of time, God had foreordained who was to be saved and who is to be damned, and you have no choice. Predestination. Therefore, the logical assumption would be that people who believed in predestination would be a *laissez faire*: they just sit and wait saying, “There's nothing we can do about it.” But Calvinists were quite other than that. They were very energetic people; too energetic. Very, very vigorously moral. They gave us the Protestant ethic. But they believed in predestination because, you see, they simply had all the psychic energy which Catholics were dissipating upon wondering whether they were saved or not—see?—and being in a state of fear and trembling about “Have I made the right decision? Did I act rightly?” and so on. So they didn't have as much energy as the Calvinists.

So then, in this day and age we say—in the line of thought of psychiatry or of most schools of psychotherapy—it's important for you to accept yourself rather than to be in conflict. Get with yourself. But everybody says, “But!” Because nobody dares take that too far. There's always a little bit of reservation on the end of it. It's like, I've never heard a preacher—to this day!—give a sermon on the passage in the Sermon on the Mount which begins: “Be not anxious for the morrow.” They do, occasionally, refer to it and say, “Well, that's all very well for Jesus.” But the the actual putting into practice of this—nobody will agree with. They say it's not practical to not give a damn about how you're going to provide for the next day's meals, and all that sort of thing. But it is practical. It's much more practical than what we're doing, if you mean by “practical” that it has survival value. Only, I want to point out that this is a kind of a two-step way. See, the first step is not being anxious for the morrow, not dreaming for one moment that you can change anything, or improve anything. Which of you—by being anxious—can add one cubit to his stature, you see? But this, just like the belief in predestination, has an unexpected consequence: namely, the making of the energy available so that, in fact, you can take care of the morrow—but for the simple reason that you're no longer worrying about it.

And thus it comes about that people who do not live for the morrow have some reason to make plans, but those who live for the morrow have no reason to make plans for anything because they never catch up with tomorrow; because they don't live in the present. They live for a future which never arrives. That is very stupid.

But, you see, so all this is said in quite another spirit than the spirit of sermonizing. I'm not talking at all about something you should do. All I'm doing is explaining a situation, and you can do anything you like about it. Actually, you know, you cannot lift yourself up by your own bootstraps—however hard you try—and I'm merely pointing out that it can't be done. I'm not saying that you shouldn't try, because it may be your lifestyle to be constantly attempting to do things that can't be done. I do this in a way because all poets do it. A poet is always trying to describe what cannot be said. And he gets close, you know? He often really gives the illusion that he's made it. And that's a great thing: to be able to say what can't be said. I'm trying to say, to express, the mystical experience—and it just can't be done. And therefore, everything I'm saying to you is a very elaborate deception. I'm weaving all kinds of intricate nonsense patterns which sound as if they were about to make sense, and they don't really. But, you see, we could take that to another level and say, "Well, that's just life!"

Once I was talking with Fritz Perls at the Esalen Institute and he said, "The trouble with you is you're all words. Why don't you practice what you preach?" So I said, "I don't preach. And furthermore, don't put words down. Because the patterns that people make with words are just like the patterns of ferns, or of the marks on seashells. They are a dance. And they're just as much a legitimate form of life as flowers." He said, "You're impossible!" But, you see, that's very important.

And that is why—in certain forms of methods of meditation and religious rituals—we use words in a way that is not ordinarily in accord with the use of words. Words are normally used to convey information. But in religious rituals words are not used to convey information: words are used musically for the sake of sound. And this is a method of liberating oneself from enthrallment with words. When you say any ordinary word—just take a word like "body," see?—and you say it once, and it seems to be quite

sensible. But say it four or five times: body, body, body, body, body, body. And you think, “What a funny noise.” Isn’t that curious? Or “apple dumpling.” Apple dumpling, you know? That’s kind of a nice sound: apple dumpling.

And so in one of the great methods of meditation—which is called mantra yoga—the use of sound for liberating consciousness is precisely that. You take all sorts of nonsense and chant it. And you concentrate on these sounds quite apart from anything that they may mean. See, this is why the Catholic Church has made a ghastly mistake in having Mass celebrated in the vernacular. Now everybody knows what it means, and it really wasn’t so hard after all. And—while it was in a tongue that was completely incomprehensible—have this sense of mystery to it. And furthermore, if you knew how to use it as a *sādhanā*; a method of meditation—you could do very well. All monks were trained when they recited the Divine Office. They would explain to a novice: “Don’t think about the meaning of the words. Just say the words with your mouth and keep your consciousness on the presence of God.” They used it that way, see?

So it’s a very good thing, then, to use words in this way to overcome slavery to words. I’ve just written a book of nonsense ditties which are to be used in this way. To get the rhythm going—which is an incantation. Which is a way of getting beyond the bondage of thought. Because, you see, you cannot think without words. You can use numbers and a few things like that. But if you preoccupy your consciousness with meaningless words, that very simply stops you from thinking. And then you dig the sound. Do you know what it is, to dig the sound of anything? Anybody who’s had a psychedelic experience knows exactly what this means. That you—I can only call it “you go down into sound,” and you listen to that vibration, and you go into it, and into it, and into it, and you suddenly realize that that vibration that you’re listening to—or singing—is what there is. That’s the energy of the cosmos. That’s what’s going on. And everything that’s going on is a kind of a pulsation of energy, which in Buddhism is called “suchness” or “thatness”—*tathātā*. You see? What’s da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da-da-da. And that’s what we’re all doing. Only: we look around and, you know, here we all are with people. We’ve got faces on, and we talk, and we’re supposed to be making sense, but actually we’re just going da-da-da,

da-da-da, da-da-d-da-da in very complicated ways, see? And playing this life-game. And the thing is that if we don't get with it, it passes us by. That's alright! You can miss the bus; it's your privilege. You see? But it really is a great deal to go with the dance and know that that's what you're doing, instead of agonizing about the whole thing.

Well, now, we've been discussing—in two sessions—the ways in which thought can conceal truth, and so now we have to come to the other aspect of the problem, which is: how to get un-bamboozled. And I often say that, in a way, this is the wrong question because it reminds me of the famous tale about the American tourist in England who wanted to find a way to obscure a little village called Upper Tuddenham. And he asked a local yokel the way, and the man scratched his head and said, "Well, sir, I do know the way, but if I were you I wouldn't start from here." And the problem, therefore, of what to do is, in a way, the wrong question. Because—as I pointed out yesterday—you have to begin with the assumption that you can't do anything. You can't change yourself because the whole idea involves a sort of schizy situation where this "I" is going to change "me." And this is where the genius of Krishnamurti comes out, where he won't give anyone a method. And, actually, he gets you into the meditation process by pretending not to. He's a real tricky character! Very, very great guru, except that nobody really knows what to do with him. Because whenever you suggest that there might be something that you could do to bring your mind to tranquility or your heart to the knowledge of the ultimate reality, he says simply, "Well, why do you want to? Find out why you want to." And then he gives you a kōan. And, in a way, this gets you meditating naturally instead of it being a kind of artificial process; you get so bugged by this questioning that you are involved in the kōan process right away. And he's very insistent about this.

But my own view is very generous. I think that all ways of meditation can be followed. And because even if some of them are folly—to quote Blake again—the fool who persists in his folly will become wise. All that's required that you keep at it. So I want to talk this morning about the various central methods of meditation, and we'll begin—why not—with the Yoga Sūtra, Patañjali, where [in] the first he says, "Now, yoga is

explained.” This is the first verse. And the commentators point out that the word “now” means that this is a discourse following other discourses. Something has gone before; certain things you have to have mastered before you try yoga. And this is in line with the Hindu view of life that life is divided into ashramas, or stages: that you start out with the stage called brahmacharya, which is the studentship, and then you become a gṛhastha, which is householder. And only after you’ve fulfilled the life of the householder do you take up yoga. And this is, of course, also in line with Jung’s views that spiritual awakening belongs properly to the second half of life.

But you mustn’t take that literally. The stages of life can be lived simultaneously, and they don’t necessarily follow each other in chronological order. And today, the predominance of interest in yoga in the West is among young people. And these are the people who are now the new saṁnyāsa; the “wandering monks,” the drop-outs. After all, a saṁnyāsa is a drop-out—only a high-class drop-out. But he has—in India, of course—fulfilled his social debts. He has raised a family, established his work, and put his oldest son in charge of the business. But we are in an entirely different situation because many of our oldest sons despise the business that we, as adults, were involved in. Because they see through the hollowness of a way of life that has so hopelessly confused symbol with reality. So I guess in our circumstances yoga is important for everyone.

Now, the next verse of the Yoga Sūtra says, “Yogas citta vritti nirodha.” And this is a complicated thing to translate. It says “Yoga is the cessation of turnings of the mind.” Vritti means “to turn,” to be turbulent. When you talk about a cakravartin as a great ruler, a great king, means “one who turns the wheel.” Vartin is the same as vritti. And a vartin is one who turns; a vritti is a turning, a wave. Like a wave rolls over and splashes. Citta means, approximately, “consciousness.” It refers to the basic awareness that we have, whether it is strictly conscious or subconscious. Citta means something like—let’s suppose we make the mind analogous to a mirror, a reflecting mirror. The mirror itself would correspond to what is meant in Sanskrit by citta. You see, we’re not aware of the color of the lens of our eye, and so we just name that color transparent. If it had a color, we wouldn’t know it, and so we don’t. But you can’t really altogether ignore

the background of vision because it's very important, even though you never see it. It's basic to all that you see, just as the diaphragm in the speaker of the radio is basic to all that you hear on the radio. But so, in the same way, there is something basic to all our sensations, and that is citta.

So now, there are two schools of thought. One who says that yoga—that “citta vritti nirodha,” the cessation of the turnings in the citta—is the elimination of all sense experience and all thought and all feeling whatsoever from consciousness. And when one speaks, then, of the goal of yoga as being samādhi—and particularly what is called asamprajnata samādhi, which means “samādhi without a seed in it,” or nirvikalpa samādhi—nirvikalpa is a moot word. Some people think that that means this total elimination of all contents from consciousness. It's like when you get into a sensory deprivation chamber and you learn to relax the muscles of your tongue, and the muscles of your eyes, and you really go blank. But I think that is a false interpretation. It's a very interesting experience to go through and I recommend it if you want to make a little adventure. I was just in a sensory deprivation chamber a day or two ago; it was fascinating. But, you know, it's real quiet. It's just as nice as nice can be and I recommend that everyone install one in a New York apartment! But nirvikalpa means, strictly, “without concept.” Vikalpa means a “concept,” having an idea. And that's a symbolic thing. It doesn't mean having no sensation.

And they make a great point of this in the instruction about practicing meditation in Zen. They say quite definitely, “Don't shut your eyes. Don't close your ears. But simply: eliminate thought.” If you cut out your sensation input entirely and have a blank mind, then you're no better than a log. In that case, logs and rocks would be Buddhas. The point, then, is, in other words, they have various poetic phrases in Zen to indicate the nature of samādhi. One is the moon in the water. You see, there's a verse which says, “All waters contain the moon. Not a mountain, but the clouds encircle it.” So “all waters contain the moon” means that whenever the moon rises, instantly, it is in all waters. They didn't know, of course—in those days—anything about the speed of light. But they felt that the moon comes into the water when the moon is in the sky in exactly the same way as, when the hands are clapped, the sound issues without a moment's hesitation. And so

another verse says, “The geese do not intend to cast their reflection. The water has no mind to receive their image.” It’s zzwht, there. Like that.

And so the ideal of samādhi is for you to have a mind like that—what they call a “mind of no hesitation.” A mind which doesn’t, as it were, stop to say whether this should or should not be reflected. And so they would go on to explain the basic nature of your mind is like that from the beginning. That’s what it is to have a mind. That’s what Zen master Bankei would call the “unborn mind,” or the “Buddha mind” in every one of us that we all have as a natural gift. And so he says when you hear a crow go caw, you know immediately it’s a crow. (I am a crow, for the moment!) And so, in the same way, when Bankei was once giving a talk, there was a Nichiren priest—you know, those Nichirens are kind of a Buddhist Jehovah’s Witnesses—and this priest was heckling him in the back and he said, “I don’t understand anything you’re saying.” And Bankei said, “Come closer and I’ll explain it.” And this man began to weave his way through the crowd. And Bankei said, “Come closer still.” “Still closer. Come right here.” And he came right up. And Bankei said, “You see? You understand me perfectly!”

So the feeling, then, is that the nirvikalpa samādhi is this state of just perfectly clear consciousness which responds to everything going on without labeling it, without categorizing it. And even to say “respond” isn’t quite right because that means as if consciousness was something that is pushed by life and then reacts to it. Action and reaction, like cause and effect. The crow caws, and the ears vibrate: cause and effect. That’s not the Buddhist theory. The Buddhist theory is not cause and effect, it is called pratīyasamutpāda. And that means “interdependent origination.” In other words: when the wind blows, the trees move. This is not two events, but one. Wind blowing and trees waving are all the same process. And so the verse says, “The tree displays the bodily power of the wind.” It manifests it. Because nobody would know there was any wind blowing unless the trees were waving. Nobody would know there was any light shining unless there was something reflecting it. They really go together, you see? So the tree displays the bodily power of the wind, the water exhibits the spiritual nature of the moon. Because, you see, when the water flows and ripples, it breaks the moon into thousands of pieces. So that is the spiritual power: the one becomes many.

So then, what we are looking at, then, is a state of consciousness which is like that—which is one with the whole thing going on. And this is saying the same thing as Krishnamurti says when he tries to explain that there really is no feeler separate from our feelings and no thinker separate from our thoughts. There is simply a process going on. And so, in the same way, Huìnéng—the Sixth Patriarch—prefers not to use the image of the mirror for the mind, but he prefers the image of space. That’s why, when his rival for the patriarchy made up the poem which explained that “the mind is a mirror and we must wipe it to keep off the dust,” Huìnéng countered this by saying “there isn’t any mirror, and so whereon can the dust fall?” See? So this is saying that you will never, never be able to discover a thinker other than thoughts, a feeler other than feelings, a sensor other than sensations. That’s the meaning of the dialog between Bodhidharma and Eka. When Eka said, “I haven’t any peace of mind. Please pacify my mind.” And Bodhidharma said, “Bring out your mind in front of me, and I will pacify it.” Eka said, “When I look for it, I can’t find it.” Bodhidharma said, “There! It is pacified.”

So Eka, you know, was looking for his mind. It’s like “Who are you?”—the question that the Maharshi Ramana always asked to anybody who said, “Maharshi, who was I in my last incarnation?” And he would always reply, “Who’s asking the question?” Which is the same as Krishnamurti’s “Why do you want to know?” Because this throws the question back at the questioner. Who are you? Who has the problem? And you look, and you look, and you look, and you can’t find it. When you look for—Hume, the British philosopher, really went through the same experience, because when he tried to find out what was his consciousness he couldn’t find anything but sensations, or images, in his head. And so, in the same way, when you want to find out what’s behind your eyes—most people think that they have a blank space behind their eyes; kind of a non-dark, non-light blind spot which you can’t ever see. That’s not the case. You know how the inside of your head is? Why, it’s what you’re looking at! That’s how it feels inside your head. It’s all this that you see in front of you: that’s inside your head. It’s all in these nerves back here, where the optical nerves are centered.

And so this is saying that our conscious relationship to the world is a transactional relationship in which you can speak about the subjective

standpoint and the objective standpoint. But that, really, you've got one continuum in which these two standpoints are simply opposite ends of a diameter. You go with it, it goes with you, and vice versa. So this is the whole meaning of the Taoist idea that is called "mutual arising." When Lao Tzu says that "to be" and "not to be" arise mutually, that "difficult" and "easy" suggest each other, "high" and "low" subtend each other, and so on—he's describing this polar relationship. So you don't get an '—in other words, you don't get a confrontation, you don't get a kind of a meeting from things that impinge on each other from entirely separate situations. You get the opposite sort of thing where, when a flower buds and the bud breaks, the petals expand. And it's true—you have the petals on the far left and you have the petals on the far right. But they arise together, like that, see? That's how all life is happening. When you come into being, the universe comes into being. When you go out of being, the universe goes out of being. And that's true for everyone. Not only people—all sentient beings whatsoever. So without the being—the sentient being—there is no cosmos. All we are saying in talking about a cosmos that existed before any sentient beings existed is we're simply describing what would have happened if there had been any sentient beings around. It's a kind of extrapolation.

So that relativity of the sentient being and the universe is basic to Buddhist philosophy and is saying, then, that the one implies the other. Because this is the philosophy called *jiji muge* (事事无碍): that between thing-event and thing-event there is no barrier. This is the philosophy of the mutual interdependence of all things and events. That the moment there is anything at all, it implies everything else. So, in the same way—you know—with laser beam photography: you can take a tiny fragment of a photographic negative, and by laser beam photography you can restore the whole negative from which it was cut. Because the crystalline structure of any part of the negative is in an inseparable relationship with its whole area. So you can imply it. You'll get a picture which is (around the area that you have taken out) very clearly definite, and as it moves away from it the outlines will become a little vaguer, but you'll be able to see everything that was there. It's fantastic. So in the same way, every hair on your head—this is the real meaning of the saying that the hairs of your head are all numbered—that every hair on your head implies all galaxies because it

wouldn't exist without all the galaxies. Nor would all galaxies exist without the hair, or without the hair having existed. It doesn't make any difference.

So then, this state of complete unity of mind and nature (what's going on) without the intervention—first of all—without the intervention of thought is the state of meditation. It may be called dhyāna, it may be called samādhi, and you may make certain subtle differences between these two states, but forget it for the moment. Now, the way of arriving at this is, of course: there is no way. Because that's the way your mind is working anyway. But you have to find that out. You have to find out that you don't need to accept yourself by trying to accept yourself. It doesn't mean anything to accept yourself because who accepts what? But you don't know that at first. You think there is a "who" who has to accept "what." And you can only do this by trying to do the impossible. This is the method of reductio ad absurdum. So then, in the beginning of meditation there are alternative methods you can use. You can use the questioning method: "Who am I?" and "Who is it that wants to know?" "Who is asking who it is that is asking?" You can—that's the method of interiorization; look within: thou art Buddha.

Then there's the method of concentration: a method of banishing the interior stream of chatter by watching your breathing. Or by focusing your attention on a small point of light or upon a single sound. If you have a tape recorder, all you have to do is you make a loop tape with one sound on it. And you turn your tape recorder on, and that practices meditation for you. And you just listen to that sound. Or—easier still—you hum a sound like om. And you take a long, long, easy, deep breath, and you hum "om, om, om." And just keep it going. And that's a great method. It's one of the best ways if you are an auditory kind of character.

Then you can also do it by looking into a crystal ball or by using a mandala. You see, the way a mandala is constructed with circles, you eventually get the feeling from looking at a mandala that you're dropping into it. And you're going in, in, in, in, in to that circle. Always in, in. And that brings you altogether in one place, and you go in, in, in to the heart of it. The radii—or whatever they may contain—simply have the function of being, as they were, slides which bring you into the center. And you go in, in, in to that, and you get the same effect, visually, as when you do when you listen

into a sound. And you go in, in, in to the sound. You get down to the basic, basic, ungh—you know?—which everything is. And then, when you get that basic ungh, you stay there, see? And you dig that. And eventually you see that that's what there is, and always was, and always will be. In fact, there isn't any time in meditation; time completely disappears. You discover there is only the present.

And that brings up another form of meditation that you can practice, and it is a good one for practicing while being active. You see, sitting isn't the only way of meditation. There are actually four types of meditation. Sitting meditation (called zazen), walking meditation, standing meditation, and lying down meditation. So it's also good to lie flat on your back for these things—except that you may easily go to sleep that way. Walking meditation has long been practiced both by Christian monks and by Buddhist monks. And in the satipatṭhāna method of meditation that is practiced today—in Burma, and Thailand; in Silom—they do a great deal of it walking. It's a very good way because you certainly don't go to sleep that way. And it's a rhythmic movement, and therefore is peaceful: you just walk slowly up and down. This is the way I use mostly. Especially if you go out to Jones Beach and it's clear—you know? You go out on a weekday and it's absolutely clear, and nobody is there, and you can go for miles and miles along the beach in the walking meditation. Beautiful.

So in [those] various ways of posture, shall we say, you can concentrate on sight, on sound. Nobody has done much with touch, but people have done meditation on bodily motion—as in dancing or mudra. That is another thing. Mantra is sound, mudra is gesture. And in Huston Smith and Elda Hartley's film of Tibetan Monks you'll see them doing the mudra method of meditation: constantly moving their hands. This is the same kind of a thing.

Or another method is the letting everything alone, where you allow all your psychic processes and sensuous processes free reign to do anything they want to do. And you will find, for example, that—let's, supposing that, at this very moment, you are all hearing the sound of my voice. Now, if you turn your conscious attention from the meaning of what I'm saying simply to the sound of the words, you will be surprised to discover that you don't have to make any effort to understand what I'm talking about because your

brain will take care of that. And you can just listen to the noise. It'll all go into you and you'll understand. But you can just concentrate on the flow of sound. American Indians often do that when they're encountering a stranger, because they can tell more about him by the tone of his voice than what he says. He may be lying. So you can listen to the tone of my voice and find out whether I'm putting something over on you.

It's the tone that is important, you see? Fundamentally. It's the music that finally counts in life. As I was explaining yesterday, one may regard the universe as a musical phenomenon. That it is a huge system of extremely complex vibrations which is playing. And that's what it's all about. Just, you don't ask what does Mozart mean? You just listen to Mozart. It's great. So you don't ask what the universe means.

Well, now—in a way—this meditation method of just letting your mind alone and let it go where it wants to go has the same disadvantage as lying down on the floor: you may go to sleep. But don't worry about that too much, especially if you do it early in the morning. And, on waking, immediately, is the easiest time. You're just in that moment between sleeping and waking. You will find you are in a very fascinatingly clear state of mind. That's the ideal hour of the day for having an experience of cosmic consciousness. And you can move right into it at that point—don't get up immediately, just lay flat out. You may want to do something or other to refresh yourself a little, like taking a drink of water or something, but right at that moment you find you can have extraordinary clarity. And then you see—as you go on—it begins to become clear to you that there really is no one separate from this changing stream of feelings who's having them; they're just there. And in that moment the problem of what to do about yourself vanishes because there is no separate self.

Thereafter, the most fascinating thing that follows from this is that you can keep up meditation while thinking. This is why a Zen master can also be a scholar and an intellectual: because the way he does his thinking is exactly the way as he sweeps a floor or meditates. There is no illusion of the thinker doing the thinking, there is just the thinking process. And therefore, he doesn't get misled and bamboozled by his thoughts. So, you see, it's very important to emphasize this because the process of meditation is not anti-

intellectual. In fact, it is—I would say—a basic requisite for leading the intellectual life because the person who lives the intellectual life is, of all people, the most liable to be bamboozled with words. And that's the besetting danger of all academicians. That's why they get so stuffy and doubtful, and they suffer from intellectual porcupinism. They're always prickly and querulous, and so on. So the reason is they're starved. They don't have anything to think about except thoughts, and they write books about books. And they don't, therefore, have any first-hand experience of life to use for thinking; to think about.

So—of all places—in a university is the place where meditation should be practiced; of getting out of thought for some time of the day. This refreshes the intellectual life. This gives it a zip and a quality so that, as you begin, like Suzuki—old D. T. Suzuki—he was a great intellectual. But he practiced scholarship in the same natural way that one would sail a boat, or watch clouds. So that he was never (in his pursuit of scholarship) cantankerous and pretentious, he was never pedantic. And, of course, in the field of sinology today in the United States you will find some of the most pedantic people in existence. It's represented by the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, which is a testy, quarrelsome, bitchy journal. Everybody's going kkrk, kkrk, kkrk at everybody else. And when, you know—a scholar doesn't always have to be a scholar. You can write a scholarly book. I wrote a book called *The Way of Zen*, which is rather scholarly. But then I can do a movie called *The Mood of Zen* which isn't scholarly at all, which is just creating an atmosphere. But boy do the scholars hate it! They say, "This is of no value at all. This is just..." And they call you a popularizer. And they call Suzuki a popularizer because he didn't put in the right kind of footnotes. He was a little vague about some things. But he had forgotten than most of them ever knew!

So, in this way you can sit light to intellectuality. It's a very good thing, because otherwise you become hopelessly ponderous. You become a sort of mechanical, tick-tock being that is full of—it's like you put fish in your mouth, and the whole thing were very small bones with no meat on them at all. And that's the sort of feeling you finally get from being over-intellectual. So, really, I do want to make this plain, because so many people think that the domains of the intellect and the domain of intuition are

mutually exclusive. They're not. It's only: people keep saying, "I understand what you say intellectually, but I don't really feel it." And, therefore, seem to think that an intellectual understanding may even be an obstacle. And a lot of teachers sometimes give that point of view. They say, "The more you think about it, the further you are from it." But I don't think that's true. At least it's oversimplifying the matter. If you've got an intellect, you must use it. It's a divine gift. It's a talent. And nobody can make the sacrifice of the intellect unless they've got one to sacrifice.

A lot of fanatics think they've made the sacrifice of the intellect and say, "I've given up my private opinions, and I'm purely obedient to holy scripture"—or whatever; authority. And that's a lot of—if I may say so—bullshit! Either they haven't thought it through, or else they are concealing from themselves that their obedience to scripture is, at root, their own personal opinion. So there isn't this antagonism. It's very—if you've got an intellect at all, it's very important that you think things through as far as they can be thought through. But, you see, your intellect will eventually tell you its own limitations. It will—in other words—say, "I have a certain function (as intellect) just like the dial on the telephone has a certain function." And if you spell out questions about the existence of God on the dial of the telephone, you'll be told to go to hell! That's not its function! And so you can easily see—as I've tried to explain to you—that the thought process has limitations; that there are things it will not do. It is the symbolizing of the world, but it is not the real world—except insofar as: thoughts are, themselves, vibrations. That's (how I was discussing yesterday) that you can say words, and listen to the words simply as sounds. Then you're getting in closer contact with the real world; with the vibration that's at the basis of everything.

So thought itself tells you that it can't go all the way. And then, when you understand that, thought naturally gives up. And you become quiet. Let it go. Let all the senses go. And eventually you find you're quiet, and you're centered, and still. But don't make an exercise of it! Dōgen, the great Japanese Sōtō Zen master, always told his students, "Do not practice zazen to attain satori. Sit just to sit. This, already—practicing zazen—is being a Buddha." This is sitting like a Buddha. And if you do it with an ulterior motive, you're not doing it. There is nowhere to go. So, likewise, if you

practice centering on the present, you can't do it with an objective, because you're off it. And so: in action. And you try to do what Gurdjieff calls self-remembering, and you've always got your mind on the present, and you're fully aware of what you're doing all the time —see?—then, eventually, you will discover that there is nothing else you can do. Because if you think about the past, that's happening now. Think about the future—that's happening now. There's nothing else but now! So then, when you discover that, meditation becomes automatic. You're always in it. Only: you have to be stupid and exercise a little folly in order to find it out; that is: to try to be there. You see? That's putting legs on a snake, or a beard on a eunuch. Or we would say gilding the lily. But somehow, to wake up, that has to happen.

So it's a most marvelous discovery, you see, when you've been working to try an center, to be present, to be alert and awake, and be just here. And you work at it, and work at it, and one day you go boing! There is nowhere else to be! And then you get a very strange sensation. It seems that the now and you are all the same. And it's like a stream which is moving along, carrying you, but not going anywhere. It moves and doesn't move. It's like looking at a blot, like a Rorschach blot, and seeing the blot running—but into the place where it is. Everything is moving into where it is. And this is state called eternal now. This is the meaning of eternity. Eternity isn't static. So, this is the meaning of the Zen poem which says:

I walk over the bridge, and it's the bridge flow, not the water.

I'm walking on foot, and yet riding on the back of an ox.

I'm empty-handed, and yet a spade is in my hand.

Divine Madness

This morning I'm going to talk to you about a particularly virulent and dangerous form of divine madness which is called falling in love. Which is, from a practical point of view, one of the most insane things you can do, or that can happen to you. Because in the eyes of a given woman or a given man, an opposite who go to the eyes of everybody else a perfectly plain and ordinary person can appear to be God or Goddess incarnate, to be such a

and enchantment that one can say in the words of an old song which probably dates me every little breeze seems to whisper Louise. And this is an extraordinary disruptive experience a subversive experience in the conduct of human affairs. Because you never know when it will strike off for what reason. It's something like contracting a very chronic disease once you get into it, and we try to resolve it sometimes by making it the basis for a marriage, which is an extraordinarily dangerous thing to do. And this is because in Western civilization we have a tradition of the family which is very curious and which would seem to be the most ridiculous composition of disparate ideas imaginable.

When we go back to the origins of Western civilization in the Hebrew and Christian traditions, we find that the idea of marriage and the experience of falling in love are really rather separate things. Because in those earlier times, in agrarian cultures, nobody ever chose their marriage partner. There are certain exceptions to this that in ancient Greece. You would occasionally find a woman who is called a parthenos, which has been mistranslated Virgin. The correct meaning of parthenos is a woman who chooses her own husband. And there were very few of them and in that passage in the Gospel and the Book of the prophet Isaiah where it says "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and his name should be called Emmanuel." That is in Greek Parthenos, a parthenos shall conceive. And therefore [this] has nothing strictly to do with a virgin, although a woman who chooses her own husband might conceivably be a virgin.

But by and large a marriage was an alliance of families. And it was contract did not simply for the purpose of raising children, yes, but also to create a social unit smaller than a village, a village therefore being a cluster of families. And these families were rather large. So families allied the oldsters, the grandpa and grandma, who had an enormous voice in who their children were going to marry. Used to, you know—I suppose this is no news to any of you—used to dicker and. Use go between. Ones and they considered not only whether this girl was suitable for their son and vice versa but also what kind of a dowry she would bring and whether it would be advantageous to the two families to form such an alliance and of course these things almost up to quite recent times were always important in the marital affairs of royal families. But as is notorious, all royal families and

kings and queens kept concubines and had outside arrangements when and if they should happen to fall in love. And even if they didn't they had mistresses simply to prevent monogamy from becoming monotony. So, that is the basis, you see, and that is why to this day marriage is a civil or our own and or religious ceremony, the basis of which is a contract, a legal contract, which one signs on the dotted line. And therefore there are all kinds of laws as the laws relate to contracts that this contract is very difficult to get out of. The rationale for that being quite obvious. That society believes that it requires a secure environment for children. But also just the general stability of things. Because when people break up a marriage it's sort of unnerving for everyone. You see a couple and you think for a long time that they're the happiest and best adjusted couple you ever met. The next thing you know is that they've split up, and you begin to think now what goes on here are all my friends crazy because you see people breaking up all around. Because if you call it breaking up that's a put-down phrase, to break up. Especially It sounds a smashing something as if for the something precious and been smashed. Whereas it may be something quite different altogether depending on how you evaluate it.

But now, into this kind of feudal conception of marriage. There came in, very largely I think as a result of the poetic movement that was centered in southern France in Provence in the Middle Ages what is called The Cult of Courtly love. This is something about which scholars dispute. According to one theory, the knightly or courtly lover who was also a poet would select a lady to be his heart's desire, preferably a married lady. And he would yearn for her, and sing songs under her window and to send messages to her and little tokens of his devotion, but according to this particular theory he must never go to bed with her. Not only would that be adultery, but it would spoil the state of being in love. That it should always be an unfulfilled state and an unhappy state this is the theory of Denis de Rougemont, in his book *Love in the Western World*, or *Passion in Society*, it has two titles.

And the other theory is probably more realistic that this was first of all the the great ladies of the noble families were awfully bored because their husbands were always out hunting and making war and wenching and so on and therefore they had to have lovers too. And so they did indeed have adulterous affairs on the side, and a great deal of poetry rose out about this,

because you see it's that the my friend Yon Carvarde [sic], always says that laws about sexual relationships should never be liberalized. There should always be strict. Disapproval of adultery and fornication because if there is not that strict disapproval and if it's not difficult to attain it's less fun. And I have worked out those of you who read my book *Beyond Theology*, I worked out a whole theory of the Christian repression of sex that the secret intent of this was to make people more interested in sex because if there is complete liberality in prep promiscuity in every direction it all becomes so easy that it might indeed be in danger of becoming a bore. And then people would seek other dissipations of perhaps a less healthy kind.

So then, as a result of the gradual fusion of these two approaches to the relationship of the sexes we have arrived at the idea of the romantic marriage. In which the two trends are ms-allied to say the very least. You are supposed there for to fall in love with someone. And of your own choice naturally it has to be that way for going to fall in love if that is a choice. And then enter in to that relationship. With a legal contract. In which you get up before a magistrate or a priest do solemnly curse and swear that you will be faithful to each other until death do you part which leads often to matter. And it seems to me perfectly obvious that two young people are extremely anxious. To get into each other's embraces and the only way of doing so under the circumstances is entering into this contract will naturally be ready to promise anything. To fulfill this desire. And while there are indeed many, many married legally married couples who have a very very happy alliance that goes on all their lives and we don't hear about them because. Good news is never news. It's only the unhappy couples who make the newspapers. And there are enormous numbers of them but they are mainly I think people who are lucky. There is no way of making a marriage work, so far as I know, because every attempt to make a marriage work is secretly it within that breast of each partner builds up hostility. You can, I know all this, I'm speaking from a certain amount of that experience. You can work very hard to keep a marriage together, and as you do so, you may fail to recognize you see that you are being untrue to your own emotions. And you think well, I must control my emotions, for the sake of children, for the sake of society, for the sake of everything, like that and so you work, and work and one of the ways of working is to try to convince yourself that you're in love. And you go through the pretenses of love you

empathise yourself with loving language towards your partner you go out of your way you make little lists to remember the tensions you must pay you keep a diary in which you remember your wedding anniversary because you were very liable to forget it and all these things and you really work it now the more you work it the more you are building up promises and expectations for something that you are probably not going to come through with at the level of deep feeling. And everyone is well aware of that is a *hintergedachte*, there you know it in the back of your mind. And so you build yourself increasingly into a wall to wall trap. And so the mutual hostility grows worse and worse and worse so that one psychologist was recently known to ask a patient with whom are you in love against. The most awkward course from the falling in love is between people who are already married to someone else. And because you see this is a cataclysmic and disruptive experience in the presence of shorter and we know I mean Victorian novels—a lot of people are still living out the door in novels. But in Victorian novels, the great thing is where a couple madly in love with each other say to each other well it's best for us that we don't see each other any more this is becoming bigger than either of us. And this, this fantastically mad experience is denied, swept under the rug and strangled. What should one do.

Well as I've often said I'm not a preacher and therefore I don't know what you should do. But I would like to make some reflections on this particular form of madness, and to raise again a very disturbing question. And this disturbing question is as follows: Is it only when you are in love with another person that you see them as they really are? And in the ordinary way, when you are not in love with people you see only a fragmented version of that being. Because when you are in love with someone you do indeed see them as a divine being. And suppose that's what they are truly. And your eyes have by your beloved been opened in which case your beloved is serving to you as a kind of guru. An initiator. And that is why there is a form of sexual yoga, based on the idea that man and woman are to each other as mutual guru and student. And through a tremendous outpouring of psychic energy in total devotion and worship to this other person who is respectively the goddess of the god. You realize by total fusion and contact with the other organism. You go down to the divine center in them and it bounces back and you discover your own or you could

put it in this way which is another aspect of it that by falling in love and regarding falling in love not just as a sort of sexual infatuation, because it's always more than that, isn't it. I mean you can have a great sexual enjoyment with a pleasant friend, you know. But you may do so simply because he or she appeals to your aesthetic senses. But when you fall in love, it's a much more serious involvement, you just cannot forget this person. You feel miserable when not in their presence, you're always yearning, that's get to see more of each other let's get together that's we're completely entangled and then you see you've actually kind of out what I would call spiritual element has been introduced. And the Hindus were sensible enough to realize that this was a means of awakening, enlightenment, and therefore it was. Surrounded. With a sort of rigid religious ritual meditative art, with a form of sexual yoga that is designed to allow the feeling of mutual love to the extent of grand passion to have an extremely fitting fulfillment and expression.

Falling in love is a thing that strikes like lightning and is therefore extremely analogous to the mystical vision. We don't know. No how really people attain the mystical vision. There is not as yet a very clear rationale as to how it happens because we do know that it is opened to many people who never did anything to look for it. And many people especially in adolescence have had the mystical vision all of a sudden without the slightest warning and with no previous interest in that kind of thing. On the other hand many people who have practiced yoga or zen disciplines of what you will for years and years and years have never seen it. And in both classes, there are of course exceptions—there are those who have never had the spontaneous experience and there are those who through yoga or zen have attained this inside. But as yet we are not clear as to why it comes about and if there is any method of attaining it the best one is probably to give up the whole idea of getting it.

But you see it is completely unpredictable and so it is in that way like falling in love, capricious and therefore crazy. But if you should be so fortunate as to encounter either of these experiences. It seems to me to be a total denial of life to refuse it. And what we therefore have to. Admit in our society is so that we can contain this kind of madness. We must be far more realistic about the marriage arrangement so that it can contain the

possibility of falling in love. When you base marriage you see on the falling in love and you go into a pseudo love affair, which is simply hot pants, and set up a rigid family in which you expect to the other person that they will. Always be in love with you, and then, in that context, you go and fall in love, then your falling in love is of necessity disruptive of the marriage and of the family. But you see it could only disrupt it because the love relationship between the two partners was false, was pretended.

But if marriage were based more on the old idea of the reasonable contract between two people to bring up children, who may be expected at the best to be good friends and to allow each other to be persons that is to say in the ordinary sense of the word person to have their own freedom. Then if Love strikes it is tolerated within this arrangement provided you're not going to be so unreasonable as to go on to say well life since I've fallen in love with somebody else I must marry them. Well that's perfectly ridiculous.

You see, in this way we can think about and structure the necessary stable social institution of family sometime without it being constantly threatened of foundering on the rocks of love. Now you see this this then means that when when people marry is they take it any vows at all to each other instead of. Saying that they will always be true to each other in the sense of meaning I Will Always Love You. It means I will be true to you in the sense of I will always be truthful to. I will not pretend that my feelings towards you ARE other than what they are. Because I marry you because I think that you are a reasonable person to live with and therefore I want you to be you I want you to be someone else I want to be a rubber stamp of me—how boring that would be?! So it is a really and the arrangement not of us leave we always say jocularly did you get the ball and chain on him. But an arrangement in which people set each other free and make an alliance to cooperate with each other in certain ways. Now if it should so occur that they are of immense sexual attraction to each other, so much the better? That this should not be a primary factor in entering into marriage. Admittedly, you must be to a certain extent attractive to each other otherwise there will be no progeny. But this is this is seems to me to be a sensible and reasonable view and just because it is sensible and reasonable it can accommodate what is not sensible and reasonable which is falling in love. We should regard then marriage as it is especially if it should possibly

be called holy matrimony, as a mutual, well, setting free of to people to live together in freedom and therefore in responsibility because the present situation although it's pretending to be responsible is in fact extremely irresponsible. Because it is dishonesty with respect to the way you feel towards another person.

Well now really when we go back then to falling in love. And say it's crazy falling. You see we don't say rising into love. There is in it the idea of the fall. And it goes back as a matter of fact two extremely fundamental things that there is always a curious tie at some point between the fall and the creation. Taking this ghastly risk, is the condition of there being life. You see, for all life is an act of faith and an act of gamble. The moment you take a step, you do so on an act of faith, because you don't really know that the floors not going to give in to your feet. The moment you take a journey what an act of faith. The moment you enter into any kind of human undertaking in relationship what an act of faith you see you've given yourself up. But this is the most powerful thing that can be done surrender see and love is an act of surrender to another person. Total abandonment. I give myself to you. Take me, do anything like with me. So, that's quite mad because you see it's letting things get out of control all sensible people keep things in control. Watch it, watch it, watch it. Security. Vigilance. Watch it police, watch it Gods, watch it , who's going to watch the Gods? So actually there for all the cost and wisdom what is really sensible is to let go that is to commit oneself to give oneself up and that's quite mad, so we come to the strange conclusion that in madness lies sanity.

We as Organism

I wonder if it's ever struck you how curious a thing it is that most of the things that we experience we regard as things that happen to us, which we ourselves do not originate, which are events expressing some sort of power or activity that is external to ourselves. And if you consider that, you realize that what you mean by 'yourself' is rather narrowly circumscribed. Even events that go on in our own bodies are put in the category of things that happen to us in the same way as things that go on in the world outside our skins. If there's a thunderstorm or an earthquake—well, it happens to you; you're not responsible for it. But so, in the same way, when you have

hiccup you didn't plan on it. If you have belly rumbles, you had no intention of doing it. And as for the catastrophic act of getting born... well, you had nothing to do with that. And you can spend all your life blaming your parents for putting you in the situation in which you find yourself.

And this way of looking at the world in this sort of passive mood—as something that happens to you—goes right down to our general feeling about life. It goes down to the way in which, as Westerners, we have been accustomed to look at human existence as a precarious event in a cosmos that, on the whole, is depicted as being completely unsympathetic and alien to our existence. In other words, if you're reared with a 20th century—or, shall we say, an early 20th century—common sense (which is based on the philosophy of science of the 19th century with its rejection of Christianity and Judaism), you regard yourself as an accident—a biological accident—in a stupid universe which is mechanical but has no feelings—no finer feelings. A vast, pointless gyration of radioactive rocks and gas in which you happen to occur.

Of course, if you don't have that point of view and you are more traditional, you look upon yourself as a child of God and therefore under authority. In other words, there's a big boss on top of all this who allowed you, at his pleasure, to deign to have the disgusting effrontery to exist, and you better watch your Ps and Qs because that Almighty is looking after you with the attitude of “this is going to hurt me more than it's going to hurt you.”

And when you look at the world in that image—or in the other image that it's a stupid mechanism—either point of view you take, you don't really belong. You're not really part of all this. And I could use a stronger word than ‘part,’ only we don't have it in English. We have to say something like ‘connected with it,’ ‘essential to it.’ Or, to put it in the strongest possible way, it is quite alien to Western thought to conceive that the external world—which is defined as something that happens to you, and your body itself is something that you got caught up with—it is quite alien to our thought to consider all that as you, yourself. Because you see, we have such a myopic view of what one's self is. It's as if, in other words, we selected how much experience is really to be regarded as “me,” as if you focused your attention

on certain restricted areas of the whole panorama of things that you experience and say “I will take sides with that much of it.”

Now, we come here—right at the start—to an extremely important principle, which is the different points of view you get when you change your level of magnification. That is to say, you can look at something with a microscope and see it a certain way, you can look at it with a naked eye and see it in a certain way, you look at it with a telescope and you see it in another way. Now, which level of magnification is the correct one? Well, obviously, they’re all correct, but they’re just different points of view. You can, for example, look at a newspaper photograph under a magnifying glass and where, with the naked eye, you will see a human face, with a magnifying glass you will just see a profusion of dots rather meaninglessly scattered. But as you stand away from that collection of dots, which all seem to be separate and apart from each other, they suddenly arrange themselves into a pattern. And you see that these individual dots add up to some kind of sense.

Now you’ll see at once, from this illustration, that maybe you—when you take a myopic view of yourself, as most of us do—but you may add up to some kind of sense that is not apparent to you in your ordinary consciousness. When we examine our bloodstreams under a microscope we see there’s one hell of a fight going on. All sorts of microorganisms are chewing each other up. And if we got overly fascinated with our view of our own bloodstreams in the microscope we should start taking sides, which would be fatal. Because the health of our organism depends on the continuance of this battle. What is, in other words, conflict at one level of magnification is harmony at a higher level. Now could it possibly be, therefore, that we—with all our problems, conflicts, neuroses, sicknesses, political outrages, wars, tortures and everything that goes on in human life—are a state of conflict which can be seen in a larger perspective as a situation of harmony?

Well, it is claimed, you see, that some human beings have broken through to that vision. That they slipped, somehow or other, into states of consciousness where they see the apparent disintegration and disorganization of everyday life as the functioning of a totality which, at its

level, is completely harmonious. And you could say, “A-ha, at last, I see. I got the point. I’ve seen how all this makes sense.” But what this insight depended upon was your overcoming the illusion that space separates things. That is to say the space—the interval between your body and mind, the interval created by birth at one end and death at the other, and then after somebody’s death, then somebody else’s birth—these are events with intervals between them. And normally we regard these intervals in time and these intervals in space as having no importance, no function.

We tend to see the universe itself as really consisting in all the stars and galaxies. That’s what it is, that’s what we notice. But the space in which all this happens is sort of written off as something that isn’t really there. But what one has to realize is that the space is an essential function of the things in the space. After all, you can’t have separate stars unless there is a space around them. Eliminate the space and you would see you couldn’t have this phenomenon at all. And vice versa: you couldn’t have the space—it wouldn’t be there in any sense whatsoever—if there weren’t the bodies in it. So the bodies in the space and the space are two aspects of a single continuum. They’re related together in exactly the same way as a back and a front, and you just don’t get one without the other.

So the moment you see that intervals—that space—is connective, you can understand at once how you are not just to be exclusively defined as a flash of consciousness that occurs between two eternal darknesses, which is the popular common-sense view which Western man has of his own life: that you consider that in the darkness that comes before your birth there was no you, and in the eternal darkness that follows your death there is, likewise, no you. And I’m going to discuss these matters not by appealing to any special, spooky knowledge—as if I had been traveling on the higher planes and knew all my previous incarnations, and therefore could tell you authoritatively that you are much more than this individuality. I’m going to do it on a basis of complete common sense that everybody has access to the facts, and that just what you have to realize is that life is a pattern of immense complexity, and what you call ‘yourself,’ as a living organism—say, I am my whole body, at the very least—now what is that body? That body is recognizable, and I recognize my friends when I meet them again (with luck), and you recognize me. Although, the last time any of you saw

me, I was absolutely something entirely different from what I am now; just as the flame of a candle is never a constant. A flame of a candle is a stream of hot gas. Only, you say “the flame of the candle” as if it were a constant. Well, it is a recognizably constant pattern: the spear-shaped outline of the flame and its coloration is a constant pattern. But in exactly the same way, we are all constant patterns, and that’s all we are; the only thing constant about us at all is the doing rather than the being. It’s the way we behave, the way we dance; only there’s no ‘we’ that dances, there’s just the dancing. Just as the flame is the streaming of hot gas, just as a whirlpool in a river is a whirling of streaming water. There is no thing that whirlpools, there is the whirlpool.

And in the same way, each one of us is a very, very delightfully complex undulation of the energy of the whole universe. Only, by process of mis-education we’ve been deprived of the knowledge of that fact—not as if there was someone to blame for this because it’s always with our own tacit consent. Because life is, basically, a game of hide-and-seek. Because life is pulsation: on and off, here it is and now it isn’t. And by being this pulsation, we know it’s there. See, you don’t know what you mean by ‘on’ unless you know what you mean by ‘off.’ That’s why, when we want to awaken someone, we knock at the door. It’s not enough to slam the door once with your fist and make this big noise, but you keep up a pulsation. Because that, by its on-and-off-ness, attracts attention.

All life, you see, is this flickering in and out. Only, there are enormous rhythms in it. There are very fast flickering ins and outs like the reaction of light upon our eyes, such that when I take a lighted cigarette in the dark and I spin it, you will see a circle of fire. Because the reflection of that cigarette tip on your retina lasts; it endures, just in the same way as on a radar screen an image stays a little while until it’s revived by another round. So in that way, you see, you notice continuity. And in the same way, then, you notice the continuity of a light. Because although, like, say, with an arc lamp—an arc lamp is actually a flickering light, and that’s why they don’t allow arc lights to be used in any shop where there’s a circular saw moving: because sometimes the flickering speed of the arc light so synchronizes with the turning speed of the teeth on the blade, that the teeth look as if they’re not

moving, and so anybody who might put his hand on the blade will have it chopped off thinking it was a still one.

So, in this way, very fast impulses are looked upon as constant. And we see—where there are fast impulses—a solid thing. When you look at the blade of a propeller or an electric fan, the separated four or three blades become a solid disk and you cannot throw an egg through it. Well, so in exactly the same way, you can't put your finger through a rock because the rock is moving too fast for your finger to go through. That's the meaning of the whole phenomenon of hardness. Hardness in nature is immense energy, but acting in a very concentrated space; restricted space, but going to beat hell. That's why you can't get through it.

Now, from those very tiny fast rhythms, which give us the impression of continuity, there are also—in this universe—immensely slow rhythms, and these are very difficult for us to keep track of. And they impress us and depress us as our own life and death, as our coming and going which goes for what is—to us—such a slow pace that we can't possibly believe that it is really a rhythm. We think of it as our birth, as something quite unique that could never occur again, because we're so close to it, you see? And it's moving so slowly. And so, with that point of view, we are like Marshall McLuhan has said—he borrowed a metaphor from me—which is that we are driving a car looking at the rear-vision mirror. That means that the environment in which you believe yourself to exist is always a past one, it isn't the one you're actually in. The process of growth, the basic process of biology, is one in which lower orders are always being superseded by higher orders. But the lower order can never figure out—or only very rarely figure out—what the higher order is that's taking over, and may see it as a terrible threat; as total disaster, as the very end. But [it] can never be aware that the principle of growth always has, and always will, continue. Because that's what's going on. But you never know what the next step is going to be, because if you did know you wouldn't take it—because it would already be past. Do you understand this? That any certainly known future is an event of which we can say you've had it, and in that sense it's past.

When we play at games, and we—say, in chess, or in bridge, or whatever game you're playing—the outcome of the game becomes certain, we at that

point cancel the game and begin a new one. Because the whole zest of the thing—and which takes me back to the idea that this whole thing is a hide-and-seek game—is that you don't know what the next order coming up is. But one thing you can be sure of: it will be an order, and it will comprehend you.

At the moment we stand at a time in history where we're beginning to think of the great countdown on the end of the human race. Terrifying possibility that, through atomic energy, we may obliterate this planet and turn the whole globe into a star. Maybe that's the way all the stars started. Imagine, you know, this great thing coming up; the countdown on the end: seven, six, five, four, three, two, one, PEEEEERRRRRRRRRUUMMMM! Ssshhhhhhhhwshwshwshwshwww... POOSSSSHHHHH! Ssshhhhwwwrrrrhh... POOSSSHHHH! Where have you heard that before? You sit on the seashore and you hear the waves going in and out. And you don't stop to think. That's what you're doing. That's what the whole business is doing. And there are places where the wave mounts and mounts, and it gets too big for its boots or whatever, and it spills and breaks. We could do just that. But... very important to realize that that's what you're doing because then you don't get panicky about it. And the person who's going to press that button is the person who's going to be in panic.

So if you realize that that's what it is and that it doesn't really matter if the whole human race blows itself up, then there's a chance that it won't do it. That's the only chance we have. Not to do this thing, which attracts us like a kind of vertigo, like a person who looks over a precipice and is all set to throw himself over, or a person who jumps out of a plane when they're skydiving and forgets to pull the parachute ring because he gets fascinated with a target. It's called target fascination; you just go straight at it, you see? So we can get absolutely fascinated with disaster, with doom. All—you know—all the news in the newspapers is invariably bad news. There is no good news in the newspaper. People wouldn't buy a newspaper consisting of good news. Even the free press is full of terrible news. Except the San Francisco Oracle. And the fascination, you see, for this doom might be neutralized if we would say, "Well, why bother about that?" It's just another fluctuation in this huge, marvelous, endless chain of our own selves and our own energy going on.

See, here's the problem: because of our myopia, because of the way we've restricted consciousness to focus upon just that certain little area of experience that we call 'voluntary action'—that's us—and everything else happens to us. Now, that's obviously absurd. Let's suppose you take in your hand one of those toys—a gyroscopic top—and you suddenly notice, the minute you get this in your hand, that it has a kind of vitality to it. It seems to resist you, it starts pushing you in a certain way, see? And sometimes you're with it and following it, and then sometimes—you see, it's just as if you held a living animal in your hand. You know, you pick up a hamster, you know, or a guinea pig, and you hold this little thing in your hand and it's always trying to escape. So the gyroscope always seems to be trying to escape your hold. Now, in exactly the same way, what you're experiencing all the time: all sorts of things are getting out of control and doing things you don't expect. It's trying to escape your hold. Alright, then don't grab it so hard! And you discover that this living thing that you're feeling—like the gyroscope top—it's your own life. Because you can see very simply that you would not understand the experience that you call 'voluntary action' and 'decision,' 'being in control' and 'being yourself,' unless in opposition to that there were something else. You couldn't realize self and control and will unless there were something other, out of control, and instead of will, won't! It's the two, together only, that produces the sensation that you call 'having a personal identity.'

Only, there is a funny thing about human consciousness which has been worked out very carefully in Gestalt psychology, which is that our attention is captured by the figure rather than the background, by the relatively enclosed area rather than the diffuse area, and by something moving rather than what is relatively still. And to all those phenomena that—in this way— attract our attention, we attribute a higher degree of reality than the ones we don't notice. That's only because, for the moment, those are more important to us. Consciousness, you see, is a radar that is scanning the environment to look out for trouble just in the same way as a ship's radar is looking for rocks or other ships. And the radar, therefore, does not notice the vast areas of space where there are no rocks, no other ships. So, in the same way, our eyes—or rather, the selective consciousness behind the eyes—only pays attention to what we think is important.

I am at this moment aware of all of you in this room, of every single detail of your clothing, of your faces and so on, but I'm not noticing it all. And therefore I will not be able to remember tomorrow exactly how each one of you looked and what you were wearing. Because what I notice is restricted to things that I think are particularly important. If I notice some particularly beautiful girl in the audience, then I might notice also what she's wearing, and that would be memorable. But by and large—you see—we scan things over, but we pay attention only to what our set of values tells us we ought to pay attention to. And so, in this way, we have this rather myopic way of looking at things and we screen out—from attention—anything that is not immediately important to a scanning system based on sensing danger. But, quite obviously, you—as a complete individual—are much more than this scanning system. You are in relationships with the external world that, on the whole, are incredibly harmonious.

Going back to this illustration of every living body as something like the flame of a candle: the energies of life—in the form of temperature, light, air and food, and so on—are streaming through you all at this moment in the most magnificently harmonious way. And you're—all of you—far more beautiful than any candle flame. Just sitting in these chairs; just zzzhwwwwt: going, you know? Only, we're so used to it we say about that, "So what? Show me something interesting. Show me something new." Because it's a characteristic of consciousness that it ignores stimuli that are constant. When anything is constant it says, "Okay, that's safe. It's in the bag. Needn't pay attention to that anymore." And therefore we eliminate—systematically, from our awareness—all the gorgeous things that are going on all the time, and instead only become focused on the troublesome things that might happen to upset it. Which is alright, but we make too much of it and become... we make so much of it that we identify our very selves—I, ego—with the radar; with the troubleshooter. And that's only [a] tiny fragment of one's total being.

So that if you do become aware that you are not simply that scanning mechanism, but you are your complete organism, then—very swiftly in turn; as a consequence of that—you become aware that your organism is not the way you think about it when you look at it from the standpoint of conscious attention, from the standpoint of the ego. From the standpoint of

the ego, your organism is your—kind of—vehicle, your automobile, in which you go around. But from a physical point of view, your organism is, again, like the candle flame or the whirlpool: it is something which is a continuous patterning—or activity—of the whole cosmos.

The key idea here is pattern. Let's suppose—I'm going to borrow a metaphor from Buckminster Fuller—suppose we have a rope, and one section of this rope is made of manila hemp, the next section is cotton, the next section is silk, the next section is nylon, and so on. Now we tie a knot in this rope—just an ordinary one-over knot—and you find, by putting your finger in the knot, you can move it all the way down the rope. Now as this knot travels, it's first of all made of manila hemp, it's then made of cotton, it's then made of silk, it's then made of nylon, and so on. But the knot keeps going on. That's the integrity of pattern; the continuing pattern, which is what you are. Because you might, you know, be—for several years—you might be a vegetarian, and you might be a meat-eater, and so on. And, you know, your constitution changes all the time, but your friends still recognize you because you're still putting on the same show. It's the same pattern that is the recognizable individual.

But we are trained in our language. The very structure of the language we talk deceives us into misunderstanding this, because when we see a pattern we ask, "What's it made of?" Like, you see a table: is it made of wood or is it made of aluminum? But then, when you inquire into what is wood and how does wood differ from aluminum, the only thing a scientist can tell you is the different patterns—that is to say, the different molecular structure of the two things. And the molecular structure is not a description of what something is made of, it is a description of what dance it is performing, what motions, what kind of a symphony this is. Because, basically, all phenomena of life are musical, and gold differs from lead in exactly the same way that a waltz differs from a mazurka: it's a different dance. And there isn't any thing that's dancing.

That is a deception we get into because we have two parts of speech in our grammar: we have nouns and verbs. And verbs are supposed to describe the activities of nouns. And this is simply a convention of speech. You could have a language with only verbs in it; you don't need any nouns. Or you

could also have a language with nouns only and no verbs, and it would perfectly adequately describe what's going on in the world. So if you were used to speaking with a language that had one part of speech, you could say just as much as we can with two and be a lot clearer—only: at first it would sound awkward, but you'd soon get used to it. And then, when you got used to it, it would be a matter of common sense that the patterning of the world is not some kind of stuff that's patterning; you don't have to seek for a substance underlying the whole thing, it's just patterning! And we're all that.

And so, in this way, there is—to a person who really wakes up—you very soon realize that your existence is not something that is just the hopeless little creature that's suddenly confronted with a great big external world that goes GAAAH! at it—you know?—and eats him up. Every tiniest little thing that comes into being—every minute little fruit fly or gnat or bacterium—I will go so far as to say is an event upon which this whole cosmos depends. Because this thing goes both ways: it's not only that every little organism which exists depends on its total environment. The reverse is also true: that the total environment depends on each and every one of those little organisms. So that you could say this universe consists of an arrangement of pattern in which every event is essential to the whole thing.

Now, we screen that idea out of our consciousness in exactly the same way that we screen out the perception of space as an important reality. Just as we pay attention to the figure and ignore the background, so we see one way of looking at things: mainly, that the organism is very frail against the environment. It lasts a long time—the environment—but the organism only lasts a short time. What do you mean, the environment lasts a long time? What does the environment consist of? Just a lot of little things. And yet, there is the environment just as the same way as there is the face in the newspaper photograph behind all those little dots. When you get far enough away from it you see the face. When you get far enough away from all the organisms and the little bits of things you see the environment in another scale of magnification. But actually, the whole thing is arranged in a polar system where the enormous depends on the tiny and the tiny depends on the enormous, and you get a relationship between these extremes which can be called a transaction. That is to say, a transaction—when there's buying and

selling, it's impossible to have buying without selling and selling without buying.

So you always—wherever you are looking at the general panorama of sensory experience, try switching. Try shifting your attention to all the things you thought were unimportant—to the constants, to the background—and begin looking at the spaces between people. All painters have to learn this, because—especially if you're working in oils—you actually have to paint in the background. Weavers know this because when they are making patterns in weaving they've got to weave the background as well. Or if you do needlepoint with embroidery, think of the hours you spend putting in the background over the canvas in wool. And you become aware of it. Same way that people have made the great oriental carpets. They're much more aware of the background as constituting an essential part of the total experience.

So as you become aware of this you see the same thing that you notice in music, namely that it is only as a result of hearing the interval between tones that you hear any melody. If you don't hear the interval you're tone deaf, and all notes are the same noise; all you hear is rhythm if you don't hear any melody. You've got to hear the interval. So then: watch the intervals between people, the things that aren't said, the things that are tacit, the things that are implicit rather than explicit in all life. And then you begin to get connected. You know, it's very important to have a connection in life and to be in the know. And this is the way it fundamentally comes out of seeing the thing you forgot.

You know, you can always bug people in a beautiful way—in a very helpful way—by just saying to them, “What did you forget?” They say, “Well, I don't know. Was I supposed to remember?” “I'm really not trying to put you on. I mean, it's not difficult; this is something completely obvious that you forgot. You'll easily remember it because it's so obvious.” Well, that's the hardest thing in the world to think of. What's the most obvious thing I forgot? Huh, what's that? Well, who do you think you are? Well, how do you answer that question, “Who are you?” Well, you give a name. You say, “I'm Joe Dokes, I'm Alan Watts.” That's not true. That's what people told you you were. They put that name on you and they taught you to identify

with it and to behave as it was expected to behave. But that's not who you are. You know very well. Go back in your memory, go back into your infancy before they started telling you all this stuff. Who are you? And if you get with that you'll know very well who you are: the jolly old ancient of days.

Only: there's a conspiracy that you mustn't let on about that because everybody is. And if one person realizes it, the other is a little bit offended and will say, "Well, how come you're so great?" We worked it in Christianity by a very clever thing: of allowing just one individual to be recognized as the God incarnate, and nobody else, therefore, could be. And since he had been safely crucified and whisked up to heaven, he wouldn't bother us anymore. So everybody, therefore, who gets an intimation of who they really are and ever comes out with it—in Christian civilization—people say, "Who the hell do you think you are? You're Jesus Christ?" Well, you say, "Jesus Christ said he was Jesus Christ and everybody put him down for it, and that's what you're doing to me." "Oh," they say, "forget that one." Because that's like somebody comes out and composes some perfectly terrible music, and the critics say, "This man is a cacophonist, he is completely incompetent." And he said, "Did you read the reviews of Beethoven's First Symphony when it was performed at Vienna?"

Now, the thing is: we allowed one person, you see—one human individual—to be the incarnate God, because we have all been living in a theory of the universe in which the individual is simply involved in something that happens to him. And we feel that this thing that happens to us is reality, it is facts that we have to face and accept and cope with. See? It's always something other than you. You don't recognize it as an integral part of your own being without which you cannot know what you mean by the word 'I.' But in the truth of the matter is, though, that if you will face it out, every single one of us knows that that isn't true. There is, as it were, a recess of the soul—of the psyche—where everybody knows perfectly well that you are not just this irresponsible little mouse that's been chucked down into this world, but that you are really doing this work. You're running it.

Only: you can't admit it just in the same way as you can't admit that you're responsible for the way your own heart beats. You say, "Oh that's not my

doing. I've no control over my heart." Do you have any control over being conscious? Do you know how you will? When you say, "I intend to take my hand down from my face and put it on my leg"—I can do that, but I don't know how the hell it's done. So that what we mean by the capacity of voluntary control—in the ordinary sense of the word—we don't understand it at all! So you might say, in a funny backwards way, that the only kind of control you really understand is that where you're not using your will because you just do it. So easy, like you open and close your hand. You know how to do it? Sure you know how to do it. But you can't put it into words and explain to someone how to do it. You say, "Well, come on. Aren't you human? Don't you know how to open and close your hand? Just do it, silly!"

But we don't realize, you see, that just as we know how to do this, we know equally well how to turn the Sun into light, how to blue the sky, how to blow the wind, how to wave the ocean, how to digest food. And, I might add, to be digested—by bacteria—and transformed. As we transform our steaks we will, in turn, be transformed. But the pattern keeps going. And it's always you. Only, you see, you have this marvelous capacity to transform yourself without knowing that you're doing it. Therefore, you keep surprising yourself, and therefore you keep on doing it. Because if you didn't surprise yourself you wouldn't go on doing it. It's just the very fact, you see, that you seem to be the victims of a thing you don't understand, and that you seem to conclude your life every time in a wipeout called 'death'—where all your control goes—it's just exactly that opposite condition to what you call 'being alive' that allows you to be alive! Only: every time it happens it's like it's new. It's like every time you're born it seems like it was the only time. But, of course, if it wasn't like that you wouldn't do it.

On Being God

Between Western psychology, psychiatry, and psychotherapy and the so-called religions of Asia, there is common ground because both are interested in changing states of human consciousness. Whereas, institutional western religions – Christianity, Judaism, and even Islam – are relatively less interested in this matter. Western religions are more

concerned with behavior, doctrine, and belief than with any transformation of the way in which we are aware of ourselves and of the world. But this matter concerns psychiatry and psychology very much. Only, those states of consciousness which are not normal are usually treated in Western psychology as being in some way sick.

There are, of course, exceptions to this. And they have increasingly been exceptions. In the work of Jung, and to some extent even of Groddeck, of Prinzhorn, of more modern people as Rogers and Ronald Laing, changing consciousness is often looked upon as a form of therapy. But in general, different states of consciousness from the normal are regarded as a form of sickness. And therefore, official and institutional psychiatry constitutes itself the guardian of sanity and of socially approved experience of reality. And very often it seems to me that reality appears rather much the way the world is seen on a bleak Monday morning, in this official doctrine – I might even say dogma – of what reality is. Because after all, we know that our science, such as it is of psychology, is founded in the scientific naturalism of the nineteenth century. And the metaphysical and mythological assumptions of that science still underlie a great deal of psychological thinking. In behaviorism eminently, but also, to a large extent, in official psychoanalysis.

Indeed, one might say that psychoanalysis is based on Newtonian mechanics, and in fact could be called psycho-hydraulics. Not that that analogy is altogether inappropriate because there are certainly respects in which our psychic life flows and exhibits the dynamics of water, but of course we want to know what kind of water. And for the scientific naturalism of the nineteenth century, the basic energies of nature were considered to be very much inferior to human consciousness in quality. Ernst Haeckel, the biologist of that time would think of the energy of the universe as blind energy. And correspondingly, it seems to me that Freud thought of the libido as essentially blind, unconscious energy embodying only a kind of formless, unstructured, and insatiable lust.

This is a generalization, some modification in that thinking is of course possible. But the tendency is to regard all that which lies below the surface of human consciousness as being less evolved, because you must remember

that it was also the time of Darwin's theory of evolution, of seeing the human mind as a fortuitous development from much more primitive forms of life coming forth by purely mechanical processes, by natural selection, and by the survival of the fittest.

And therefore, man was, in general seeing, as a fluke of nature and embodiment of reason, emotion, and values for which the more basic processes of nature had no sympathy and about which they did not care. If, therefore, the human race was to flourish, we must take charge of evolution. It can no longer be left to spontaneous processes, but must be directed by human ingenuity. Despite effect, that although our brains are capable of dealing with the colossal number of variables at once, our conscious attention is not. Most people cannot consider more than three variables at the same time without using a pencil. And this shows that in many ways the scanning process of man's conscious attention is very inadequate for dealing with the infinitely many variables, the multidimensional processes of the natural universe. However a serious attempt has been made, and scientific naturalism issued in a fantastic fight with nature.

In this whole notion of the conquest and subordination of nature which has, as a matter of fact, very ancient, non-scientific and biblical origins. With the idea of man as the head, and chef, and ruler of nature, in the image of God, and the time has now dawned upon us all when our attempts to beat nature into submission are having alarming results. Because we see that it is very dangerous to mess around with processes that we don't understand, that have enormous numbers of variables, and we have begun to wonder whether we hadn't better leave well enough alone.

At the same time, although I said that Western psychology had more in common or more common interests with Oriental religion than it does with Western religion, there is a sense in which psychiatry and psychotherapy are becoming the religion of the West. Psychoanalysis has much in common with the forms and procedures of institutional religion. There is, for example, apostolic succession: the passing down of mana [mana: impersonal force, authority, magical power], of qualified power to practice therapy from the father-founder Sigmund Freud through his immediate apostles to an enormous company of archbishops and bishops. Among

whom there are of course, as there was in Christianity, heresiarchs such as Jung, Groddeck, Rank, and Reich, and the heresiarchs are duly excommunicated and anathematized. There are rituals, as there are also rituals with religion. There is the sacrament of the couch, there is the spiritual discipline of free association. There is the mystic knowledge of the interpretation of dreams, and there are also the two great symbolic fetishes: the long one and the round one.

Now it is extraordinarily easy to make fun of all this. And we must not forget that we owe a tremendous debt to Freud if for nothing else than pointing out that much of ourselves – of which we are aware in terms of the conscious ego – is not really ourselves. It is something superficial, however we define its nature it is superficial, and the realities of human life are not under the gaze of its scanning process, at least not in the ordinary way. And that was a tremendous revelation, there is no question about that. But one sees troublesome signs when the doctrines and processes of psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and so forth become officialised. And I think, Thomas Szasz, in his books *The Myth of Mental Illness* and *The Manufacture of Madness*, is pointing out something extremely important to us: which is that in a fact the psychological official of today is the priest. And that he is beginning to exercise the same sort of controls over human life as were exercised by the church in the Middle Ages. So the professor of psychiatry at Columbia or Harvard or Yale medical schools has today the same sort of intellectual respectability and authority as the professor of theology at the University of Toledo or Padua would have had in the year 1400.

Now you must realize that the theologians of those days not simply believed in their cosmology and theology, they almost new it was true, in the same way that our scientists know certain things to be true – despite the fact that they change their opinions very often while they hold them. Their have in a fact the force of dogma, as witness the anathematization of Velikowsky for his uncomfortable ideas. And therefore, there are heresies existing today which are persecuted in the same way as heresies were persecuted by the Holy Inquisition. And they are persecuted out of kindness in exactly the same way that the Holy Inquisition persecuted heresy out of kindness and deep concern for human beings. That is unimaginable to us, but it was so. But after all, if you seriously believe that someone who did

not hold the catholic faith and who voluntarily rejects it, would be tortured physically and spiritually forever and ever and ever in hell, you would resort to almost any means to preserve a fellow human being from such a fate – especially if the complaint, or disease of heresy from which he suffers was infectious.

You would first of all reason with him. And if he was not responsive to reason, you would resort to abuse and to forceful argument. And if he was responsive to that, you would give him shock treatment and bang him about. If that didn't work, the thumb screw, the rack, and the iron maiden. And if that didn't work – as a last desperate result – you would burn him at the stake in the pious hope that in the midst of those searing fires he would think better and make a last act of perfect contrition and so be rescued from everlasting damnation. And you did all this in the spirit of “this is going to hurt me more than it's going to hurt you”, in the spirit of the surgeon who is very, very sorry indeed that he has to make you undergo this extremely painful operation, but it is in your best interest, and there really is at least a fifty-fifty chance that you may survive.

And so therefore, in perfectly scientific, medical spirit, people may be very arbitrarily and without due process deprived of their civil rights, incarcerated in prisons that are in many cases much worse than prisons for criminals, and generally left to rot, be neglected and ignored and when they are bumptious, given shock treatment or put in solitary confinement. For what? Because they have unorthodox and heretical states of consciousness.

A lot of these people are not dangerous until provoked into being dangerous by being ignored, by being treated as machines and in general define as nonhuman. And if you are define as nonhuman there is precious little you can do about it, because everything you say that sounds human will be taken as a kind of utterance of a mechanical man, as imitating humanness out of lunatic cunning. You will be suspicious, everything you say will be listened to in a different way and with different ears. And you will have one heck of a time talking yourself out of it, because there really are no rules as to what one must do when incarcerated for having unorthodox consciousness. There is no clear road to repentance.

And this is found likewise in jails where people are incarcerated on one, to ten year sentences, as in places like Vacaville, California. When I visited such prisons young men have come to me in perfect desperation and said, “I don’t know what’s happened to me because I want to live like a decent citizen. I know I’ve done things that are wrong, but I simply don’t know what is expected of me here. If I try to do what’s expected, they say I’m compliant, and that seems to be some sort of a sickness.”

Thomas Szasz drew attention to this when he quoted a discussion of the types of schoolchildren who may very well need therapy. There were overachieving, there were underachieving children. There were children who exhibited erratic patterns, there were children who were sort of dully mediocre. In fact, every sort of child can be given a diagnostic name, for his behaviour, which sounds sick. As Jung once suggested, “Life itself is a disease with a very poor prognosis. It lingers on for years and invariably ends with death.”

And I submit that with our present knowledge of the human mind, such power in the hands of psychiatrists is amazingly dangerous. What I would suggest that today we know about as much concerning the human mind as we knew about the galaxy in 1300. And that while there are indeed individuals who are certainly able to perform psychotherapy, it is the sheerest arrogance for anybody to say that he is officially qualified to do so. We do not know how it is done, just as we do not know, really, how musical, artistic, and literary genius is done. You cannot really teach it, you can put the tools for doing these things into people’s hands, and you can show them how to use the tools, but whether they will use those tools with genius is quite unpredictable.

And this is above all true of the art of psychotherapy. We don’t know how it’s done. We have got some vague ideas. There probably are some people who, by reason of their mental derangement are probably not qualified to perform it because they are maybe out just to make other people into messes. But to say that there are certain standards and certain examinations that can be passed and certificates that can be issued which doing it qualify people for this work is, I think, pernicious nonsense. And is used, of course

out of economic self-interest, when those who consider themselves official therapists run into competition.

The same was done by religion. I was talking, imagine it, to a Buddhist priest in Thailand, some years ago. I was looking at some books in a bookshop in the precincts of a Buddhist temple, and I was wondering over it, and I noticed a book on a certain form of Buddhist meditation, and I murmured, “Hmm, Satipatthana,” which is the name of a certain kind of Buddhist meditation.

And a voice suddenly said to me, “You practice Satipatthana?” I looked up and there was a skinny Buddhist monk in a yellow robe with rather red eyes looking at me.

I said, “Not exactly Satipatthana. I use a different method. It’s called Zen.”

“Oh Satipatthana not Zen.”

I said, “Well, it’s something like it, isn’t it?”

“No.”

“Well, it’s rather like yoga,” I said. “Isn’t it?”

“Not yoga, no. Satipatthana different. Only right way.”

“Well, look,” I said to him. “I have a lot of Roman Catholic friends who tell me that their way is the only right way. Whom am I to believe? You know, I said, you’re like someone who’s got a ferryboat for crossing the river, – I used the Buddhist simile – and another fellow down the stream has opened up a ferry business. You go to the government, and say, ‘He’s not authorized to operate a ferryboat, because he’s competition to you. Let all operate ferryboats who will. And if you haven’t got the sense to get off, to stay off one that sinks, it’s your fault.’” And after all I could say to him “You believe that everything that happens to you is your own karma, so why worry?”

But now, it's so interesting that sense, official psychiatry, and I underline the word official because I hope those of you in this audience who are therapists will regard yourselves as unofficial. At least that'll give you an out. But nevertheless, official psychiatry has curious things in common with Western religion as well as with Eastern. It believes, that I said, only insofar as it has an interest in states of consciousness, and in times to regard other states of consciousness than the ordinary as sick. But it has one very important feature in common with Western religion. And to (understand) that we have to go a little bit (deeper) into Western religious history and ask ourselves what in Western religion – and especially in Christianity, and this goes also for Judaism, Islam – what is the great heresy?

Curiously enough the great heresy was first, in the West, committed by no less a person than Jesus Christ who believed himself to be God. This of course will be unquestionably true if you think that the Gospel of St. John has historical value. It is a little vague in the synoptic Gospels, but if you read the Gospel of St. John there is absolutely no doubt about it, for he said, "I and the Father are one. He who has seen me has seen the Father. Before Abraham was, I am. I am the way, the truth, and the life. I am the resurrection and the life." He said all that, according to this Gospel, and that is something that in the Western world you are not supposed to say. Especially, you are not supposed to believe it, and naturally it was very difficult for Jesus because he was saying all this in the context of the Hebrew culture. And he tried to find language in the Hebrew scriptures with which to express his state of consciousness because he had an unusual state of consciousness, as I read it, he had cosmic consciousness, otherwise known as mystical experience, otherwise known as moksha, nirvana, bodhi, satori, fana-al-fana or what you will. And that happens to people. It has happened as far back as we know. It happens all over the world, and in all cultures. We don't know very much about it. We don't really know ways in which to make it happen because it seems to be of the nature of it that it is a spontaneous surprise. But it unquestionably happens, and most people keep their mouths shut about it when it does.

I had a friend who, in the middle of having a stroke, had this illumination. And he said to me, "I fear to speak to my friends of this, but it was the most beautiful experience. I shall never be afraid of death. In fact, I recommend

to everyone to have a stroke.” This was my friend Jean Varda, the lately deceased Greek painter.

But Jesus certainly had this transformation of consciousness, and he was crucified for it. Why? Because he had committed an act of insubordination and treason against the cosmic government. Because if you believe that God is a monarch, an absolute, omniscient, and omnipotent authority – shall we say a sort of cosmic ego – then to claim to be that, is to introduce democracy into the Kingdom of Heaven. To usurp divine authority and to speak in its name without proper authorization. And they asked Jesus, “By what authority do you speak – of heaven or of men?” And he was tricky about answering that one, he said “By what authority did John the Baptist speak?” And they were nervous about answering that one. He could have asked by what authority did Isaiah speak etc, or Moses?

If you believe that God is a monarch, an absolute, omniscient, and omnipotent authority – shall we say a sort of cosmic ego – then to claim to be that, is to introduce democracy into the Kingdom of Heaven. To usurp divine authority and to speak in its name without proper authorization. And they asked Jesus, “By what authority do you speak – of heaven or of men?” And he was tricky about answering that one, he said “By what authority did John the Baptist speak?” And they were nervous about answering that one. He could have asked by what authority did Isaiah speak etc, or Moses?

But Moses became official authority, and if you could wangle it, you said that your words were simply an extension of what Moses said, because Rabbi So-and-so said it who got it from Rabbi So-and-so who got it from Rabbi So-and-so who got it from Moses. Then it was okay. Notice this, that to be an authority today in the academic world depends on documentation. It is not enough to say, “For I say unto you.” You must put in your footnotes, and the more the footnotes, the more the authority, obviously. So our dissertations tend to be books about books about books, and our libraries multiply by mitosis.

So when somebody speaks as an authority, that means to speak as an author, that all it means. It’s a statement of which you are the author and, therefore, for which you assume responsibility. That is to speak with authority, and to

be original – is likewise not to be freaky – but to speak from the origin. That is what Christians mean when they say to speak in the spirit, to have your mouth possessed by the Holy Spirit, as they believe the mouth of Jesus was possessed by the Holy Spirit.

So the Gospel of Jesus, which of course was hushed up from its inception, was that, “Wake up, everybody, and find out who you are!” Asking that, again in the Gospel of St. John, they – pointing to his disciples – may be one, “even as you, Father, and I, are one.” And when he was accused of blasphemy, the Jews took up stones to stone him if you know, and he said, “Many good works have I shown you from the Father, and for which of these do you stone me?” And they said, “For a good work we do not stone you but for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God.” Now listen to the reply. He said, “Is it not written in your law, I have said ye are Gods? And if that is what the Scripture says, it cannot be denied. So why do you tell me I blaspheme because I say, ‘I am a Son of God’?” No answer. Because I said, I am a Son of God.

It doesn't say that in your King James translation, it says: I am the Son of God. And you will see the italicized, then you will think that is done for emphasis if you don't realize that passages in italics in the King James Bible are interpolations by the translators. In Greek, leaving out the definite article is equivalent to having the indefinite article. Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (Hyiòs toû Theoû) is “a Son of God,” not ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ (ho Hyiòs toû Theoû). So “Son of” in Hebrew and in Arabic means “of the nature of.” When we call someone a “son of a bitch” we mean bitchy. And so if you call someone a “Son of God,” you mean divine, of the nature of God. As the Nicene Creed subsequently defined it, “He is of one substance with the Father.”

But what happened was, that this being blasphemy for the Jews, it became blasphemy for the Christians, for anyone else than Jesus to say it. They said, “Okay. It was so with you, but there it stops! No more of this business.” And as a result of that, Jesus was made irrelevant by pedestalization, by being kicked upstairs, in spite of the fact that he said, “Greater works than these that I do, shall you do.” Oh no. Upstairs with you baby, because we just cannot have that sort of thing going on in a monarchical universe. We're not going to have democracy in the Kingdom

of Heaven. So this is why the Gospel is impossible, because we are supposed to follow the example of Christ when he says for example, “Be not anxious for the morrow.” Do not worry about what you shall eat, what you shall drink, and what you shall wear. God will take care of you. Doesn’t he take care of the birds? Don’t the flowers grow. And they’re wonderful, they’re crazy, they’re great! What are you worrying about? I have never heard a sermon preach on that, never; because it’s totally subversive, the economy would crash. So they said, “Oh yes, that’s all very well, but he was the boss’ son.” He had that colossal advantage, take up your cross and follow him.

Hey! But wait a minute! I don’t know if I’m going to be resurrected three days later, I can’t do all those miracles. He had an unfair advantage, so how can they ask us to follow the example of Christ?

But supposing he didn’t have an unfair advantage, supposing that what was true about Jesus as the Son of God is true for us. Only a few of us know it, and we are pretty careful to be quiet about it, lest the same thing happen to us as happened to Jesus – and indeed it often does.

And you know, you get these people from Arkansas or Texas or, anywhere in the Bible Belt – who never heard of the Upanishads – and they have this cosmic consciousness experience and they realized that that’s what happened to Jesus, they he says, “I’m Jesus, come back.” Well, everybody says to him, “You aren’t Jesus. It’s pretty obvious you’re not Jesus. You’re just Joe Doggs. He says “Well, that’s what they said about Jesus.” He has a perfect argument, except they say, “You’re not much of a Jesus.” They say, “Alright, if you’re Jesus, command that these stones be made bread.” And he says, “A wicked and deceitful generation seeketh for a sign, and there shall be no sign given.”

Now, why talk about this? Is it interesting, is it important for the human being to realize that in some sense of the word – whatever it means – he is God or one with God, as is plainly taught by the Hindus, hinted at by the Buddhists, only they don’t like to put it out as a concept, in case people will use the concept as an idol to hang onto. They want you to find out for yourself – and not believe in it. And certainly the Taoists understand it, the Sufis understand it. A lot of people understand it. But so what?

What the importance of this is this: that to know that you are God is another way of saying that you feel completely with this universe. You feel profoundly rooted in it and connected with it. You feel, in other words, that the whole energy, which expresses itself in the galaxies, is intimate. It is not something to which you are a stranger but it is that with which you – whatever that is – are intimately bound up. That in your seeing, your hearing, your talking, your thinking, your moving, you express that which it is, which moves the sun and other stars.

And if you don't know that (you are God), if you don't feel that, well, naturally you feel alien, you feel a stranger in the world. And if you feel a stranger, you feel hostile. And therefore you start to bulldoze things about, to bit it up, and to try and make the world to submit to your will and you become a real troublemaker.

So I feel also, one reason why you become hostile is that feeling that you were just brought into this place, that your father and mother went up to some monkey business, that they probably shouldn't have done, or it was bad rubber goods, and as a result of this, here you are, and you didn't ask to be here. You will always feel you can turn around and blame them. You can blame somebody. You can blame the government. You can blame the rascals. You can blame the cheaters. Always supposing you yourself aren't a rascal, which is a long odds. You always can blame someone and say, "I didn't ask for it. Take it away." And yet, and yet, and yet very few people are all too ready to take it away.

Camus said that "The only serious philosophical problem is whether or not to commit suicide." And if you don't, if you don't say "Take it away", what are you going to do? You really got to assume responsibility for it. You have got to say "yes" to what happens. It is my karma. And that doesn't mean merely, cause here are many main misinterpretations of the doctrine of karma. It is usually and popularly understood to be that what happens to you, either fortunate or unfortunate, is the result of good or bad deeds in a previous life. Well, that's popular superstition. The real meaning of karma, the word in Sanskrit means simply "doing." And if I say of event, that "is your karma", it is saying "it is your doing." So the exposition a book which

would expounds karma would be not so much a whodunit as a youdunit. But that seems fantastic.

Now therefore what I propose we do is that we, instead of just ideologising, we have a clinical experience. You know, in psychiatric school, in medical school, it's very usual for a doctor to bring a patient out in front of the students, and talk with the patient. As a kind of demonstration, he says, "I want you to recognise the difference between a psychopath and a manic depressive or a schizophrenic or something" – they don't know what all these things mean. And especially, there's schizophrenia, and... so, he has a dialogue with the patient right there. So, let us suppose that I'm the patient and you are the students and the doctors, and I suffer from what you would call the delusion that I'm God. And therefore, you might want to do something about me or with me, or humour me, or ask me questions. And so I'm perfectly willing to submit to your examination and your treatment and invite you to help yourselves.

Male voice: When did you become God?

Watts: Now.

Female voice: Will you marry me?

Watts: No.

[Laughter]

Male voice: Do you sleep on your front or your back?

Watts: Sleeping is like politics. One sleeps on the right side, and then when you're tired of that, you sleep on the left. When you're tired of that, you sleep on your back, and when you're tired of that you sleep on your stomach, and it is thus that the world goes round.

[Laughter, light applause]

Male voice: If you are God now, what were you yesterday?

Watts: Now...

Female voice: How do you become God?

Watts: You don't become God.

Female voice: Interesting.

Male voice: Am I also God?

Watts: Yes.

Male voice: Are we, then, the same person?

Watts: No. Remember, three persons but one God.

[Laughter]

Male voice: God, will you tell us a little bit about Satan?

Watts: Could I tell you a little bit about Satan? [pauses] Yes. Although the matter is a little esoteric, but I told you all about it in the Book of Job, where you will see that in the court of Heaven, Satan is the District Attorney. He is not, as Christians imagine, the enemy of Heaven, and the enemy of mankind. He's merely the person who sees the bad side of things and carries out the dirty work. And therefore, he saw Job, and wondered whether Job was really as great a guy as he seemed to be, and suggested that God should appoint a committee of investigation to find out. And the committee did its work very thoroughly but the case went against Satan because it was proved in the end that Job was an honourable man. Now you notice that although we pay the salary of the District Attorney, whenever there's a great criminal case before the public eye, people begin to take the side of the underdog. And the prosecutor always has less public sympathy than the defence – except in political trials. On the right hand of God, and you know the defence is always on the right hand of the judge in court, is our only mediator and advocate, which is the phrase referring to Jesus Christ, Our Lord. So there is the defence, and there is the prosecution, and it is the function of Satan to be the prosecutor. There's a good deal more to it than that because before all this started, lies in a stage play, there was an arrangement in the green room before coming on stage, in which certain

things were understood but that are only to be revealed when the curtain goes down at the end of the play.

Female voice: Is Job God too?

Watts: Yes, but he doesn't know it.

Female voice: Why do you hide from the sight of so many?

Watts: Why do you hide? It's for the same reason you're hiding!

Male voice: God, did you create [inaudible]?

Watts: Yes.

Male voice: [inaudible]

Watts: Who else?

Male voice: Does man have free will?

Watts: Huh?

Male voice: Does man have free will?

Watts: Man has free will to the extent that he knows who he is. Not otherwise.

Male voice: Where does he get free will from?

Watts: Where I got it from.

[laughter]

Female voice: Does woman have free will too?

Watts: Yes. To the extent that she knows who she is, yes.

Male voice: If man has free will and knows just what he is, and man is God, then, you're saying then you'd say that you are no more than any God in this room – or any man.

Watts: That is correct, I am no more God than any of you.

Male voice: And you only have the power to know who you are?

Watts: Well, that is saying quite a bit. Yes.

Male voice: What is not God?

Watts: What is not God? There is nothing that is not God.

Male voice: How do you learn who you are?

Watts: It's like waking up from a dream. After a while one's experience begins to have what I would call a "haven't we been here before?" feeling. Going round and round and round...and then you begin wondering: "where am I going?" And to answer that question you have to try and find out what you want. And so I went into that very thoroughly. What do I want to happen? And, of course, as soon as you ask yourself that you begin to fantasize. And our amazing technology is of course an expression of human desire, desire for power, for what we want to achieve. So I simply set myself to thinking through how far we could go. And so I soon found myself at a great push-button place where I had a fantastic mechanism, with buttons available for every conceivable thing I could wish! So I spent quite a bit of time playing with those. And science fiction wasn't doing it. You know, you go "going" like that and here is Cleopatra. And so on – you know press this button; symphonic music in – ahh...4 channel sound, 16 channel sound – anything! All possible pleasures are available. And when you're like everybody's dream of the sultan in the palace, you suddenly notice there's a button labeled "surprise". You push that. And here we are.

Male voice: Is boredom a problem?

Watts: Yes boredom is of course the problem. Boredom is the other side of creativity. And the energy of creation has as its – that is the Yang. The Yin

side of that energy is called boredom. Everything is of course fundamentally Yang and Yin. If you understand that you really don't need to understand anything else.

Male voice: As God, what responsibility do you feel to ameliorate evil in the world?

Watts: As God, what responsibility do I feel to ameliorate evil in the world? I begin with the point that I am responsible for the way the world is. If I couldn't feel that I'd have to blame somebody else. I'm not willing to do that because I know that under various changing circumstances, it might be appropriate for me to be as big a rascal as rascals have been. Now as to improving the world, the world is always improving. It may look to some people slow, but it's improving even when it is declining, because the world works in an undulatory process, like a wave: it goes up and it goes down, it goes up and it goes down. And it couldn't go up all the time because if it did, we wouldn't know that that was up. So it goes down some of the time so that we can know when it goes up because if we didn't know when it went up it would be like being in a space where everything was light. There'd be nothing to write home about. There'd be no black marks on the space and so it would be like a piece of perfectly empty paper. Similarly, to be in a completely black space would also be a kind of unconsciousness with nothing to write home about, as there'd be nothing – nothing would make any difference. So, therefore, if you're going to have black, you won't know that it's black unless you have some white and if you're going to have white, you won't know that it's white unless you have some black.

Male voice: Why do you teach us all to love one another, because if we get to that point, there won't be any ups and downs?

Watts: Correct, but that's not a teaching it's a kōan. A kōan is a Japanese word for a spiritual problem, used in Zen Buddhism, such as 'what is the sound of one hand?' And these problems are given to those who ask questions concerning their spiritual development. And sometimes, as St. Paul pointed out, commandments are given not in the expectation that they will be obeyed, but in the expectation that they will reveal something to those who hear them. That was St. Paul's comment on the whole Mosaic law... Yes, sir?

Male voice: If we are all God –

Watts: Yes –

Male voice: – what of the hereafter? Is there a heaven, is there a purgatory, is there a hell?

Watts: The hereafter is of course now, because if you will examine it closely there is no-when else than now. And if you want to make hell of it, you can make hell of it – if you want to make a heaven of it, you can make a heaven of it – purgatory, purgatory. It's all here. Always was, always will be.

Female voice: What is death?

Watts: Death is an undulation in consciousness. How would you know you were alive unless you'd once been dead?

Male voice: Do you realise – in the same way that Jesus did the will of God – why was it unnecessary for him to have material possessions and necessary for you?

Watts: It wasn't unnecessary for him to have material possessions. They said of St. John The Baptist that he was an ascetic – but of Jesus: “this man consorts with gluttons and wine bibbers and comes eating and drinking.” And when the Lady Mary poured precious ointment on his feet and anointed him, they said the same thing that the members of the vestry say to the ministers today – “why this great expense? Couldn't it all have been sold for much money and given to the poor?”

Male voice: ...but this is a problem...

Watts: It is a problem, sure. But you see, in many ways when you get down to these very deep ethical problems, where there sure is no easy decision one way or the other, you must look at the problem from the point of view of an artist. Which way of doing this is in some sense greater? It may be better to go off with a bang than with a wimper.

On Being God Q&A

Let me see. Ye—

Are you God all the time? I mean, are you consciousness all the time?

There is no time, my dear. It's always now.

[???] and it's during every event. [???] In every precise moment in consciousness, are you conscious of it?

Oh, of—yes, if you put it that way, of course.

You are consciously God, as an experiencing unit on this plane of—

Wait a moment. Consciously? Not necessarily, because that would spoil the fun.

That's what I'm asking.

If you press button "Surprise!" you'll press the button so that you forget who you are.

Wait, so then you don't always know the answers to a given problem?

Yes, that's perfectly true. This is called in the Bible kenosis. In St. Paul's epistle to the Philippians he says, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus who, being in the form of God, sought not equality with God a thing to be grasped, but humbled himself and made himself of no reputation, and was found in fashion as a man, and became obedient to death." And so you get, from this, the kenotic theory of creation—held by some of the Greek fathers—that the creation of the universe is the self-emptying, or self-forgetting, of the Godhead.

Yes, I think it's your turn now.

How does your concept of creation [???] so that man could see that good is different from the old story of man beating his head against the wall so he could feel how good it is when you stop?

It's really rather like it. Because the universe is fundamentally a system which creeps up on itself and then says "Boo!" And then it laughs at itself for jumping. And, you see, every time it does it, it forgets that it did it before, so it never becomes a bore.

Yes, the lady in red.

Can you make yourself into a point of consciousness and travel around the cosmos, such as Dr. Lilly was speaking of last night [??]?

Yes, but it isn't necessary to travel. The question is: can I make myself into a point of consciousness and travel around the cosmos, and see things from all sorts of places? I say: yes, but it isn't necessary to travel. One is already there. In other words, I'm using your eyes where you are like you're using mine. Just in the same way, my head is not my feet, it uses my feet. The head is very different from the feet. You couldn't possibly say the head and the feet are the same, but they are one organism.

They each have a sole/soul.

Two.

What do you do about boredom?

What do I do about boredom? Press button "Surprise!"

Oh, it's always there.

Yes, always.

Yes, the lady in purple here.

You talk about boredom. It seems to me [??] many people that one of the biggest problems in life is being forced into earning living and something which is not what you'd rather be doing. And I often wonder: is the answer to go somewhere and live on less money and do the things that I would like to do, or must I resign myself—as many people have—to do the thing that gets me the bread and then, in my spare time, try to make up for the many days and years of this time of [??]. What is the answer?

Well, there are two sort of answers, one of which you've already indicated, which is to do with less and do what you want. Which...

But if everyone did that, you know, those things [???] accepted as part of life, when they get done?

I think the objection "if everyone did that" is rather like asking what would happen if everybody wanted to catch the four o'clock train from Grand Central to Westport, or if all the molecules of air in this room were suddenly to congregate over in that corner. There is a bare chance that it might happen, but very low.

Yes?

Would you say we're going around in circles trying to eliminate evil because we never will? And it might not be an evil?

Yes.

We'll never eliminate it, so we're just playing games.

We are going 'round in circles. But, you see, going 'round in circles—you may have observed by looking at the sky—is what the universe is doing. You see, before...

As long as we recognize that we're going around in circles, we're all right.

Yes. Yes, that's the thing. It's a dance. And when you dance you don't dance to get somewhere

I didn't mean going around in circles [???] ocean.

Yes, alright. But you turn—when you wake up—you turn the confusion into a dance. And so I go back to your question: what is the alternative to clearing out of the job you're doing and, say, doing less with more fun? Well, there are ways of making almost any activity into a dance. Supposing you had to drive a bus in New York—which is a very harrowing job in the ordinary way—you must not take seriously anything about it. This is the first rule: that it doesn't matter a damn if you don't get there on time, but it

would be fun to go as fast as is consistent with safety. And therefore, you swing that bus, and you play things through the horn; you take the whole thing lightly as if it is not serious.

Because—and this is the nature, say, in ritual, when you have a procession. Now, people who don't understand religion don't know how to make the right kind of processions. There are those who go in military march, and they don't understand it because their objective is to get there. There are those who dawdle like ducks, and they don't understand because they are trying to be dignified. On the other hand, there are those who walk as if they had already arrived, and this is the way kings walk. Because a king is the center, and he is always where it's at. Where it's at is where the king is, by definition.

So if you work in this way, even—I mean—people who are practicing meditation take up monotonous things for fun, and meditation is supposed to be fun—I hope John Lilly told you that this morning—where you say you're going to do Aum Mani Padme Hum. Aum Mani Padme Hum. Aum Mani Padme Hum. Aum Mani Padme Hum. You know, you can really have a gas doing that. And so that anything monotonous can be treated in the same way. This is the way—one of the ways—of overcoming boredom. Because boredom's the great problem for energy. See, energy's always on the go.

Yes, sir? Yes, the gentleman in the white shirt, here.

Does it bother you to be called mythic [??]?

Mythic? No. Mythic is a great word. The question is: does it bother me to be called mythic? No. Myth is very powerful. Myth is fun! Myth is stories told to children. Everybody loves them.

Yes, sir?

Is God omniscient?

Is God omniscient? Well, it depends what you mean by the word. A lot of people think that omniscience is like knowing everything that's in the

Encyclopædia Britannica. That's not omniscience, that's intellectual elephantiasis.

Now, you see, let me explain this question because it's always important, and when anybody announces that he or she is God, people say at once, "Well, will you tell us, in millimeters, the height of Mont Blanc?" And I say, "Look it up in the encyclopedia, it's there." The thing is this: what we ordinarily call knowledge is the translation of life into words, and that is a very cumbersome process because if we had to translate the process into words every time we took a breath, we'd never get around to it. It takes so long to describe and think through the whole physiology of breath. Therefore, we do it without thinking about it. And I find that I'm shining the stars in just the same way. I mean, if you want it in words it's going to take us a long time to get through them because words are strung out in a line.

[???] and we're all gods, how come as gods [???] therefore I am God, how come [???] difficulty recognizing and understanding [???] peace and tranquility within myself?

How do you—if you are God—how do you find such difficulty in finding peace and tranquility in yourself? That's because you're looking for it away from the place in which you are. You are seeking it apart from the experience which you have at this moment and you are regarding that experience and saying, "That's pretty lousy, I'd like something better than that." But the trouble with that is that it splits you in two pieces, and once you're split in two pieces you're lost. Because you made a difference between the experience you are now having, on the one hand, and yourself, who is having it, on the other. And you wish you could get away from that experience. Now, the truth of the matter is: you can't. Because you are what you experience. It's a myth, purely, that there is some sort of experiencer who has the experience. You are what you know because it is not "I know something," there is simply a process called "the knowing." You could say that knowing, like the world, has two poles: north and south. And so the knowing-ball has the knower and the known, but only in that sense. Now, knowing changes; it changes itself. But if you try to stand outside it and change it, it'll be like standing outside your hand and trying to move your

hand from outside. And so comes the difficulty. In other words, this would be the difficulty for God in the press-button “Surprise!” situation, where you think you want something different from what you have. But if you do think that you’ve got to ask yourself the question: what it is that you really want? This is the most fundamentally important question. And you will find, if you go into it very, very deeply, that you have it. Now, you may change your mind about it, but you do have what you want.

God, if this place caught on fire I would find myself so scared that I wonder if I also feel that I was God, and if I am God and scared, what do I do about that?

Well, one of the ways of not being bored is to scare yourself. Don’t we all go to the—we go to the movies just to be scared. We put certain limits on it, indeed, before we go and say, “Well, this isn’t really going to happen. It’s only a play or a movie.” And therefore, while we see the safe outline of the presceni-um arch, back in the back of our minds is a sort of Hintergedanke—we know it’s only a play.

I’m talking about what it is [???

How do you know it isn’t? If, you see, after all, the task and the act are on the stage is to come on so well that the audience thinks it’s real. So that he has them crying, so that he has them shaking with fear, so that he has them sitting on the edges of their chairs. Well, that’s just one ordinary Joe Dokes actor. But supposing the actor of the play is the real big actor—wow! That play would seem real. So that’s what happens when the house catches on fire.

Yes? Lady in red. Yes, you’re looking behind yourself.

God, what is sleep for you?

What is sleep? The seventh day.

When is it?

When is the seventh day? When you sleep!

Yes?

Yes, God. The only reason I know that I'm God is because I take the responsibility for it.

Yes...

Doesn't that answer the lady's question about the fire?

Oh yes, that also would answer it. Yes. It's a question of taking responsibility for what happens.

What happens if you don't do anything about the boredom?

If I don't do anything about the world?

The boredom.

The boredom.

What's through the boredom?

Well, that's another way. That's another way. You can explore boredom. You can bore into boredom and watch it. Sometimes, when you're bored, that's the only thing to do, because even for God you can't lift yourself up by your own bootstraps. Because that is, by nature of the definition, impossible.

You said [???] you would enjoy having [???] you.

Yes, I think that would be fun. I mean, why else does one go on stage except to make myths?

[???]

Excuse me, what did you say?

[???] motivation for going on stage?

What is my motivation for going on the stage? That is like asking, “Why is there a universe?”

Why is there?

Well, now, if you listened to George Leonard last night, George Leonard explained how children were befuddled by being taught to ask ‘why’ about everything. Because you always look away from what you’re asking about to its antecedents, and that won’t lead you anywhere at all. Why am I here? And I answer that question. Then somebody says, well, why that? And then somebody says, well, why that? Why that? Why that? And you get back and back and back, and eventually you get tired of answering. And so fathers, when their children say, “Why, daddy? Why? Why?” they say, “Oh shut up and eat your lollipop!” But what happens, you see—when we trace the causation of things into the past, it all begins to fade out in silence and no answer. Why? Huh. Because it didn’t begin there. The universe begins now, it didn’t begin in the past. And the past trails back from now like the wake of a ship.

If everything is God and there is no time except now, what is the role of chance?

If everything is God and there is not time except now, what is the role of chance? Chance pairs with order. We’ll say randomness—we’ll call it—and it pairs with order. And it is part of the nature of order—if you know what you mean by order, you know that you mean contrast with randomness. And if you know what you mean by randomness, you know that you mean contrast with order. So if you want to have order you must have randomness, and vice versa.

Yes?

Did you have this much charisma before you discovered your true nature?

Yes, but it came out in a different way.

Yes?

I think there's a sort of danger here, though. The riddles are funny and if you have time enough to think each one through they'd be very profound. There's a certain danger of everything and everyone being God, because if you've really found yourself as God, then you know that certain things that you, as God, have created that don't personally affect you. You created them for the reason you stay out of them, and you aren't a do-gooder. But if you think you're God, and then you try to go into too much social action and change the evils of the world, you end up hurting yourself and a lot of people, and you're playing God and you're not really being God.

Well, I admit to you, my dear, that this is a very, very dangerous conversation. And... that I thoroughly agree with, but we didn't come here—did we?—to play it safe. All profound ideas and profound questions are dangerous. It is dangerous to go into science. As we all know too well, it is dangerous to go into medicine. Dangerous to go into writing, because the pen is often mightier than the sword. And so I don't think we should withdraw from certain things because they're dangerous, but I entirely agree with you that if I were, as it were, in the spirit of God to go about social reform, I would be failing to realize the construction of my own universe, which is that when you interfere with it you've got to know exactly how you're interfering. Otherwise, the most amazingly unexpected things will happen. So when people ask for miracles they don't realize what the miracles involve. I mean, if I turned the microphone into a rabbit, it's altogether possible that you might drop dead because those events might be connected.

Have you ever studied with Carl Jung?

Did I ever study with Carl Jung? I never s—

Or work with him?

I didn't study with him. I knew him and I read a lot of his writings, yes.

Does the notion of watching yourself, like watching your boredom or being aware of yourself, imply that there's separation somewhere?

It does in a way, yes. And it depends how you're watching. I some— there is a very interesting thing that comes up in this respect with regard to the Bhagavad Gita and to the Yoga Sutra, where they talk about the witness. There is, as it were—behind our ordinary self with its emotions and involvements—a witness self that does nothing more than perceive what happens. And this is the Ātman, or the puruṣa, which is not involved. And some of you, no doubt—especially in times of crisis—have suddenly discovered this sort of witness center behind everything that just isn't involved. The most terrible things can be going on, but the witness is impassive.

Now, when we go into these states we've got to be very careful about descriptive language, because the descriptive language makes the witness seem something apart from what is happening in such a way that—if we want to become, really, sort of schizy and catatonic about things—we can always be withdrawn and go in and in and identify ourselves with the solitary and uninvolved witness who is merely a hang-up for the ego, as when the police raid a house in which there are burglars. And the burglars know they'll be caught if they're on the ground floor, so they go up to the first floor. So then, the police come up to the first floor, they're up to the second. Finally, they get to the roof, the open sky and the infinite. And, in this way, this was why the Buddha did not teach about the Ātman—the real Self within us—because he knew people would use the real Self as a hideout for the ego.

And so, when, say, Krishnamurti tries to explain this, he doesn't talk about the witness. He talks about awareness and people say to him, "But who is aware? What is aware?" And he seems a little sticky in his answer here, because what is the matter is that the people asking the question are bewitched by grammar. They are using a language in which it is part of the grammatical convention that the verb always have a noun subject. Now, how on earth do verbs get started by nouns? I ask you: how can a thing start a process? Surely, this is really the same problem Descartes was wrestling with when he tried to find out how spirit could influence matter, or how mind could influence body. Because everybody knows that all proper ghosts walk straight through walls without disturbing the bricks. So how can the

ghost in the machine, as Koestler put it—the soul in the body—how can it do anything to the body with no connection? Two different realms.

The point is, when we're talking about this awareness... what we call thought, feeling, sensation, emotion, we could say in a very clumsy way is: it's aware of itself. It's the very nature. There wouldn't be sensation without awareness. You don't have to have some thing which is aware of it any more than you have to have a thing called lightning which does something called flashing. The flashing is the lightning. And so awareness is the one who's aware of it. You could say this awareness—if I say, "I am aware," the word "I", as William James suggested, is simply a word of position like "this" or "here." Awareness here. And your awareness there.

Yes, sir?

Is life, like, one great kōan that [??]?

Yes, life is like one great kōan.

Is death the solution of it?

No, death is not the solution; it has no solution. Otherwise it wouldn't happen. You see, the thing is like this—this is what is hard, for Westerners especially, to understand: I said if you understand the yang and the yin, you don't need to ask any further questions, and all you I Ching buffs ought to know this by now. What is not a component of Western common sense is that nothing is something. Now, that may sound a little contradictory, but I think I can explain it. We treat nothingness as if it were ineffective, as if it wasn't really important at all. And yet, when we look out at the night and we see all these stars in space, try and imagine what the heavens would look like if there weren't any space. Then, obviously, there wouldn't be any stars. I mean, you could think they would all be jammed together in a lump. There are various objections to that; how would you see the edge of the lump, and know it was a lump, without space around it? Furthermore, we know, when we investigate the constitution of matter physically, that at the atomic level there's more space in something than there is anything else. Most of it is empty, which led a physicist at the Argonne Lab at the University of Chicago to become a little nutty. He was so impressed with

the emptiness of matter that he went around in the most enormous padded slippers in case he should fall through the floor.

So... now, the point that I'm making is this: if space is essential to solid, it's perfectly obvious, then, that nothing is essential to something. If you can't have something without nothing, it means nothing is pretty powerful stuff. Because something comes out of it. BLWWP, like that! It's a dogma of Western thought expressed in the Latin phrase *ex nihilo nihil fit*: "out of nothing comes nothing." But that's not so, out of nothing comes something! Now, you would say, "Well, if something comes out of nothing, there must be some kind of mystery inside nothing, it must have a secret structure of some kind. I mean, there must be, sort of, electrical goings-on." This is the trouble they have about cosmology: how could this world generate? Could it just be out of free-floating hydrogen? No! It's a much simpler idea than that: it comes out of real, solid nothing.

It's so simple! Look: if you listen, you see, you live in a world where there's only sound, for a moment. You'll hear every sound coming out of silence. Where do these sounds come from? They come out of silence. Suddenly: BOOIINGG. And you can accustom yourself to seeing light doing the same thing. You can open your eyes and see all this world emerging out of nothing. BOOIINGG, like that, and fading off into the past. So that's why the future is unknown, because the future is zero. And everybody who tries to know it—and that's the whole endeavor of... you see, trying to be God... you don't need to try to be God, you are! But if you try to be God it means you don't know you are, and therefore you try to know and dominate the future. And you believe prophets, and things like that. Well, prophecy is simply contaminating the future with the past; projecting what we know upon the unknown. And that's why, really, things like astrology—although interesting—are rather ridiculous. Because if you know the future, there's no surprise for you. A completely known future is past; you've had it.

Quick question.

Yes?

Where the future and the past come together, it seems to be there isn't anything. There is no now, really. [???] seem like you don't exist—you

know, how could we exist if there's no now to exist in? The past and the future come right together. Where is that place in between? How long is it?

Ah, there are two answers to that question. This is a real fun question; I love it. The question is about now. He's saying: really, there is no now. There is the future and the past come together, and the future turns into the past. They go BLWP, and it's gone, like that. So, you know, in no time at all, the future has become past. And so we get this frantic feeling: where do you go?

Well, let's take the small view, first of all. The now is infinitely short, and yet it's the only thing that is. In that case, this whole world is an illusion. It doesn't really exist. So when the king—the emperor Akbar—once was feeling a little sorry for himself and asked his jeweler, he said, “Make me a ring that will restrain me in prosperity and support me in adversity.” And so the jeweler made him a ring, and gave it to the emperor, and he saw written on it: “It Will Pass.”

Now, the other side of the matter is this: that this short now is an illusion of the clock. We make our second-marks on clocks as thin as is consistent with visibility. And therefore, we always think of the present as crossing the hairline. TICK. That's too long, see? How short can you get? You see? But really, the present isn't like that at all. Everything'd go BWWWP, got it. There is nowhere else but now! Everything that happens is happening now. Well, it's like your field of vision. Your field of vision isn't just a point of light, your field of vision is an oval. And it isn't fuzzy at the edges, it just ceases to be at the edges. But there's plenty of room in it to see something move across. So, in your field of time—your now—there is enough now to include a phrase of music. If there weren't, you wouldn't be able to make out melodies because there'd just be instantaneous notes with no connection between them. You would never hear intervals. So, now is a big, sloppy thing. But it comes out of nothing.

Yes? Lady standing by the pillar.

Is there no need for man to seek for some meaning [??]?

So the question is: is there, then, no need for man to seek for a meaning in his life?

Not only his life.

Not only his life, but the life of the universe? Right.

No, there is no need to seek for a meaning. Meaning—I use the word in rather a definite way—and for me, meaning is a function of signs. Particularly of words and symbols. Meaning is the referent of words, as when we take the word “water”—the meaning of it is something drinkable, whereas the sound “water” is not drinkable. So, therefore, if we ask life to have a meaning, we look for something other than life to be that meaning. And therefore, we reduce life to a being mere words and mere symbol.

Now, of course you may use the word “meaning” in a less precise way, and say, now, although the music of Bach has no meaning in the sense that it is not like the music of Tchaikovsky, designed to imitate natural events and noises, nevertheless it has meaning in the sense that it enchants us, the patterns of it ravish us in the same way as abstract patterns in an arabesque. That’s a little different sense of the word “meaning.” And yes, I would say that life has that kind of meaning. But you don’t seek it. Because if you seek it you lose it. I see the process of life as an essentially musical process which has no meaning except itself. It is going ’round in circles like we love to spin in circles when we’re dancing, like children love to spin around in circles ’till they get dizzy. That’s fun. And so the articulation of wonderful patterns is the meaning of life.

If you seek for meaning—now, this applies to all seekers; I’m sorry, growth-seekers. But seeking’s alright. I mean, it’s a free country. But it invariably takes you away from what you’re looking for because every search supposes I will find it later, not now. In the next moment. That somehow, by some gimmick, by some exercise, by some process of transformation I will later discover what I want. This is postponement.

Yes?

I do not [???

Yes.

...and I feel that it's much more common than that, and if you do seek meaning it doesn't take away from life, it's gives to life. And it gives it a much more meaningful and [???] a profound thing. That's all [???]

Well, this is a matter of words, my friend, because you may think that dancing is superficial, whereas I think it's profound.

Yes.

And so on. And I suggested two meanings of the word "meaning," one of which reduces life to being symbolic of something else, something always beyond. Then I'm going to ask what's the meaning of that? And then we get into that infinite regression of questions. I feel that instead of getting into these infinite regressions of what is beneath, what is behind—look. It's right out in front of you now. And when you catch on to that, now gets very profound. I mean, it's the moment when nothing becomes something and I don't see how much profounder than that you can get.

Yes?

But isn't the hide-and-seek sort of the essential game, and seeking fun in itself? Even if you never find it.

Oh yes! I'm telling—that's... I agree with. Seeking can be fun! But it won't get you to what you're looking for. You see, it's a way—seeking is a way of postponing finding. Let's put it off, you see? Children, on a hot day, they're terribly thirsty and they say, "Let's get an ice cream soda." The other kid says, "No, let's get thirstier." So when we finally get the ice cream soda, we are a real Zomb. This is the principle of postponement, and everybody who is questing, who is practicing yoga, and Zen meditation—all that kind of thing—is putting off that ice cream soda.

Well, then, if that's the case, what do you propose?

What do I propose? Nothing.

I don't think [??] in just quite that way. Then you will say nothing is something, and then we'll go around and [??]

But if you really believe that, then there would be no [??] on society. [??] whether it's doing something or thinking something, we definitely are not just feeling that we are going to sit and let everything happen to us. Why do I come here? Or why does anyone come here?

Yeah, but I mean, look here: when you ask, always, "Why did you come?" I repeat: that is a barren question. Why did you do it? Why did this happen? It goes—a question that peters out. So this is not important. What is important, surely, is this immediate now. Not why are we here, but what are we here? In—unless you live in the eternal now consciously, you have no use for plans. Because people who live in the future—or for the future—when their plans come off, they're not there enjoying them. They're planning for another future. They never catch up with themselves.

Can you not put your future in the now?

Yes, in that sense. Of course. When you make plans you plan now, and that can be a gas, making plans. But for goodness sake, do it in the now spirit rather than, as it were, "Oh, I can't wait 'till that happens." Because then, if you're in an I-can't-wait spirit, you just bolt life like somebody swallowing food so fast they can neither taste it nor digest it.

Yes?

Aren't there really two different ways to [??] search? The way of intellectually trying to figure it out and plan it, and a way of experiencing it. And part of your experience would be taking in what will happen in the future, and that second way isn't a bad search, it's just really being.

Yeah.

So isn't there a type—that's the type of searching for meaning that would be okay, that would be fulfilling?

Well, yes. The searching in a spirit that the search is more fun than the finding—you know that? When you're traveling, for example, going somewhere is the real joy of it, often. That's the fallacy of the jet plane: that it abolishes distances between places. And all places which have a distance abolished between them become the same place. So there's no point going to Tokyo if it's already Los Angeles. I mean, this is the thing.

Yes, [???] here.

Is it possible [???]?

Well, the comment is about seeking. Is it necessarily a road, like taking a road, or is seeking also conceivable as readiness to receive? Well, of course, the road isn't a merely Western analogue. It's a very common metaphor. The path, and the stages of the path, the steps of the path are used in both East and West. But the Chinese word for the Way is Tao, and the path is what we're looking for—in the Chinese sense, you see? The Tao is the works, baby. That is the which than which there is no whicher, and to be in harmony with the Way, to be on the way, you see? But the Tao isn't going anywhere. And that's like when the Chinese poet is wandering in the forest, and he looks at the clouds and he says, "Where are they going? No one knows. Where does this path lead? No one cares. I'm wandering on and on in a great forest without thought of return." That is poetic feeling to the far East; both to the Japanese and the Chinese. They call that spirit yūgen, and it's the mysterious going-nowhere-ness of things, the wandering spirit. So that sort of seeking is different from anxiety to get something in the future which you don't have now.

Yes, sir?

What difference between just existing in now and experiencing everything [???] not seeking anything, and pure hedonism?

Well, pure hedonism is a quest for pleasure. The hedonist, in that sense of the word, would not live in the eternal now if he found it not altogether enjoyable. He would then read romances of the past or fantasies of the future to get away from now, because what he's looking for is pleasure. But when we look for pleasure, you see, we split ourselves. We divide ourselves

from pleasure in seeking it and in trying to get away from pain. We divide ourselves from pain not realizing that that's what creates pain, is the division of experience so that the wholeness of experience is broken and we are dis-integrated.

Yes?

Before you made the distinction between nothingness and something [???] was a category, isn't that just an intellectual fallacy? There's no such thing as any category [???]?

That's true. Categories do not really exist in nature. Categories are like taking a network printed on cellophane and putting it over a picture of a forest, and then numbering the trees according to what squares they're in on the cellophane. That's categorization.

If you believe that, then that category of nothingness really is anything because there's no such thing as that category out there.

Oh, I said it was thoroughly empty. But—wait a minute—it is a category in the sense that something is its limit. So it has an edge, and that's what you see in the yang-yin diagram.

Would you comment on China and the recent developments?

No. I don't want to comment on China at the moment.

Could you repeat that about pain, what you just said?

Yes, what I was trying to say about pain is this: we are in a split relationship with the contents of our experience. The knower and the known. Then there is: the knower is opposed with a known called pleasure and tries to identify with it. The knower is confronted with a known called pain and tries to be disentangled from it. But it is this very split; it is trying to get away from pain that makes pain painful. It's as if you got caught in some brambles and you pulled away from them, and they just dug more deeply into your skin. You would have to go the other direction to let the brambles out, you'd have to go into the bush.

Enter the pain.

Yeah.

Ride with it.

Yeah.

Not fight it.

So—I mean, that’s only a metaphor. But the point is that as we keep up this distinction of the knower from the known, we’re always running away and want a changed experience. And as a fundamental, therefore, escape in every project to transform consciousness, there is an escape from what is. And when you realize you cannot get away from what is—not should you, not might you, but you can’t—then, at that point, when you realize you can’t get away from what is, there’s nothing left to you but to watch it. And then, for the first time, you’re taking a good look at your real self. Because your real self is a happening. The Chinese call it ziran—‘nature,’ ‘what is so of itself’—and that’s you. And you is this happening, and everything that you’re aware of is your happening—and a good deal more besides. You’re not aware of all of yourself. Like, you don’t have an immediate vision of the contents of your stomach; you haven’t got eyes down there.

Um... yes, sir?

God, what is your criteria for heaven now or hell now? Are you going to [???] beauty as opposed to ugliness?

Yes. This—you see, I know when I’m confronted with the beautiful or when I pass into the beautiful as I know when I pass into the ugly. When I try to say what these are or what my criteria are, all I’m doing is I’m trying to find a form of words that will apply to all my different sensations of beauty or of ugliness. The problem is not to know what is beautiful but to know how to put it into linear language. That’s where the complexity comes in. We very well know what is beautiful, but when we come to talk about it the words disappear.

Here's our fundamental problem because, you see, in a certain way, what we mean by sense is God. Now, it is not that God doesn't have a sense of nonsense—look at giraffes, for heaven's sakes! But it's this old thing. One form is: could God make a stone so heavy that he couldn't lift it? That is an equivalent question to saying, "Could God make a dead body into a living body?" That is the same question as asking, "Could a dead body be a living body?" And that is the same question as asking, "Could the head be the feet?"

God, earlier, though, you did say that everybody alive had been dead before.

Yes, that's a different matter.

[???

Now, look: one of the most interesting meditations is to think about death and imagine what it would be like to go unconscious and never become conscious again. That is, as Keats said of the Grecian Urn: "it teases you out of thought." And while you think of that, say, "Good heavens, fancy. Never coming to again," you get a mirror image thought which is about your birth. My goodness, you came to without ever having gone unconscious! That's pretty weird, and it seems to me that if that happened once it can happen again.

Now, what happens is this: when you die, BOING; there's a blank. And the next thing you know is, WAAAAH! Just as you did it before. Because every "I" that comes into this world is I, is me, is you. On this level it is diversified. But yet, I is always central. Everyone feels he's the center of the universe, and on the surface of a sphere any point may be the center of the surface.

So here it is. Every time it happens it's me. So I should worry about reincarnation.

Yes?

According to the Sufi doctrine, if you reach the third level you're supposed to have the choice. You don't have to be reincarnated. Do you feel that? Is that [??]?

All wise action is never the result of choice.

Say again?

Wise action is never the result of choice.

Because it implies logic?

Huh?

Does choice imply logic?

Choice implies ignorance, indecision. When you know what to do you don't choose, you do it.

What question could we ask you about love?

What?

What question could we ask you about love?

What question could you ask about love? What is love? Love is not a what. Love is the energy of the world, and nobody can say what that is. If anybody were to say what God is or what the energy of the world is, he would be talking nonsense. Now, there are times when it is important to talk nonsense because we can discover the energy of the universe through nonsense. When you, say, you take a sound that really doesn't mean anything much, like Aaaaauuummmmm, that's the energy of the universe going. Dig it! See? As you listen to sound. That's why music is a marvelous support for meditation. Digging sound. Listening, just listening to that hum. There goes the energy of the universe, see? What is it? Aauuummmmm, that's what it is. Auuummmmmmm, see?

Yeah?

Would you say that we meditate for the sake of the meditation?

Yes.

In other words, not if I meditate at some future date, something may or may not happen?

Yeah, that's right. Then, if you do that, it isn't meditation.

Right.

Meditation is centered in the here and now. Done for some other reason it isn't meditation, it stops dead right there.

God, what is satori?

What is satori? Satori is any kind of a-ha, Eureka! phenomenon, only specifically applied to discovering who and what you are.

It's the clear light.

The clear light is that. You say, "I saw the light!" It doesn't necessarily mean that there was the physical hallucination of a flash. It may mean suddenly everything becomes transparent. That may be a way of feeling it. It's just that the problem vanishes and you stop asking the question.

Would you risk being God outside of this [???] situation?

I, uhm... what do you mean, risk it? The thing or the problem—there's no risk being God, the risk is being human!

Mysticism and Morality

I'm referring to a kind of experience, a kind of—shall we say—state of consciousness which seems to be as prevalent among human beings as measles. It's something that simply happens, and we don't know why it happens. And although there are all sorts of techniques which claim to be able to promote it, and which are more or less successful in doing so—and

sometimes rather less than more—nevertheless, there is this peculiar thing that happens to people. And it's been recorded as far back in time as we have any recording at all. And that is coming over people the peculiarly convincing sensation that their ordinary sense of individuality—of personal identity—is transcended, and the individual suddenly feels an experience that... actually, it could be described from a number of quite different points of view. But we could add up these dominant characteristics:

That—instead of the ordinary feeling that I, as an individual, confront a world that is foreign to me, that is not me—in this kind of experience I find myself to be of one and the same nature or identity as the world outside me. In other words, I suddenly feel no longer a stranger in the world, but as if the external world were my own body.

The next aspect of the feeling is even more difficult to assimilate to our ordinary practical intelligence. But a very overwhelming feeling that everything that happens—everything I have ever done, everything anybody else has ever done—was part of a harmonious design. That there is no error at all. And that's the sort of thing I'm referring to.

Now, you see, I'm not talking about a philosophy, I'm not talking about a rationalization, some sort of theory that somebody cooked up in order to explain the world and make it seem a tolerable place to live in. I'm talking about a rather whimsical, unpredictable experience that suddenly hits people, and it includes this element of feeling the total harmoniousness of everything. Now, I realize that those words can carry with them a sort of sentimental feeling, a sort of Pollyanna feeling. There are various religions in our society today which try to inculcate in you the belief that everything is a harmonious unity. You know, things like Christian Science—or the Unity Movement, and so on—they want to make a kind of propaganda for one to believe, and through believing, to feel that everything is harmonious.

Now, to my mind that is a kind of pseudo-mysticism because it's an attempt to make the tail wag the dog, to make the effect produce the cause. Because this sensation of things being harmonious is somehow never brought about by insisting to yourself that that is so. Because when you do that—when you would say to yourself all things are light, all things are God, all things are beautiful, et cetera—actually, by doing that, you're implying that

they're not. Because you wouldn't be saying all this stuff if you really knew it to be true.

So this thing—the sensation of a kind of universal harmony—can not come to us when it is sought, when we look for it as something to be an escape from the way we actually feel or to compensate for the way we actually feel. It's a thing that comes out of the blue. And when it comes out of the blue—just like hiccups come out of the blue, or something like that—it's overwhelmingly convincing and it stands as, actually, the foundation for most of mankind's profound philosophical, mystical, metaphysical, and religious ideas. Someone, in other words, to whom this sort of thing has happened. And as I said before, it strikes us as measles may strike us. Someone to whom this sort of thing has happened can't restrain himself when it has happened, and he has to get up and tell everybody about it. And, at last, he becomes the founder of a religion. Because people say, Look at that man! How happy he is. What conviction he has. He has no doubts. He seems to be sure in everything he does.

You see, that the wonderful thing about a great human being: he's like an animal or a flower. See, when a flower buds and the bud goes pop and opens, it has no hesitation or doubts about it. But when a young woman appears in society as a debutante—you know, she's not quite sure if she's going to come off—and she appears on the stage of society with some doubts in her mind. Therefore, all appearances of this kind are of a rather sickly nature. But when the bird sings, or the chicken's egg breaks, the flower buds, there's no doubt about it at all. It comes forth.

And so, in the same way, when somebody has an experience of this kind he just has to tell everybody about it. Because, you see, he sees everybody around him looking dreadfully serious, looking as if they had a problem, looking as if the act of living were extremely difficult. But from his standpoint—the person who's had this experience—he feels that they look funny, that they don't understand that there isn't any problem at all. That he has seen—from where he stands, you see—that the meaning of being alive is just being alive. That is to say, I look at the color of your hair and the shape of your eyebrow, and I understand that that is the point. That's what we're all here for. And it's so plain, and it's so obvious, and so simple. And

yet, here is everybody rushing around in a great panic as if it were necessary for them to achieve something beyond all that. And the funny thing is: they're not quite sure what it is. But they're devilishly intent upon it, after that thing.

And so, to the person in this state of consciousness—which I call 'mystical'—that all seems very weird, very absurd. But it's not something that you criticize in an unkindly way. You don't say, Those damn fools! Those idiots! You say, It's such a pity that they don't see it. Because although they are going around in this wildly ignorant pursuit, one of the funny things about it is that they don't realize that there is a dimension, a sense, in which their pursuit is magnificent. It's to give an obverse sense to the saying, Father, forgive them for they know not what they do. Turn that into its opposite. Not forgive them, but give them a blessing because they don't know what they do. Give them an honor.

In other words, the intensely serious preoccupations and anxieties of mankind appear from this standpoint not to be foolishness, but to be a kind of marvel in the same way, perhaps—as you could say—that the protective coloring of a butterfly, who has somehow contrived to make its wings look like enormous eyes. So that when a bird who is about to devour this beast is confronted by these staring eyes, the bird is a little hesitating—as when you stare at somebody they're always taken a little bit aback. And so the butterfly appears to stare at the bird. And perhaps, you see, this phenomenon—of the marvel of staring wings of the butterfly—is in some way a result of anxiety. The anxiety to survive, all the problems and struggles of natural selection. Nevertheless, in this intense struggle, we are unknowing poets.

You see, one of the greatest ideas in the world that has ever been produced is, for my thinking, the Hindu idea that the world is a drama in which the central and supreme Self behind all existence gets lost and involved, and pretends—plays—that he, or it, or he/she, or whatever you want to call It, is all the creatures that there are and gets totally involved. And thus, you see, the more involved, the more anxious, the more finite, the more limited the infinite manages to feel itself to be, the greater the artistry, the greater the depth of the illusion which is created. For, you see, all art is—in a way—

illusion. The art of the magician is the art of illusion, the art of misdirecting attention so that the magic seems to appear.

And so, in this way, the more there is anxiety, the more there is uncertainty, to that degree the play has succeeded in the same way as, when you are watching an actual play or reading a novel or a movie, the more the author or the actors manage to grip you and to persuade you just for a moment that you are actually involved in reality, the more they have succeeded as artists. You may have a faint recognition in the back of your mind that this is, after all, only a play. When you sit on the edge of your seat, and you're sweating and your hands clutch the arms of the chair. When the scene so grips you... that is magnificent acting. And so the Hindus feel that the whole arrangement of the cosmos is something exactly like that.

But when, in the reality of actual life, you are sweating it out and you're wondering whether this surgeon—who's got to operate on you in a matter of life and death—is a competent man or a charlatan. Or whether the investment that you made is a good thing or whether it's going to make you lose your shirt. You see? All those matters of terrific crisis are exactly the same as when you're sitting in the theater, sweating it out there. But now, a far more convincing theater has been arranged. Because, as the Hindus would say, that in you which is It—the basis of you, the thing that is real in you and that connects you under the surface with every other being that is alive—this is the player of the parts, this is the maker of the illusion. This, the player of the game which has got you involved in this mess, and is living it up in the same way as those actors on the stage are living it up to convince you that this is a real situation.

And this is very understandable because, basically, everybody loves to play this game. The game of hide-and-seek. The game of scaring one's self. Running up behind yourself in the dark and saying, BWOOO! All children like to do this. And this is the most human thing. That's why we go the play, to the movie, and why we read novels. And our so-called real life is, from the position of the mystic, an extension of the same thing. Because, you see, he is the person who suddenly has realized that the game is a game and that behind all—you see, if the game is hide-and-seek, or if the game is lost-and-found, everything to do with the hide side or the lost side is connected

with where we, as individuals, feel lonely, impotent, put down, and so on; all the negative side of existence

I have tried to show you at various times that there's really one simple principle that underlies everything, and it's so simple it's funny. The principle is: all insides have outsides. Because, you see, you don't know that the inside is inside unless there's an outside, and you don't know that the outside is outside unless there's an inside. Okay. Then you, as you ordinarily feel yourself, are the inside. You are the animate, sensitive being inside the skin. But the inside of the skin goes with the outside of the skin. If there weren't the outside of the skin there wouldn't be no inside. And the outside of the skin is the whole darn cosmos. Galaxy beyond galaxy, and everything. You see? And that goes with the outside in the same way that front goes with back. So that if you wake up and understand that, you find that the two are one and the same identity, one and the same Self, one and the same life. So that's the mystic's point of view. He finds that out.

Now, if I may switch: what is morals? In the sense in which I am using the term 'morality,' or 'morals.' It's a set of rules analogous to the rules of language. Now, it's perfectly obvious, isn't it, that we can talk to each other in English only if there is mutual agreement among ourselves as to how to use the language. What words refer to what experiences, and what ways of stringing words together to be meaningful, how to be used. And it's very much of interest that we don't have too much trouble in coming to this agreement about language. We don't find that the police have to enforce grunt [?]. The schoolteacher—yes, for little the school teacher does sometimes have to enforce grammar and say in an authoritative way, and in the old-fashioned schools with the aid of some implement of corporal punishment. You know? You use the correct grammatical forms. But when we grow up into adult life we use these grammatical forms without much difficulty and very rarely do the police have to enforce it.

But it is otherwise—with other arrangements that we have to make—in common, because just as we have to agree in order to communicate about language, we have to agree about, say, the rules of driving on the highway, the rules of doing business, the rules of doing banking, and so on, and so on, the rules of family arrangements and whatnot. And these are actually

rules of the same kind as the rules of grammar. But, alas, this is not very often recognized because the authority, the sanctions, the power behind these rules is different from the authority behind grammar.

What I mean is this: if you transgress the rules of grammar people will shrug their shoulders and say, Well, he doesn't make sense. They won't summon the police. But if you transgress the rules of driving on the highway, or the rules of finances, someone is likely to summon the police. And so one sees the authority of the state as standing behind those rules. And there are other rules where our society sees standing behind them not the authority of the state but the authority of the Lord God Almighty, so that if you transgress those rules you're in danger not simply of going to jail but, according to your religious persuasion, of frying forever in hell or, on the other hand, of failing, lamentably, to be a real person.

Now, the problem is this: where the domain of mysticism and the domain of morals come into conflict. You see, throughout all known history of religion the mystics have been suspect insofar as religions have been the upholders of moral rules; the—as it were—the guardians, the authorities. In the same way, for example, as the lexicographers of the Grammarians guard the rules of grammar and expound upon them, so in the same way priesthoods and the lawyers guard the rules of social behavior. But when, into the domain of religion, there appears the mystical experience, then the priests are very, very disturbed.

Now, you all know that—in recent months, in California—there has been a very strange outbreak in the most respectable of all churches, the Episcopal church. Various congregations of the Episcopal church have had a phenomenon called glossolalia, and this means 'speaking with tongues.' If you will turn on your radio to any [African-American] revival meeting on a Sunday night, you will hear glossolalia. That is to say, when the preacher starts talking sensibly but the congregation gets more and more enthusiastic and says, Ah yeah! Amen! Yes, Lord! And so on, and it works up the preacher so that, by the time he's through, he is not talking sense anymore, he's just lalling. He's going through glorious nonsense. In other words, he's become a—all the dry, theological categories have turned into, not only poetry, but beyond poetry, into music, and he's just saying, Haaaa dedade

badede! Haaabele, ba de de de dah, haaaaaa dewahloh! You see? It's just going like that. And the congregation's behind him and it's wonderful. You see, he's become—at that moment—one, in spirit, with the universe. Because that's what that stars are doing. The stars above us, the galaxies, they're not making sense, see? They're making a colossal display of fireworks in the sky. Haaaa dedade badede! See? It's going like that.

Well, it so happened that, in recent months, various congregations of the Episcopal church had outbreaks of this. The bishop of California, when all this happened—bishop Pike—wrote an encyclical letter to his pastors and said, With all due regard for everything, you know, we must not be too dogmatic. We must recognize always that the spirit of God may work in mysterious ways that cannot be foreseen. And we should keep an open mind about all these matters. (This was said in a very complicated way across several pages.) Then, finally—when it came to speaking with tongues—in effect, This must not happen in the Episcopal church! Yeah. I mean, in effect, this is what was said. It was said—you know, the iron hand was in a velvet glove—but: this mustn't happen.

Now, you see, this has characteristically—through the ages—been the attitude of priesthoods, of the guardians of law and order—or, as they say in the Episcopal church, everything should be done decently and in order. The guardians of this kind of thing have always been afraid of the spontaneous manifestations of the spirit. And not only of things like mysticism, but also of things like falling in love. They're very, very dangerous happenings. And so, here an absolutely astounding paradox comes about, and it goes like this:

We know, on the one hand, that human love is only genuine when it is felt in the depths of the heart. And we know that this is true whether it be the love of man or whether it be the love of God. We're always looking for the genuine article, you see? We don't want someone to love us because they're forcing it. We want them to love us because they really do, in their heart. Now, you see, when you go back to the study of the history of the Hebrew religion underlying the history of Christianity, you will find this problem in this way: that you've got two traditions constantly compensating one against the other, playing each other off in the history of the Hebrew religion—the priestly tradition and the prophetic tradition. The priesthood is

always concerned with the external observance of the laws. But the prophetic tradition is always concerned with do you really mean what you do? They constantly condemn as a hypocrite—and, you see, in this sense, Jesus is the greatest of the prophets—they constantly condemn as a hypocrite the person who obeys the law without meaning it. Maybe this man does not commit adultery, but the prophet says if he has looked at a woman to lust after her, he has already committed adultery in his heart. So that if you really obey the law, you obey it with your feelings and not just outwardly. For as Jeremiah says, The day will come when no man shall anymore say to his brother: ‘Know God.’—that is to say, know the law of God—but they shall all know me, for I will write my law in their inward parts. The ideal, in other words, is people who do not simply obey and do the right things, but who want to do the right things, whose desires are transformed. For the heart—to write the law in the heart—means to change one’s desire.

So, you see, what this comes to, then, is a peculiarly paradoxical situation that you are required, by law, to be completely honest. And more than that; you are required, by law, to be loving, and honestly loving. You must love God and love your neighbor honestly, not forcing it, not pretending to it, not being a hypocrite. You must really feel it. Now that, you see, is where the astonishing conflict occurs between the mystic and the moralist. For the moralist knows that he has to be more than a legalist. He has to be more than one who insists that the outward observance of the law be kept to. Luther said that the law which requires that inward compliance is the most terrible thing. He based a great deal of his philosophy on an attack on the idea that one’s own inner feeling could be commanded. Because, you see, the moment you subscribe to the idea that your inner feeling should be commanded, you let yourself in completely for hypocrisy. If, you see, you tell another person that you love them because you know you’re supposed to love them and, in fact—in your heart—you don’t love them, you’re a liar. And therefore, the more you insist on that lie, the more you feel it’s your duty to make your feelings over and to love that other person, the more you get yourself deeper, and deeper, and deeper into trouble. Because here, if anywhere, the truth will out. You will not be able to sustain the pretense. You will not have sufficient energy to go on pretending and making a kind of mock of the feeling of love. And you have at last, then—if you’re honest

—to say, I don't. It doesn't matter whether this is to some other human being or whether, in a religious situation, you have to sit back and look at the Lord and say, Lord, I don't love you. I think you're a bore. You're demanding, you're authoritarian, you're domineering. And probably I ought to love you, but I'm sorry—I don't.

Now, we think—you see—that an honest expression of our feelings would be disruptive of law and order. It wouldn't; not in the least. Actually, it would be contributive to it. Because if I say to somebody, Look, I'm not doing this for you because I love you or because I like you, I'm doing it for you because the book says I must. Now, that puts it up to the other person, who has to look within himself and say, honestly, Ought I to accept this favor from this person, or ought I to go about seeing how I could provide myself with these conveniences? He may say, I understand you don't like doing this, but excuse me—I'm in a terrible jam and I will be most beholden to you if, for a little while yet, you will go against your feelings and help me out. See? That's a nice way of doing things. That's the kind of real understanding that we have to have.

I was associated once with somebody—in a business way—who was a complicated person who pretended, always, that he was a great idealist and that he was doing whatever he did for the benefit of mankind, for the furtherance of mutual understanding, for unselfishness and love between human beings. Actually, his dealings were ethically of a very shady character and I couldn't get on with him because he wouldn't come clean. If he had said, Look, I'm in a kind of a jam. And in order to get around this problem we have to manipulate things thus and so. And I know this isn't very ethical, but that's what we have to do. I would have said, Well, I'm entirely in agreement with you. But then he wouldn't've come on with this sort of pious line that was so sickening and offensive. He would've come on in a human way and we would've understood each other.

You see, now, how real honesty is a genuine basis of morals. Real honesty is always not pretending that you're feelings are other than they are. We know, as we deal with situations practically, that we may have to do things that go against our feelings, and it's the same with helping people—when you have to—whom you don't like and you don't want to help, but on the

whole it's rather necessary to do so. But don't ever be dishonest in playing that you're feelings are not what they are.

Now, from this standpoint we can perhaps understand something about the deep relationship between morals and mysticism. If we go back, you see, to the experience that I described as mystical we see that it is the vision—I tried to put it, fumblingly, in the sense of the rightness, the harmoniousness of everything that you are from one moment to another. That, in other words, human behavior—its ups and its downs—is no different in principle from the behavior of the clouds, or of the wind, or of dancing flames in the fireplace. As you watch the pattern of the dancing flames they never do anything vulgar. Their artistry is always perfect. Ultimately, it is the same with human beings. We are just as much a part of the natural order as flames in the fire or stars in the sky. But this is only apparent to the person who is honest in the sense in which I have spoken. In other words, the person who is tied up with trying to pretend that his feelings are other than what they actually are—he can never see this, and he's always a troublemaker. He is the original hypocrite. The person who is unbelievably destructive is the person who pretends that he is a model of love and rectitude and justice, and, in fact, isn't. Because nobody really can be. But then, superior altogether is the kind of person I would call the 'loving cynic' who knows, of course, that everybody has his weakness and his price and so on, but isn't contemptuous for that reason.

Incidentally, may I be so bold as to recommend a book? *Memories, Dreams and Reflections* by C. G. Jung: Jung's autobiography. The life story of a man who, in my opinion, was a superb human being in this particular sense of thoroughly knowing his own limitations, and of having a certain humor about them. A man who understood how to integrate into his whole being the devil in himself and the monkey in himself.

So then, in the metaphysical sphere the mystic is the one who feels that everything that happens is in some way harmonious, is in some way right, is in some way an integral part of the universe. Now, when we transplant or translate that into the moral sphere, the sphere of human conduct, the equivalent is this: there are no wrong feelings. There may be wrong actions in the sense of actions contrary to the rules of human communication. But

the way you feel towards other people—loving, hating, et cetera, et cetera—aren't any wrong feelings. And so to try and force one's feelings to be other than what they are is absurd and, furthermore dishonest.

But, you see, the idea that there are no wrong feelings is an immensely threatening idea to people who are afraid to feel in any case. And this is one of the peculiar problems of our culture: that we are terrified of our feelings. Because they take off on their own and we think that if we give them any scope, and if we don't immediately beat them down, they will lead us into all kinds of chaotic and destructive action. It's so funny that we, in our Western culture today, say that kind of thing. We, who do more chaotic and reckless kind of action than anybody ever did.

But if, for a change, we would allow our feelings and look upon their comings and goings as something as beautiful and as natural and necessary as changes in the weather, the going of night and day, and of the four seasons, we would be at peace with ourselves. Because what is problematic for Western man is not so much his struggles with other people and their needs and their problems, as his struggle with his own feelings, with what he will allow himself to feel, and what he won't allow himself to feel. He's ashamed to feel really, profoundly sad, so much so that he could cry. It is not manly to cry. He is ashamed to loathe somebody because you're not supposed to hate people. He's ashamed to be so overcome with the beauty of something—whether it be a natural landscape or a member of the opposite sex—that he goes out of his mind with this beauty. Because all that kind of thing is not being in control, old boy! Not—kind of—having your hand on the wheel!

But it is because, you see, we don't go with that that we are not in control, that we try to pretend that our inner life is different. So I think this is the most releasing thing that anybody can possibly understand: that your inner feeling is never wrong. That's to say, what you feel—it's never wrong that you feel that way. It may not be a right guide to what you should do. In other words, if you feel that you hate someone intensely, it isn't necessarily the right way of dealing with that feeling to go out and cut his throat. But it is right that you should have the feeling of hating, or of being sad, or frightened, terrified—whatever it is.

For, you see, when a person comes to himself, he comes to be one with his own feeling. And that is the only way of being in a position to control it. It is in exactly this way that the sailor always keeps the wind in his sails. Whether he wants to sail with the wind or whether he wants to sail against the wind, he always uses the wind. He never denies the wind. Well, it's in exactly that same sense that a person has to keep going with his own feeling. Whether he wants to act as the feeling obviously suggests or act in a different way, he has to keep the feeling with him because that's his own essential self. But when he attempts simply to sail against the wind, he's lost himself. He's become just a kind of empty mask which hasn't got any real life behind it. And all its protestations of love and good will are hollow.

So, you see, it is in the most basic, simple situation: a mother has a child. She got it by accident. You know? And she thinks, Oh, heavens. Now I'm all tied up full of responsibility, and I can't stand it. So I really didn't want to have it, and I—uh-oh-oh... I mustn't think that thought! All good mothers naturally love their babies. And so, when she gets the baby, she says, Darling, I love you, but her milk is sour and the baby gets the other message, and the baby's mixed up. And it will be much better if that mother said to the baby, Listen, you're a pest, and you're a nuisance, and I didn't want to have you around. Well, then they understand each other and everything's clear. There's no confusion, there's nothing mixed up here. And, too: when you feel somebody is a pest and a nuisance, and you really let it go and you tell them so, you're apt—in a while—to get a sense of a kind of humorous feeling about it. That you can begin from telling them that they're a damn nuisance, and I wish you'd just disappear and get lost. After a while you say, Yeah, you old bastard. You know? And it begins to have a kind of affectionate feeling to it.

So, to sum up: what the mystic primarily feels is the divinity, the glory, of whatever is. And when we apply that to the moral sphere, what is is what one feels genuinely. And this must always be admitted, always allowed. It doesn't mean to say—let me emphasize this—it doesn't mean that we always are therefore compelled to act upon the basis of what we feel. That is to say, to kill the person we hate. Hatred does not necessarily lead to violence. It is unacknowledged hatred that leads to violence. Honest hatred can be expressed in much simpler ways. But the expression, the

recognition, the acceptance of what is honestly felt is the moral equivalent of the vision that whatever exists is a manifestation of the divine.

What is Reality

I find it a little difficult to say what the subject matter of this seminar is going to be, because it's too fundamental to give it a title. I'm going to talk about what there is. Now, the first thing, though, that we have to do is to get our perspectives with some background about the basic ideas that, as Westerners living today in the United States, influence our everyday common sense, our fundamental notions about what life is about. And there are historical origins for this, which influence us more strongly than most people realize. Ideas of the world which are built into the very nature of the language we use, and of our ideas of logic, and of what makes sense altogether.

And these basic ideas I call myth, not using the word 'myth' to mean simply something untrue, but to use the word 'myth' in a more powerful sense. A myth is an image in terms of which we try to make sense of the world. Now, for example, a myth in a way is a metaphor. If you want to explain electricity to someone who doesn't know anything about electricity, you say, well, you talk about an electric current. Now, the word 'current' is borrowed from rivers. It's borrowed from hydraulics, and so you explain electricity in terms of water. Now, electricity is not water, it behaves actually in a different way, but there are some ways in which the behavior of water is like the behavior of electricity, and so you explain it in terms of water. Or if you're an astronomer, and you want to explain to people what you mean by an expanding universe and curved space, you say, 'well, it's as if you have a black balloon, and there are white dots on the black balloon, and those dots represent galaxies, and as you blow the balloon up, uniformly all of them grow farther and farther apart. But you're using an analogy—the universe is not actually a black balloon with white dots on it.

So in the same way, we use these sort of images to try and make sense of the world, and we at present are living under the influence of two very powerful images, which are, in the present state of scientific knowledge, inadequate, and one of the major problems today are to find an adequate,

satisfying image of the world. Well that's what I'm going to talk about. And I'm going to go further than that, not only what image of the world to have, but how we can get our sensations and our feelings in accordance with the most sensible image of the world that we can manage to conceive.

All right, now—the two images which we have been working under for 2000 years and maybe more are what I would call two models of the universe, and the first is called the ceramic model, and the second the fully automatic model. The ceramic model of the universe is based on the book of Genesis, from which Judaism, Islam, and Christianity derive their basic picture of the world. And the image of the world in the book of Genesis is that the world is an artifact. It is made, as a potter takes clay and forms pots out of it, or as a carpenter takes wood and makes tables and chairs out of it. Don't forget Jesus is the son of a carpenter. And also the son of God. So the image of God and of the world is based on the idea of God as a technician, potter, carpenter, architect, who has in mind a plan, and who fashions the universe in accordance with that plan.

So basic to this image of the world is the notion, you see, that the world consists of stuff, basically. Primordial matter, substance, stuff. As parts are made of clay. Now clay by itself has no intelligence. Clay does not of itself become a pot, although a good potter may think otherwise. Because if you were a really good potter, you don't impose your will on the clay, you ask any given lump of clay what it wants to become, and you help it to do that. And then you become a genius. But the ordinary idea I'm talking about is that simply clay is unintelligent; it's just stuff, and the potter imposes his will on it, and makes it become whatever he wants.

And so in the book of Genesis, the lord God creates Adam out of the dust of the Earth. In other words, he makes a clay figurine, and then he breathes into it, and it becomes alive. And because the clay become informed. By itself it is formless, it has no intelligence, and therefore it requires an external intelligence and an external energy to bring it to life and to bring some sense to it. And so in this way, we inherit a conception of ourselves as being artifacts, as being made, and it is perfectly natural in our culture for a child to ask its mother 'How was I made?' or 'Who made me?' And this is a very, very powerful idea, but for example, it is not shared by the Chinese,

or by the Hindus. A Chinese child would not ask its mother 'How was I made?' A Chinese child might ask its mother 'How did I grow?' which is an entirely different procedure from making. You see, when you make something, you put it together, you arrange parts, or you work from the outside in, as a sculptor works on stone, or as a potter works on clay. But when you watch something growing, it works in exactly the opposite direction. It works from the inside to the outside. It expands. It burgeons. It blossoms. And it happens all of itself at once. In other words, the original simple form, say of a living cell in the womb, progressively complicates itself, and that's the growing process, and it's quite different from the making process.

But we have thought, historically, you see, of the world as something made, and the idea of being—trees, for example— constructions, just as tables and houses are constructions. And so there is for that reason a fundamental difference between the made and the maker. And this image, this ceramic model of the universe, originated in cultures where the form of government was monarchical, and where, therefore, the maker of the universe was conceived also at the same time in the image of the king of the universe. 'King of kings, lords of lords, the only ruler of princes, who thus from thy throne behold all dwellers upon Earth.' I'm quoting the Book of Common Prayer. And so, all those people who are oriented to the universe in that way feel related to basic reality as a subject to a king. And so they are on very, very humble terms in relation to whatever it is that works all this thing. I find it odd, in the United States, that people who are citizens of a republic have a monarchical theory of the universe. That you can talk about the president of the United States as LBJ, or Ike, or Harry, but you can't talk about the lord of the universe in such familiar terms. Because we are carrying over from very ancient near-Eastern cultures, the notion that the lord of the universe must be respected in a certain way. People kneel, people bow, people prostrate themselves, and you know what the reason for that is: that nobody is more frightened of anybody else than a tyrant. He sits with his back to the wall, and his guards on either side of him, and he has you face downwards on the ground because you can't use weapons that way. When you come into his presence, you don't stand up and face him, because you might attack, and he has reason to fear that you might because he's ruling you all. And the man who rules you all is the biggest crook in

the bunch. Because he's the one who succeeded in crime. The other people are pushed aside because they—the criminals, the people we lock up in jail—are simply the people who didn't make it.

So naturally, the real boss sits with his back to the wall and his henchmen on either side of him. And so when you design a church, what does it look like? Catholic church, with the altar where it used to be—it's changing now, because the Catholic religion is changing. But the Catholic church has the altar with it's back to the wall at the east end of the church. And the altar is the throne and the priest is the chief vizier of the court, and he is making abeyance to the throne, but there is the throne of God, the altar. And all the people are facing it, and kneeling down. And a great Catholic cathedral is called a basilica, from the Greek 'basilikos,' which means 'king.' So a basilica is the house of a king, and the ritual of the church is based on the court rituals of Byzantium.

A Protestant church is a little different. Basically the same. The furniture of a Protestant church is based on a judicial courthouse. The pulpit, the judge in an American court wears a black robe, he wears exactly the same dress as a Protestant minister. And everybody sits in these boxes, there's a box for the jury, there's a box for the judge, there's a box for this, there's a box for that, and those are the pews in an ordinary colonial- type Protestant church. So both these kinds of churches which have an autocratic view of the nature of the universe decorate themselves, are architecturally constructed in accordance with political images of the universe. One is the king, and the other is the judge. Your honor. There's sense in this. When in court, you have to refer to the judge as 'your honor.' It stops the people engaged in litigation from losing their tempers and getting rude. There's a certain sense to that.

But when you want to apply that image to the universe itself, to the very nature of life, it has limitations. For one thing, the idea of a difference between matter and spirit. This idea doesn't work anymore. Long, long ago, physicists stopped asking the question 'What is matter?' They began that way. They wanted to know, what is the fundamental substance of the world? And the more they asked that question, the more they realized they couldn't answer it, because if you're going to say what matter is, you've got to

describe it in terms of behavior, that is to say in terms of form, in terms of pattern. You tell what it does, you describe the smallest shapes of it which you can see. Do you see what happens? You look, say, at a piece of stone, and you want to say, 'Well, what is this piece of stone made of?' You take your microscope and you look at it, and instead of just this block of stuff, you see ever so many tinier shapes. Little crystals. So you say, 'Fine, so far so good. Now what are these crystals made of?' And you take a more powerful instrument, and you find that they're made of molecules, and then you take a still more powerful instrument to find out what the molecules are made of, and you begin to describe atoms, electrons, protons, mesons, all sorts of sub-nuclear particles. But you never, never arrive at the basic stuff. Because there isn't any.

What happens is this: 'Stuff' is a word for the world as it looks when our eyes are out of focus. Fuzzy. Stuff—the idea of stuff is that it is undifferentiated, like some kind of goo. And when your eyes are not in sharp focus, everything looks fuzzy. When you get your eyes into focus, you see a form, you see a pattern. But when you want to change the level of magnification, and go in closer and closer and closer, you get fuzzy again before you get clear. So everytime you get fuzzy, you go through thinking there's some kind of stuff there. But when you get clear, you see a shape. So all that we can talk about is patterns. We never, never can talk about the 'stuff' of which these patterns are supposed to be made, because you don't really have to suppose that there is any. It's enough to talk about the world in terms of patterns. It describes anything that can be described, and you don't really have to suppose that there is some stuff that constitutes the essence of the pattern in the same way that clay constitutes the essence of pots. And so for this reason, you don't really have to suppose that the world is some kind of helpless, passive, unintelligent junk which an outside agency has to inform and make into intelligent shapes. So the picture of the world in the most sophisticated physics of today is not formed stuff—potted clay—but pattern. A self-moving, self-designing pattern. A dance. And our common sense as individuals hasn't yet caught up with this.

Well now, in the course of time, in the evolution of Western thought. The ceramic image of the world ran into trouble. And changed into what I call the fully automatic image of the world. In other words, Western science was

based on the idea that there are laws of nature, and got that idea from Judaism and Christianity and Islam. That in other words, the potter, the maker of the world in the beginning of things laid down the laws, and the law of God, which is also the law of nature, is called the 'loggos.?,.' And in Christianity, the loggos is the second person of the trinity, incarnate as Jesus Christ, who thereby is the perfect exemplar of the divine law. So we have tended to think of all natural phenomena as responding to laws, as if, in other words, the laws of the world were like the rails on which a streetcar or a tram or a train runs, and these things exist in a certain way, and all events respond to these laws. You know that limerick,

There was a young man who said 'Damn, For it certainly seems that I am A creature that moves In determinate grooves. I'm not even a bus, I'm a tram.'

So here's this idea that there's kind of a plan, and everything responds and obeys that plan. Well, in the 18th century, Western intellectuals began to suspect this idea. And what they suspected was whether there is a lawmaker, whether there is an architect of the universe, and they found out, or they reasoned, that you don't have to suppose that there is. Why? Because the hypothesis of God does not help us to make any predictions. Nor does it— In other words, let's put it this way: if the business of science is to make predictions about what's going to happen, science is essentially prophecy. What's going to happen? By examining the behavior of the past and describing it carefully, we can make predictions about what's going to happen in the future. That's really the whole of science. And to do this, and to make successful predictions, you do not need God as a hypothesis. Because it makes no difference to anything. If you say 'Everything is controlled by God, everything is governed by God,' that doesn't make any difference to your prediction of what's going to happen. And so what they did was drop that hypothesis. But they kept the hypothesis of law. Because if you can predict, if you can study the past and describe how things have behaved, and you've got some regularities in the behavior of the universe, you call that law. Although it may not be law in the ordinary sense of the word, it's simply regularity.

And so what they did was got rid of the lawmaker and kept the law. And so they conceived the universe in terms of a mechanism. Something, in other words, that is functioning according to regular, clocklike mechanical principles. Newton's whole image of the world is based on billiards. The atoms are billiard balls, and they bang each other around. And so your behavior, every individual around, is defined as a very, very complex arrangement of billiard balls being banged around by everything else. And so behind the fully automatic model of the universe is the notion that reality itself is, to use the favorite term of 19th century scientists, blind energy. In say the metaphysics of Ernst Hegel, and T.H. Huxley, the world is basically nothing but energy—blind, unintelligent force. And likewise and parallel to this, in the philosophy of Freud, the basic psychological energy is libido, which is blind lust. And it is only a fluke, it is only as a result of pure chances that resulting from the exuberance of this energy there are people. With values, with reason, with languages, with cultures, and with love. Just a fluke. Like, you know, 1000 monkeys typing on 1000 typewriters for a million years will eventually type the Encyclopedia Britannica. And of course the moment they stop typing the Encyclopedia Britannica, they will relapse into nonsense.

And so in order that that shall not happen, for you and I are flukes in this cosmos, and we like our way of life—we like being human—if we want to keep it, say these people, we've got to fight nature, because it will turn us back into nonsense the moment we let it. So we've got to impose our will upon this world as if we were something completely alien to it. From outside. And so we get a culture based on the idea of the war between man and nature. And we talk about the conquest of space. The conquest of Everest. And the great symbols of our culture are the rocket and the bulldozer. The rocket—you know, compensation for the sexually inadequate male. So we're going to conquer space. You know we're in space already, way out. If anybody cared to be sensitive and let outside space come to you, you can, if your eyes are clear enough. Aided by telescopes, aided by radio astronomy, aided by all the kinds of sensitive instruments we can devise. We're as far out in space as we're ever going to get. But, y'know, sensitivity isn't the pitch. Especially in the WASP culture of the United States. We define manliness in terms of aggression, you see, because we're a little bit frightened as to whether or not we're really men. And so we put

on this great show of being a tough guy. It's completely unnecessary. If you have what it takes, you don't need to put on that show. And you don't need to beat nature into submission. Why be hostile to nature? Because after all, you ARE a symptom of nature. You, as a human being, you grow out of this physical universe in exactly the same way an apple grows off an apple tree.

So let's say the tree which grows apples is a tree which apples, using 'apple' as a verb. And a world in which human beings arrive is a world that peoples. And so the existence of people is symptomatic of the kind of universe we live in

You, as a human being, you grow out of this physical universe in exactly the same way an apple grows off an apple tree.

So let's say the tree which grows apples is a tree which apples, using 'apple' as a verb. And a world in which human beings arrive is a world that peoples. And so the existence of people is symptomatic of the kind of universe we live in. Just as spots on somebody's skin is symptomatic of chicken pox. Just as hair on a head is symptomatic of what's going on in the organism. But we have been brought up by reason of our two great myths—the ceramic and the automatic—not to feel that we belong in the world. So our popular speech reflects it. You say 'I came into this world.' You didn't. You came out of it. You say 'Face facts.' We talk about 'encounters' with reality, as if it was a head-on meeting of completely alien agencies. And the average person has the sensation that he is a someone that exists inside a bag of skin. The center of consciousness that looks out at this thing, and what the hell's it going to do to me? You see? 'I recognize you, you kind of look like me, and I've seen myself in a mirror, and you look like you might be people.' So maybe you're intelligent and maybe you can love, too. Perhaps you're all right, some of you are, anyway. You've got the right color of skin, or you have the right religion, or whatever it is, you're OK. But there are all those people over in Asia, and Africa, and they may not really be people. When you want to destroy someone, you always define them as 'unpeople.' Not really human. Monkeys, maybe. Idiots, maybe. Machines, maybe, but not people.

So we have this hostility to the external world because of the superstition, the myth, the absolutely unfounded theory that you, yourself, exist only

inside your skin. Now I want to propose another idea altogether. There are two great theories in astronomy going on right now about the origination of the universe. One is called the explosion theory, and the other is called the steady state theory. The steady state people say there never was a time when the world began, it's always expanding, yes, but as a result of free hydrogen in space, the free hydrogen coagulates and makes new galaxies. But the other people say there was a primordial explosion, an enormous bang billions of years ago which flung all the galaxies into space. Well let's take that just for the sake of argument and say that was the way it happened.

It's like you took a bottle of ink and you threw it at a wall. Smash! And all that ink spread. And in the middle, it's dense, isn't it? And as it gets out on the edge, the little droplets get finer and finer and make more complicated patterns, see? So in the same way, there was a big bang at the beginning of things and it spread. And you and I, sitting here in this room, as complicated human beings, are way, way out on the fringe of that bang. We are the complicated little patterns on the end of it. Very interesting. But so we define ourselves as being only that. If you think that you are only inside your skin, you define yourself as one very complicated little curlique, way out on the edge of that explosion. Way out in space, and way out in time. Billions of years ago, you were a big bang, but now you're a complicated human being. And then we cut ourselves off, and don't feel that we're still the big bang. But you are. Depends how you define yourself. You are actually—if this is the way things started, if there was a big bang in the beginning— you're not something that's a result of the big bang. You're not something that is a sort of puppet on the end of the process. You are still the process. You are the big bang, the original force of the universe, coming on as whoever you are. When I meet you, I see not just what you define yourself as—Mr so-and- so, Ms so-and-so, Mrs so-and-so—I see every one of you as the primordial energy of the universe coming on at me in this particular way. I know I'm that, too. But we've learned to define ourselves as separate from it.

And so what I would call a basic problem we've got to go through first, is to understand that there are no such things as things. That is to say separate things, or separate events. That that is only a way of talking. If you can understand this, you're going to have no further problems. I once asked a

group of high school children ‘What do you mean by a thing?’ First of all, they gave me all sorts of synonyms. They said ‘It’s an object,’ which is simply another word for a thing; it doesn’t tell you anything about what you mean by a thing. Finally, a very smart girl from Italy, who was in the group, said a thing is a noun. And she was quite right. A noun isn’t a part of nature, it’s a part of speech. There are no nouns in the physical world. There are no separate things in the physical world, either. The physical world is wiggly. Clouds, mountains, trees, people, are all wiggly. And only when human beings get to working on things—they build buildings in straight lines, and try to make out that the world isn’t really wiggly. But here we are, sitting in this room all built out of straight lines, but each one of us is as wiggly as all get-out.

Now then, when you want to get control of something that wiggles, it’s pretty difficult, isn’t it? You try and pick up a fish in your hands, and the fish is wiggly and it slips out. What do you do to get hold of the fish? You use a net. And so the net is the basic thing we have for getting hold of the wiggly world. So if you want to get hold of this wiggle, you’ve got to put a net over it. A net is something regular. And I can number the holes in a net. So many holes up, so many holes across. And if I can number these holes, I can count exactly where each wiggle is, in terms of a hole in that net. And that’s the beginning of calculus, the art of measuring the world. But in order to do that, I’ve got to break up the wiggle into bits. I’ve got to call this a specific bit, and this the next bit of the wiggle, and this the next bit, and this the next bit of the wiggle. And so these bits are things or events. Bit of wiggles. Which I mark out in order to talk about the wiggle. In order to measure and therefore in order to control it. But in nature, in fact, in the physical world, the wiggle isn’t bitted. Like you don’t get a cut-up fryer out of an egg. But you have to cut the chicken up in order to eat it. You bite it. But it doesn’t come bitten.

So the world doesn’t come thinged; it doesn’t come evented. You and I are all as much continuous with the physical universe as a wave is continuous with the ocean. The ocean waves, and the universe peoples. And as I wave and say to you ‘Yoo-hoo!’ the world is waving with me at you and saying ‘Hi! I’m here!’ But we are consciousness of the way we feel and sense our existence. Being based on a myth that we are made, that we are parts, that

we are things, our consciousness has been influenced, so that each one of us does not feel that. We have been hypnotized, literally hypnotized by social convention into feeling and sensing that we exist only inside our skins. That we are not the original bang, just something out on the end of it. And therefore we are scared stiff. My wave is going to disappear, and I'm going to die! And that would be awful. We've got a mythology going now which is, as Father Maskell.?, put it, we are something that happens between the maternity ward and the crematorium. And that's it. And therefore everybody feels unhappy and miserable.

This is what people really believe today. You may go to church, you may say you believe in this, that, and the other, but you don't. Even Jehovah's Witnesses, who are the most fundamental of fundamentalists, they are polite when they come around and knock on the door. But if you REALLY believed in Christianity, you would be screaming in the streets. But nobody does. You would be taking full- page ads in the paper every day. You would be the most terrifying television programs. The churches would be going out of their minds if they really believed what they teach. But they don't. They think they ought to believe what they teach. They believe they should believe, but they don't really believe it, because what we REALLY believe is the fully automatic model. And that is our basic, plausible common sense. You are a fluke. You are a separate event. And you run from the maternity ward to the crematorium, and that's it, baby. That's it.

Now why does anybody think that way? There's no reason to, because it isn't even scientific. It's just a myth. And it's invented by people who want to feel a certain way. They want to play a certain game. The game of god got embarrassing. The idea if God as the potter, as the architect of the universe, is good. It makes you feel that life is, after all, important. There is someone who cares. It has meaning, it has sense, and you are valuable in the eyes of the father. But after a while, it gets embarrassing, and you realize that everything you do is being watched by God. He knows your tiniest innermost feelings and thoughts, and you say after a while, 'Quit bugging me! I don't want you around.' So you become an athiest, just to get rid of him. Then you feel terrible after that, because you got rid of God, but that means you got rid of yourself. You're nothing but a machine. And your idea that you're a machine is just a machine, too. So if you're a smart kid,

you commit suicide. Camus said there is only one serious philosophical question, which is whether or not to commit suicide. I think there are four or five serious philosophical questions. The first one is 'Who started it?' The second is 'Are we going to make it?' The third is 'Where are we going to put it?' The fourth is 'Who's going to clean up?' And the fifth, 'Is it serious?'

But still, should you or not commit suicide? This is a good question. Why go on? And you only go on if the game is worth the gamble. Now the universe has been going on for an incredible long time. And so really, a satisfactory theory of the universe has to be one that's worth betting on. That's very, it seems to me, elementary common sense. If you make a theory of the universe which isn't worth betting on, why bother? Just commit suicide. But if you want to go on playing the game, you've got to have an optimal theory for playing the game. Otherwise there's no point in it. But the people who coined the fully automatic theory of the universe were playing a very funny game, for what they wanted to say was this: all you people who believe in religion—old ladies and wishful thinkers— you've got a big daddy up there, and you want comfort, but life is rough. Life is tough, as success goes to the most hard-headed people. That was a very convenient theory when the European and American worlds were colonizing the natives everywhere else. They said 'We're the end product of evolution, and we're tough. I'm a big strong guy because I face facts, and life is just a bunch of junk, and I'm going to impose my will on it and turn it into something else. I'm real hard.' That's a way of flattering yourself.

And so, it has become academically plausible and fashionable that this is the way the world works. In academic circles, no other theory of the world than the fully automatic model is respectable. Because if you're an academic person, you've got to be an intellectually tough person, you've got to be prickly. There are basically two kinds of philosophy. One's called prickles, the other's called goo. And prickly people are precise, rigorous, logical. They like everything chopped up and clear. Goo people like it vague. For example, in physics, prickly people believe that the ultimate constituents of matter are particles. Goo people believe it's waves. And in philosophy, prickly people are logical positivists, and goo people are idealists. And they're always arguing with each other, but what they don't

realize is neither one can take his position without the other person. Because you wouldn't know you advocated prickles unless there was someone advocating goo. You wouldn't know what a prickle was unless you knew what a goo was. Because life isn't either prickles or goo, it's either gooey prickles or prickly goo. They go together like back and front, male and female. And that's the answer to philosophy. You see, I'm a philosopher, and I'm not going to argue very much, because if you don't argue with me, I don't know what I think. So if we argue, I say 'Thank you,' because owing to the courtesy of your taking a different point of view, I understand what I mean. So I can't get rid of you.

But however, you see, this whole idea that the universe is nothing at all but unintelligent force playing around and not even enjoying it is a putdown theory of the world. People who had an advantage to make, a game to play by putting it down, and making out that because they put the world down they were a superior kind of people. So that just won't do. We've had it. Because if you seriously go along with this idea of the world, you're what is technically called alienated. You feel hostile to the world. You feel that the world is a trap. It is a mechanism, it is electronic and neurological mechanisms into which you somehow got caught. And you, poor thing, have to put up with being put into a body that's falling apart, that gets cancer, that gets the great Siberian itch, and is just terrible. And these mechanics—doctors—are trying to help you out, but they really can't succeed in the end, and you're just going to fall apart, and it's a grim business, and it's just too bad. So if you think that's the way things are, you might as well commit suicide right now. Unless you say, 'Well, I'm damned. Because there might really be after all eternal damnation. Or I identify with my children, and I think of them going on without me and nobody to support them. Because if I do go on in this frame of mind and continue to support them, I shall teach them to be like I am, and they'll go on, dragging it out to support their children, and they won't enjoy it. They'll be afraid to commit suicide, and so will their children. They'll all learn the same lessons.'

So you see, all I'm trying to say is that the basic common sense about the nature of the world that is influencing most people in the United States today is simply a myth. If you want to say that the idea of God the father with his white beard on the golden throne is a myth, in a bad sense of the

word 'myth,' so is this other one. It is just as phony and has just as little to support it as being the true state of affairs. Why? Let's get this clear. If there is any such thing at all as intelligence and love and beauty, well you've found it in other people. In other words, it exists in us as human beings. And as I said, if it is there, in us, it is symptomatic of the scheme of things. We are as symptomatic of the scheme of things as the apples are symptomatic of the apple tree or the rose of the rose bush. The Earth is not a big rock infested with living organisms any more than your skeleton is bones infested with cells. The Earth is geological, yes, but this geological entity grows people, and our existence on the Earth is a symptom of this other system, and its balances, as much as the solar system in turn is a symptom of our galaxy, and our galaxy in its turn is a symptom of a whole company of other galaxies. Goodness only knows what that's in.

But you see, when, as a scientist, you describe the behavior of a living organism, you try to say what a person does, it's the only way in which you can describe what a person is, describe what they do. Then you find out that in making this description, you cannot confine yourself to what happens inside the skin. In other words, you cannot talk about a person walking unless you start describing the floor, because when I walk, I don't just dangle my legs in empty space. I move in relationship to a room. So in order to describe what I'm doing when I'm walking, I have to describe the room; I have to describe the territory. So in describing my talking at the moment, I can't describe it as just a thing in itself, because I'm talking to you. And so what I'm doing at the moment is not completely described unless your being here is described also. So if that is necessary, in other words, in order to describe MY behavior, I have to describe YOUR behavior and the behavior of the environment, it means that we've really got one system of behavior. Your skin doesn't separate you from the world; it's a bridge through which the external world flows into you, and you flow into it.

Just, for example, as a whirlpool in water, you could say because you have a skin you have a definite shape you have a definite form. All right? Here is a flow of water, and suddenly it does a whirlpool, and it goes on. The whirlpool is a definite form, but no water stays put in it. The whirlpool is something the stream is doing, and exactly the same way, the whole

universe is doing each one of us, and I see each one of you today and I recognize you tomorrow, just as I would recognize a whirlpool in a stream. I'd say 'Oh yes, I've seen that whirlpool before, it's just near so-and-so's house on the edge of the river, and it's always there.' So in the same way when I meet you tomorrow, I recognize you, you're the same whirlpool you were yesterday. But you're moving. The whole world is moving through you, all the cosmic rays, all the food you're eating, the stream of steaks and milk and eggs and everything is just flowing right through you. When you're wiggling the same way, the world is wiggling, the stream is wiggling you.

But the problem is, you see, we haven't been taught to feel that way. The myths underlying our culture and underlying our common sense have not taught us to feel identical with the universe, but only parts of it, only in it, only confronting it—aliens. And we are, I think, quite urgently in need of coming to feel that we ARE the eternal universe, each one of us. Otherwise we're going to go out of our heads. We're going to commit suicide, collectively, courtesy of H-bombs. And, all right, supposing we do, well that will be that, then there will be life making experiments on other galaxies. Maybe they'll find a better game.

Comparative Philosophy

Mind Over Mind

The general title of these talks that I'm giving here is mind over mind. And I'm going into all the various problems which have to do with the control of the mind. And so I might introduce what I'm going to say by saying it from different points of view. For example, if you're interested in Communications, it will be the problem of feedback. Or if I may put it in theological terms, how does man follow the will of God if the will of man is perverse? The theologians say you cannot do this without having divine grace all the power to follow the will of God. How then do you get grace. Why is grace given to some and not to others? If I cannot follow the will of God by my own effort because my will is selfish, how will my will which is selfish be transformed into an unselfish will? If I cannot do it because I am already the selfish will, then Grace must do it. If Grace has not already done it, why not? Because I didn't accept it. But by definition I have no power to accept it because my will was selfish. Must I then become a Calvinist, and say that only those people who are predestined to receive grace will be able to live the good life?

Then we come back to the inadmissible position that people who live evil lives and do not get grace because they are not predestined to it out of the infinite wisdom of the Godhead then God Himself must be held responsible for their evil deeds. And so that is a nice little tangle. If I put this in the language of oriental philosophy and religion it would be something like this. The Buddha said that wisdom must come only from the abandonment of selfish craving, or desire. One who abandons that desire attain is nirvana. Which is supremely peace liberation. Nirvana means in Sanskrit 'blow out'. That is exhale the breath. The opposite, desire, is to breathe in. Now if you breathe in and hold it. You lose your breath. But if you breathe out. It comes back to you. So the principle here is if you want life don't cling to it. Let go.

But the problem is, “If I desire not to desire, is that not already desire? How can I desire not to desire? How can I surrender myself. In myself is precisely. To hold on to cling to cling to life to continue to survive. I can see rationally that by clinging to myself I may strangle myself. I may be like a person who has a bad habit, as a result of which he is committing suicide and he knows that but can’t give it up. Because the means of death are so sweet. So, it all comes down to this basic question. That human beings have, for a long, long time, been concerned about transforming their minds. Is there any way in which one’s mind can be transformed. Or is it simply a process which is nothing more than a vicious circle? I could ask why have you come here this afternoon? What were you looking for? Would it be too presumptuous of me to say that you were looking for help? That you hoped you would hear somebody who had something to say that would be of help and relevance to you as members of a world which is running into the most intense difficulty. A world beset by a complex of problems, any one of which would be bad enough. But when you add together all the great political social and ecological problems with which we are face they are appalling. And one naturally says the reason why we are in such a mess is not. Simply that we have wrong systems for doing things whether they be technological, political, or religious but we have the wrong people. The systems may be all right but they are in the wrong hands because we are all in various ways self-seeking. Lacking in wisdom, lacking in courage, afraid of death, afraid of pain. Unwilling really to cooperate with others. Unwilling to be open to others. And we all think that’s too bad, it’s me that’s wrong! And if only I could be the right person is this man going to tell me something. That will help me to change myself. So that I will be a more creative and cooperative member of the human race. I would like to improve.

So, in so many people’s minds and from so many different angles, there is this urgent feeling that I must improve me. And this is critically important because it’s obvious that at least it’s superficially obvious, that the way things are, we are going to hell fast. Now in this question, can I improve me, there is the obvious difficulty that if I am in need of improving, the person who is going to do the improving is the one who needs to be improved. And there immediately we have a vicious circle. All right, you want grace. Well ask God, maybe I’ll give it to you. And the theologian will

tell you, “Yes, God gives His grace freely. He gives it to all because he loves all. It’s here like the air, all you have to do is receive it Ari Law author doxie Catholic Christian would say all you have to do is to be baptized. To take the holy sacrament of the altar of the bread and wine the Body and Blood of Christ and there is the grace right there. And it’s given by the simple physical means so that it’s very easily and readily available. Well a lot of people got baptized. And it doesn’t always take. People fall from grace. Why do they? You see, we’re just talking about the same old problem, but we’ve put it a step up—but it’s the same problem. How can I improve myself. Was the first problem, the second problem is how can I accept grace they’re both the same problem.

Because you’ve got to make a move. Which will put yourself out of your own control into the control of a better. If you don’t believe in the Christian kind of a God you can believe in the Hindu kind of a God who is your inner Self. You see you’ve got a lower self, which you can call your ego, that’s that little scoundrel is fella that’s all is out for me, the behind the ego there is the Atman. The inner self the inward light as Quakers would call it. The real self, the spirit which is substantially identical with God. So you got to I meditate in such a way that you identify with your higher self how do you do that well you start by watching all your thoughts. Very carefully. Watching your feelings watching your emotions. So that you begin to build up a sense of separation between the watcher and what is watched. So that you are as it were no longer carried away by your own stream of consciousness you remain the witness impassively impartially suspending judgment, and watching it all go on.

That seems to be something like progress at least you are taking an objective view of what is going on you are beginning to be in a position to control it but just wait a minute, who is the Self behind the self the watching self, can you watch that one? Interesting if you do. Because you find out of cause that this is just as the problem of grace is nothing more than a transposition of the first problem, how am I to be unselfish by my own power? It becomes how am I to get grace by my own power. So in the same way we find that the watching Self, the observing Self behind all off thoughts and feelings is itself a thought that is to say. When the police enter a house in which there are thieves. The thieves go up from the ground floor

of the first floor. When the police arrive on the first floor, the thieves have gone up to the second. And so to third, and finally out of the roof. And so when the ego is about to be unmasked, it immediately identifies with the higher Self. It goes up a level, because the religious game is simply a refined and highbrow version of the ordinary game. How can I outwit me? How can I one up me? So, if I find for example that in the quest for pleasure. The ordinary pleasures of the world. Food, sex, our possessions. All this becomes a drag. And I think now it isn't there so I go in for the arts literature poetry music. And I absorb myself in that in those pleasures, and after a while, they aren't the answer so I go to psychoanalysis you see. And then I found out that's not the answer I got to religion. I'm still thinking what I was seeking when I wanted can be bought. I want to get that goodie. Only I see now that it costs not going to be a material goody, all material goods fall apart, but maybe there's a spiritual good it's not going to fall apart. But in that quest, the quest is not different from the quest for the candy bar. Same old story only you have refined the candy bar made it abstract and holy and bless it and so on. So it is with the highest self the highest self zeroed ego. And you sure hope it is eternal, indestructible and all wise, then the great problem is how to get that higher self working? How does it make any difference to what you do and what you think. I know all kinds of people who got this higher self going practicing their yoga. But they're just like ordinary people. Sometimes a little worse. And they can fool themselves. They can say for example. Well my point of view in religion is very liberal. I believe that all religions have divine revelation in them. But I don't understand the way you people fight about it. You fight and say that we. Jehova's witnesses have the real religion, others say well we Roman Catholics have it and the Muslims say no it is in the Koran. And this is the right way. And somebody else gets up and he may be a rather high brow Catholic and say well God has given the spirit through all the traditions but ours is the most refined and mature.

And then somebody comes along and says well as I said they're all equally revelations of the divine, and in seeing this of course I'm much more tolerant than you are. You see how that game is going to work. The architect this position, supposing you regard me as some sort of a guru. And you know how gurus hate each other. Always putting each other down. And I could say well I don't put other groups down. See we're always doing

that. Were always finding a way to be one up. And by the most incredibly subtle me. So you see when you see me and you say I realize I'm always doing that tell me how do I not do that. I say why do you want to know. Why I'll be better that way yeah but why do you want to be better. You see the reason you want to be better is the reason why you aren't. Should I put it like that?

We aren't better because we want to be. Because the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Because all the do gooders in the world whether they're doing good for others or doing it for themselves are troublemakers. On the basis of 'kindly let me help you or you'll drown', said the Monkey putting the fish safely up a tree. We white anglo saxon protestants; British, German, American. We have been on a rampage for the past hundred or more years to improve the world. We have given the benefits of our culture, our religion, our technology to everybody except perhaps the Australian aborigines. And we have insisted that they receive the benefits of our culture even our political styles our democracy you better be dead Democratic I will shoot you. And having conferred these blessings all over the place we wonder why everybody hates us. Because sometimes doing good to others and even doing good to oneself is amazingly destructive. Because it's full of conceit. How do you know what's good for other people? How do you know what's good for you? If you say you want to improve. Then you want to know what's good for you. But obviously you don't because if you did you would be improved. So we don't know. It's like the problem of geneticists, which they face today. I went to a meeting of geneticists not so long ago where they gathered in a group of philosophers and theologians and said Now look here we need help. We now are on the verge of figuring out how to bring in any kind of human character. We would want to have. We give you saints, philosophers, scientists, great politicians, anything you want, just tell us what kind of human beings ought we to breed.

So I said, 'How will those of us who are genetically unregenerated make up our minds what genetically generated people might be.?' Because I'm afraid very much that our selection of virtues may not work. It may be like for example this new kind of high-yield grain which is made and which is becoming ecologically destructive. When we interfere with the processes of

nature and breed efficient plants and efficient animals there's always some way in which we have to pay for it. And I can well see that a eugenically-produced human beings might be dreadful. We could have a plague of virtuous people. Do you realize that? Any animal considered in itself is virtuous it does its thing but in crowds they're awful. Like a cross crowd of ants, or locusts on the rampage, they're all perfectly good animals. But it's just too much I could imagine a perfectly pestiferous mass of a million signs. So I said to these people, 'Look, if there's anything you can do, just be sure that a vast variety of human beings is maintained.' Don't please bring us down to a few excellent types excellent for what we never know how circumstances are going to change. And how. Our need. For different kinds of people changes.

At one time we may need very individualistic and aggressive people, at another time we may need very co-operative team working people. At another time we may need people who are full of interest in dexterous manipulation of the external world, at another time we may need people who explore into their own psychology and are introspective. There is no knowing but the mall varieties and the mosque ills we have obviously the better. So you see here again the problem comes out in genetics we do not really know how to interfere with the way the world is. The way the world actually is is an enormously complex interrelated organism. The same problem arises in medicine, because the body is a very complexly interrelated organism. And if you look at the body in a superficial way you may see there's something wrong with it, here's chicken pox. And the spots that it should come all out all over the place well you might say well spots of that cut them off. So you kill the bug. But then you find you've got real problems. Because you have to introduce some bugs to kill the bug, it's like bringing rabbits into Australia. And that starts going all over the place and getting out of hand. And then you think well now wait a minute, it wasn't the bugs in the blood there are bugs all over the place. What was wrong with this person that his blood system suddenly became vulnerable to those particular bugs his resistance was in doubt? Therefore what you should have given was not an antibiotic but vitamins. OK so we're going to build up his resistance but resistance to what. You may build up resistance to this and this and this class of bugs, but then there's another one that loves that situation it comes right in. See we always look at the human being

medically, in bits and pieces, because we have heart specialists, lung specialists, bones specialists, nerve specialists, and so on. And they each see the human being from their point of view there are a few generalists but they realise that human bodies. Complicated that no one mind can understand it. And furthermore, supposing we do succeed in healing all these people of that diseases. What do we then do about the population problem. I mean we've stopped cholera, the black bubonic plague, we're getting the better of tuberculosis, we may fix cancer and heart disease.

Then what will people die of? Well they'll just go on living. On the enormous quantities of others. Then we have to fix this birthing. Pills for everybody. Then we find one of the effects the side effects of those pills. What are the psychological effects upon men and women of not breeding of children in the usual way? We don't know. And what seems a good thing today or yesterday like D.D.T. turns out tomorrow to been a disaster. What seemed in the moral and spiritual sphere, to like great virtues in times past are easily seen today as hideous evils, let's take for example the Inquisition, in its own day among Catholics the Holy Inquisition was regarded. As we'd today regard the practice of psychiatry. You, you see, you feel that in curing the person of cancer almost anything is justified. The most complex operations, the most weird surgery people suspended for days and days on end on the end of tubes with X. ray penetration burning. Or people undergoing shock treatment, people locked in the colorless monotonous corridors of mental institution. In all good faith, they knew that witchcraft and heresy were terrible things. Often plagues imperiling people souls forever and ever. So any means we're justified. To cure people of heresy. We don't change. We're doing the same thing today. But under different names. We can look back at those people and see how evil that was but we can't see it in ourselves. So therefore, beware of virtue.

Lao Tzu, the Chinese philosopher, said "the highest virtue is not virtue and therefore really is virtue." But inferior virtue cannot let go of being virtuous and therefore is not virtue. Translated in more of a paraphrastic way, the highest virtue is not conscious of itself as virtue, and therefore really is virtue. Lower virtue is so self-conscious that it's not virtue. In other words, when you breath, you don't congratulate yourself on being virtuous. But breathing is a great virtue. It's a living.

When you come out with beautiful eyes, blue or brown or green as the case may be, you don't congratulate yourself for having grown one of the most fabulous jewels on earth. Just eyes. And you don't to count it a virtue to see, to entertain the miracles of color and form. But that's real virtue virtue in the sense of the old sense of the word as strength, as when we talk about the healing virtue of a plant. That's real virtue. But the other virtue is a stuck on they're ersatz, they're imitation virtues. And they usually create trouble, because more diabolical things are done in the name of righteousness. And be assured that everybody of whatever nationality or political frame of mind or religion all ways goes to was with a sense of complete rightness. The other side is that devil.

Our opponents, whether in China or Russia or Vietnam, have the same feeling of righteousness about what they're doing as we have on our side. And a plague on both houses because, as Confucius said "the goody good is of the thieves of virtue." Which is the form of our own problem the road to hell is paved with good intentions. So in a way the moral, or the immoral, of these considerations is that if you are really aware of your own inner workings, you will realize there's nothing you can do to improve yourself. Because you don't know what better is, in any case, and you, who will do the improving, are the one who needs to be improved. And this also goes for society. We can change society, we can get enormous enthusiasm going out of the idea that there is a revolution afoot, and that this revolution is going to set everything to right. Do you know a revolution that ever said anything to right? Whether the revolution came from the left wing or from the right wing.

The best forms of government that have ever existed in the world others which muddled through. Where they didn't have any very clear set up of control, but they muddle along. A kind of what are called controlled anarchy seems to work out better than anything else. When we have a great system and great power to put it into effect there, is always more violence more bloodshed more trouble. Makes no difference whether it be Chairman Mao or Adolf Hitler.

So, what instead therefore if we see, that you can't out with yourself. You can't be shall I say unselfconscious on purpose. You can't be design it was

spontaneous. And you cannot be genuinely loving by intending to love. Either you love someone or you don't. If you pretend to love a person, you deceive them, and build up reasons for resentment. So you say well I ought to be honest. That's the beginning of so many lies you can't imagine. It like when I hear lots of Love the big love thing on the way everybody's gotta love everybody but he sings songs about love. Do you know what I do? I buy a gun and board my door. Because I know there's a storm of hypocrisy brewing. So let's look at this thing from another point of view which you will at first think highly depressing.

Let's suppose we can't do anything to change also. Suppose we're stuck with it. Now that is the the worst thing an American audience can hear. There's no way of improving yourself because every kind of culture in this country is dedicated to self-improvement. Let's take jogging, that deplorable practice. It's a very nice thing to run. And to go dancing across the hills at a fast need. But these drugs are such trash. Truck junk shaking their bones and rattling their brains running on their heels and because there's a grimness about. It's determinately good for you. See, why do you go to school? Now wait a minute, you may not clap when I'm through. Thirty one reason for going to school. And that is that somebody is got something whether it's a professor, or a library that you want to find out. That you are incredibly interested in how to write Chinese characters. Or how to understand botany. And you would like to know, you are just interested in flowers and you would like to find out everything there is to be known about them. That's the point of coming. Or you might like to know how to practice yoga there are causes now being offered at U.C.L.A. on Kundalini Yoga. For credit! Pretty funny, when I think back ten years. But the whole point of coming to school is that you're interested in something. You don't come to improve yourself. But the trouble is that the schools got the wrong idea. They gave people Honors for learning. And the reward for studying French should be the ability to speak French and enjoy reading French and having fun with French people, but when you get a degree for it, then the degree becomes the point in a game of one upmanship. And of course one upmanship is the main business of the educational community today. You learn all the rules of how to be a good professor. It's instructive to go to a professors' meeting. In my field which is philosophy you go to a congress of philosophers and you'll find when they all get together in the

bar or in the restaurant and somebody is the one thing they don't talk about his philosophy. It is very bad form indeed to show interest in philosophy among your colleagues. The same is exactly true in clergy gatherings they we don't talk about religion what they both talk about is politics, church politics and academic politics. Because it's bad form to be brilliant on the faculty, because it out classes your colleagues therefore faculty people tend to cultivate a studied mediocrity. And you've got to watch out for that, I mean if you get mobs of students coming to your lectures, you get pretty black looks from your colleagues. And then of course there's a whole world of one upmanship in research and publication of learned papers how many was that the relative quantity of footnotes to basic text footnotes on for now. And the various ways of making your bibliography painfully accurate. It's endless, but you see what it is it's scholarship about scholarship and not scholarship. Just as learning because learning is good for you is irrelevant to learning the whole idea of improving yourself by learning is irrelevant to the learning process and in the same way, doing business is doing business doing business such as manufacturing clothes. Is a very good thing to do. I could conceive that it would be extremely enjoyable something I want to be very proud of to make good clothes 'cause you need to sell them because you need to eat. But to make clothes to make money raises another question. Because then your interest is not in making clothes but in making money, and then you are going to cheat on the clothes. And then you do get an awful lot of money and you don't know what to do with it.

You can't, you can't eat ten roasts of beef in one day. Can't live in six houses that one can't drive three Rolls Royces at the same time. What do you do? When you discover make more money you put your money back invested in something else it'll make mom and you don't give a damn how it's made so long as they make it. You don't care if a foul or reversed put oil fumes throughout the area where kill off all of fish—so what?—so long as you see these figures happening you're not aware of anything else. So you see you went out to do a self-improvement thing making money you see is a measure of improvement a measure of your economic worth while or less, or least that's what it's supposed to be it isn't anything of the kind but you well are in other words for the status instead of for the actuality.

So if, in other words you do not you're a musician Why do you play music the only reason for playing music is to enjoy it. If you play music to impress an audience. To read about yourself in the newspaper you're not interested in music. So in the same way, why do I come and talk to you. Because I enjoy it. I like the sound of my own voice and I'm interested in what I'm talking about. I get paid for it and that's modernist life is to get paid for what you enjoy. So here's the situation you see there is no that the whole idea of self-improvement is a is a will o' the wisp on a. That's not what it's about. Let's begin where we are. What happens if you know if you know beyond any shadow of doubt that there is nothing you can do to be better. Well it's kind of a relief, isn't it.

Now you say well now what will I do. See there's a little fidget comes up. Because we're so used to making things better, leave the well a better place than when you found that sort of thing. I want to be of service to other people and all these dreadfully hazy ideas. And so we think there's that little itch still. But supposing instead of that, seeing that there isn't really anything we can do to improve ourselves or to improve the world, if we realize that that is so, It gives us a breather in the course of which we may simply watch what is going on. Watch what happens. Nobody ever does this, you know. And therefore it sounds terribly simple it sounds so simple that is almost looks as if it isn't worth doing. Never just watched. Watch what's happening, and watch what you are doing by way of reaction to it just watch it happen. And don't be in a hurry. To think you know what it is. In other words, people look at the well that's the external world. Oh? How do you know? The whole thing from a neurological point of view is a happening in your head. That you think there is something outside the skull is a notion in your nervous system. May or may not be, but it's a notion in your nervous system. You think this exists the material world. Well that somebody is philosophical idea. Or maybe you think it's spiritual. That too is somebody is philosophical idea this is real world is not spiritual. It is not material. The real world is simply.

So could we look at things in that way? Without as it were fixing labels and names and gradations and judgments on everything, but watch what happens. Watch what we do. Now you see if you do that you do at least give yourself a chance. And it may be that when you are in this way freed from

busy-bodiness, and being out to improve everything. That your own nature will begin to take care of itself. Because you're not getting in the way of yourself all the time.

You will begin to find out, that the great things that you do are really happenings. For example, no great genius can explain how he does it. Yes he said I have learned a technique to express myself, because I had something in me that had to come out I had to know how to give it out so if I were a musician I had to learn how music is produced, that means learning to use an instrument or learning a technique of musical notation or whatever it may be. If I want to describe something I have to learn a language, so that others can understand me. I need a technique but then beyond that, I'm afraid I can't tell you how it was that I use that technique to express this mysterious thing I wanted to show you. If we could tell people that, we would have schools where we would infallibly train musical geniuses, scientific, miracle minds, and they would be so many of them we wouldn't know what to do with them. Geniuses would be a dime a dozen and then we would say well these people are after all not very ingenious. You know P.H.D.'s how many of them are there? Because what is fascinating always about genes is the fellow does something we can't understand. He surprises us. But you see just in the same way we cannot understand our own brains; neurology knows relatively little about the brain, which is only to say that the brain is a lot smarter than neurology. Yes it didn't get there is this which can perform all these extraordinary intellectual and cultural miracles, but we don't know how we did. But we did we didn't have some campaign to have an improved brain over the monkeys or whatever may be our ancestors. It happened. And all growth, you see is fundamentally something that happens. But, for it to happen, two things are important. First this, as I said you must have the technical ability. To express what happens. And secondly, you must get out of your own way. But right at the bottom of the whole problem of control is how am I to get out of my own way. And if I showed you a system, let's all practice getting out of our own way, it would turn into another form of self-improvement. See here's the dynamics of this thing. And we find this problem you see repeatedly throughout the entire history of human spirituality. In the phraseology of Zen Buddhism, you cannot get this by thinking. You cannot attain to it by not thinking. It is only

you see, as you, as getting out of your own way ceases to be a matter of choice, when you see that there's nothing else for you to do.

When you see in other words that doing something about your situation is not going to help you. When you see equally, that trying not to do anything about it is not going to help you where are you where you stand. Your nonplussed. And you simply reduced to watching.

Now you may say I need some help in this process, and therefore I am going to find someone else to help me. It may be a therapist. It may be a clergyman, it may be a guru. It may be any kind of person who teaches a technique of self-improvement. Now how will you know whether this person is able to teach you. How can you judge, for example, whether a psychotherapist is effective or just a charlatan? How can you judge whether a guru is himself spiritually wise or merely a good chatterbox? Well of course, you ask your friends, you ask of his other students or patients and they're all of course enthusiastic. You have to be enthusiastic when you bought something expensive. If you bought an automobile which turned out to be a lemon it's very difficult to admit that it was a lemon that you were fooled and it's the same when you buy a religion or an expensive operation. But what people do not sufficiently realize is that when you pick an authority, whether it's a psychotherapeutic one or a religious one. You chose it. In other words, that this fellow, or this book, or this system is the right one is your opinion. And how are you competent to judge? After all, if you're saying to this other person or other source, I think you are the authority, that's your opinion. So you cannot really judge whether an austerity is a sound off already unless you yourself are a sound off already. Otherwise you may just be being food. You may say, for example, I believe that the Bible is the Word of God. All right, that's your opinion. I know the Bible says it's the Word of God, but it's your opinion that the Bible is not lying. The church says the Bible is the Word of God but it's your opinion that the church is right. You cannot escape from that situation, it's your opinion!

So you see when you select an author who will help you to improve yourself it's like hiring the police out of your tax money. And putting them in charge of seeing that you obey the law. I mean, can't you take care of

yourselves? I mean is this the land of the free and the home of the brave or isn't it? But you see nobody seems to want to be in charge of themselves. Because they feel they can't do it. The St. Paul said "To will is present with me. But how to do good I find not, for the good that I would I do not and the evil that I would not that I do."

So, there at once we are in difficulty, because trying to improve yourself is like trying to lift yourself up into the air by tugging at your own bootstraps, and it can't be done. Now, there are all sorts of ways in which religious people try to explain that it can be done I referred already to the grace of God. And say No you can't do the job yourself. Because the improving you is the one that needs to be improved, therefore you have to say God help me. Now of course, that God exists is your opinion, that God will answer your prayer is your opinion and your idea of God is your idea of God If you bought somebody else's script, you bought it. Maybe your mother and father talked to you about God in a very impressive way. But basically you bought their idea. And if you're a father yourself; I'm a grandfather now, I've got five grandchildren and I know I'm a stupid as my own grandfather must have been. You know I am one I sit there in the position which they look at they go wowwe as a man. I know that just like anyone else. So I hope my children are not believing things on my authority, because it's always their authority. If I look impressive and make big noises at them, they've just been taken.

Philosophy of Nature

Compare a physical globe and a political globe. The physical globe is a pretty thing with all kinds of green and brown and wiggly patterns on it. The political globe on the other hand has still got the wiggly outlines of the land, but they are all crossed over with colored patches many of which have completely straight edges. A lot of the boundary between the United States and Canada, once you get west of the Great Lakes is simply a straight line. What has that got to do with anything? With any difference between Canadians on one side of the line or Americans on the other side of the line or what have you. It's absolutely a violation of the surface of the territory. And look at the fair city of San Francisco. It's a lovely place but they planted on the hills of San Francisco a city pattern that was appropriate for

the plains of Kansas. A gridiron. And so you get streets that go straight up and that are extremely dangerous where they should have followed the contours of the hills.

Now however I think we should begin by talking a little bit about when we use the word physical reality, as distinct from abstraction, what are we talking about? Because you see there's going to be a fight about this philosophically. If I say that the final reality that we're living in is the physical world, a lot of people will say that I'm a materialist, that I'm unspiritual and that I think too much of an identification of the man with the body. You, any book that you open on yoga or Hindu philosophy will have in it a declaration that you start a meditation practice by saying to yourself I am not the body. I am not my feelings, I am not my thoughts, I am the witness who watches all this and is not really any of it. And so if I were to say then that the physical world is the basic reality, I would seem to be contradicting what is said in these Hindu texts. But it all depends on what you mean by the physical world, what is it?

First of all on this be pointed out that the idea of the material world is itself philosophical. We confuse physical events, the whole class and category of physical events with matter. But matter you see is an idea it's a concept it's the concept of stuff how something solid and permanent that you can catch hold of. Now you just can't catch hold of the physical world. The physical world is the most evasive, elusive process that there is. It will not be pinned down and therefore it fulfills all the requirements of the spirit. So what I'm saying then is that the way the non abstract world which Korzybzski called unspeakable which was really rather a good word. Is the spiritual world. And the spiritual world isn't something gaseous. Abstract. Form-less, in that sense of shape. It's formless in another sense the formless world is a wiggly. See it's where when we say something is shapeless like a cloud. What shape as this cloud you say well it's so they get shapeless. That's the real formless world.

The formal world is the one that human beings try to construct all the time. See wherever human beings have been around to see rectangles and straight lines. As we're always trying to straighten things out. And so that's the very mark of our presence. I don't know why we do it it's always been a puzzle

to me why architects are always using rectangles. But the thing is that with that they make us feel very uncomfortable if they don't. I have an architect friend who built somebody a house like a snail shell. And it was a it's spiraled in and in and in and the John was right at the center. But everybody rebels against this house, they just feel very uncomfortable and that no these are the furniture doesn't fit. Because all furniture is made to fit in a rectilinear scene.

And so we're always putting things in boxes, see all thoughts all words are labels on boxes therefore we feel we've got to get everything boxed. And so we put ourselves in boxes everything is put in boxes. But actually everything else in nature doesn't go that way, as for example the snail doesn't put itself in a box. The crab doesn't put itself in the box. It has these fascinating goddess objects. What is for example more beautiful than a Conch shell? Or a lovely scallop shell? These are gorgeous things. We could make the most delicious shells out of concrete or plastics. They could be very beautiful. And we could distribute ourselves over the landscape like shellfish along the seashore. But instead we have to live in boxes. There's nothing you can't fight it, it's the system. So you know, then you have to you begin to build your furniture and chairs, everything, accordingly to those shapes because they're easy to store away in a place that is a box in the first place.

But you see then that is this rectilinear world. This is unspiritual. This is the world of what we all call the artificial as distinct from the natural. And when we live in a world like that, we begin to have ourselves bamboozled by it. You think, you begin to think that reality is this sort of straightened out situation that we all have to limit. And you don't remember that reality is precisely the wiggly world, you see. We don't realise that we are all wiggly. The problem is that we wiggle in rather the same way, we have head, two arms, two legs, etc. But notice how we do all sorts of things to ourselves to sort of evade our willingness. The way we dress, especially men. But this world, this physical world, is wiggly. And this is the most important thing to realize about it as I've sometimes said. We're living in the middle of a Rorschach inkblot. And there really is no way that the physical world is.

In other words, the nature of truth, I said in the beginning somebody had said that thoughts were made to conceal truth this is this is a fact because there is no such thing as the truth that can be stated. In other words, ask the question, "What is the true position of the stars in the Big Dipper?" Well it depends where you're looking at them from. And there is no absolute position, so in the same way accountants are good accountant will tell you that any balance sheet is simply a matter of opinion. So there's no such thing as the true state of affairs of a business. But we're all hooked on the idea that there is you see, an external objective world which is a certain way. And that there it really is that way history, for example, is a matter of opinion. History is an art, not a science. It's something constructed, which is accepted as a more or less satisfactory explanation of events which in as a matter of fact don't have an explanation at all most of what happens in history is completely irrational. But people always have to feel that there they've got to find a meaning. For example, you get sick, and you lived a very good life and you've been helpful to other people and done all sorts of nice things and you get cancer. And you say to the, to the clergyman, "Why did this have to happen to me?" And you're looking for an explanation and there isn't one. It just happened that way. But people feel if they can't find an explanation they feel very very insecure why? Because they haven't been able to straighten things out. The world is not that way. So the truth, in other words what is going on, is of course a lot of wiggles. But the way it is, is always in relation to the way you are. In other words, however hard I hit a skinless drum, it will make no noise. Because noise is a relationship between a fist and a skin. So in exactly the same way light is a relationship between electrical energy and eyeballs. It is you in other words who evoke the world. And you evoke the world in accordance with what kind of a you you are. What kind of an organism you are. One organism evokes one world another organism evokes another world and so everything air to reality is it is a kind of relationship. So once one gets rid of the idea of the truth as some way the world is in a fixed sense, say "It is that way."

Then you get to another idea of the truth altogether. The idea of the truth that cannot be stated the truth that cannot be pinned down. I might say that I'm interested in Japanese material, because contrary to popular belief, Americans are not material. We are not people who love material. But our

culture is by and large devoted to the transformation of material into junk as rapidly as possible. God's junkyard.

In science, we really work in two different ends of the spectrum of reality. We can deal with problems in which there are very few variables. Or we can deal with problems in which there are almost infinitely many variables. But in between we're pretty helpless. In other words, the average person cannot think through a problem involving more than three variables without a pencil in his hand. That's why, for example, it's difficult to learn complex music. Think of an organist, who has two keyboards or three keyboards, for work with his hands and each hand is doing a different rhythm. And then his feet on the pedals, he could be doing a different rhythm with each foot. Now that's a different difficult thing for people to learn to do, just like to rub your stomach and circle and pat your head at the same time takes a little skill.

Now, most problems with which we deal with everyday life involve far more than three variables. And we are really incapable of thinking about them. Actually, the way we think about most of our problems is simply going through the motions of thinking. We don't really think about it we do most of our decision making by hunch. You can collect data about a decision that you have to make. But the data that you collect has the same sort of relation to the actual processes involved in this decision as a skeleton to a living body. It's just the bones. And there are all sorts of entirely unpredictable possibilities involved in every decision and you don't really think about it at all. The truth of the matter is that we are as successful as we are which is surprising. The degree to which we are successful in conducting our everyday practical lives, because our brains do the thinking for us in an entirely unconscious way. The brain is far more complex than any computer. The brain is in fact the most complex known object in the universe because our neurologists don't understand it they have a very primitive conception of the brain and admit it. And therefore if we do not understand our own brains that simply shows that our brains are a great deal more intelligent than we are. Meaning, by we the thing that we have identified ourselves with. Instead of being sensible and identifying ourselves with our brains. We identify ourselves with a very small operation of the brain which is the faculty of conscious attention which is a sort of

radar that we have that scans the environment for unusual features. And we think we are that and we are nothing of the kind that's just a little, little trick we do. So actually, our brain is analyzing all sensory input all the time. Analyzing all the things you don't notice don't think about don't have even names for. And so it is this marvelous complex goings on which is responsible for our being able to adapt ourselves intelligently to the rest of the physical world. The brain is furthermore an operation of the physical world.

But now you see though we get back to this question, physical world. This is a concept. This is simply an idea. And if you want to ask me to differentiate between the physical and the spiritual. I will not put the spiritual in the same class as the abstract but most people do. They think that one plus two equals three is a proposition of a more spiritual nature than say for example a tomato. But I think it tomato is a lot more spiritual and one plus two equals three. This is where we really get to the point that's why in Zen Buddhism when people are asked What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism you could very well answer it tomato? Because look how, when you examine the material world, how diaphanous it is. It really isn't very solid. Tomato doesn't last very long. Nor for that matter, do the things that we consider most exemplary of physical realities such as mountains. The poet says, the hills are shadows and they flow from form to form and nothing stands.

Because the physical world is diaphanous. It's like music when you play music it simply disappears there's nothing left and that for that very reason it is one of the highest and most spiritual of the arts, because it is the most transient, and so in a way you might say that transiency is a mark of spirituality. A lot of people think the opposite, that the spiritual things are the everlasting things but you see them all a thing tends to be permanent the more it tends to be lifeless.

So then, the physical world, we can't even find any stuff out of which it's made. We can only recognise each other, and I say well I realise that I met you before and that I see you again. But the thing that I recognise is not anything really except a consistent pattern. Let's suppose I have a rope. And this rope begins by being Manila rope, then it goes on by being cotton rope,

then it goes on with being nylon then it goes on with the silk. So I tie not in the rope. And I move the knot down along the rope. Now is it as it moves along the same now or different. We would say it was the same because you recognize the pattern of the knot but at one point it's Manila at another point it's cotton to another point it's nylon another it's silk, and that's just like us. We are recognised by the fact that one day you face the same way as you did the day before and people recognize your facing. So they say that's John Doe or Mary Smith. But actually the contents of your face. Whatever they may be, the water the carbons, the chemicals are changing all the time you are like a whirlpool in a stream the stream is doing this consistent well pulling and we always recognize like at the Niagara, that the whirlpool as one of the sites about the water is always moving on. And this is why it's so spiritual. To be non-spiritual is not to see that. In other words, it is to impose upon the physical world the idea of things of substantiality that is to be involved in matter. To identify with the body. To believe in other words that the body is something constant, something tangible. So therefore, if you cling to the body you will be frustrated. So the whole point is that the material world, the world of nature, is marvelous so long as you don't try to lean on it.

I was in the morning seminar making a rather outrageous suggestion. Instead of the attitude that we are either objects of fate which are puppets manipulated by natural forces. And instead also of the attitude if you can't lick 'em, join them. That is to say, as it were pretending that everything that happens is just the way you really intended it to happen. There is still something else which is intuited in all forms of mystical experience which is, not that you have to pretend anything, but that in exactly the same way as. Your own organization keeps functioning without your apparently having anything to do with doing it. That process is continuous with is one process with all the behavior going on around you of other people of nature and of the entire universe. And as you contemplate this possibility, you shall I say begin to get the feel of it. And there is a curious point where a concept which after all this is a kind of concept slips over into getting a knack. Of actually feeling that's the way it goes it's exactly the same sort of thing as getting say, the feel of the wind in sailing. Well you need to keep a certain. A certain tautness, I say in the sails. Keep up a kind of even pressure. It's the same as in many many other skills Well there comes a

point of getting a knack and at every moment of getting the knack you have the curious sensation that this what you are doing is doing itself.

You get it when you first remember riding a bicycle, when you first actually swam. Don't you remember the feeling of somehow it is doing it rather than I am doing it in the ordinary way it haven't. You know, 'Look Momma no hands.' And so in it in respect to what I'm talking about. There is a point at which it becomes perfectly clear to you that you are not something struggling against everything else or being victimized by everything else. But that what is going on, insofar as you can experience it is your own doing. And the flip, from one state to the other is just like getting the knack in swimming, riding a bicycle or any other athletic or artistic activity. But then at that point you see, you become from the world's point of view, crazy. You become a divine madmen. And at that point, you are able to practice what Jesus taught in the Sermon on the Mount. Be not anxious, for the morrow what you shall eat, what you shall drink and where with all you shall be clothed. You know that passage is the most of verses passage in the New Testament. And I have never yet heard a sermon. In which any preacher seriously advocated. They say well that's a very high ideal, and might have been all very well for Jesus who was God. And people like that you see are regarded as completely irresponsible by the clergy in general. See, and somebody actually goes out because they say they that those hippies aren't really doing it because they are relying on money from home which is by the square father. All from scrounging. And the still not quite the attitude of let it all go.

But you see, if you are a really genuine divine Madman, you are not necessarily at the same time an irresponsible being. Perhaps one of the best examples of the divine Madman, was a Japanese Zen monk by the name of Riokan. He was a poet. And a kind of a solitary lived in the cottage on a hill. And would appear to be completely naive and I want to give you a story about Riokan which shows how a divine madmen relates to the practical world. One day, he was invited to a house I suppose a fairly wealthy home because he was much prized as a guest. And he went into the reception Room. And sat down to serve tea, and then when he thought he was alone he was looking around and he saw a hanging scroll where there was a painting of a tiger. And he looked at it, was delighted it's great and he

said “Ahhr!” And have a great time playing Tiger and suddenly he noticed that there was still present in the room sitting very quietly a servant maid. He looked and said ‘Don’t you tell anybody about that they’ll think I’m crazy.’

At another time he was sitting outside his little hut and he had finished dinner. And he had put his bowl rice bowl on top of one chopstick and the spinning this and suddenly a messenger came from a local diner you know that is to say a noble dignitary, and asked him some important question as to whether he could possibly attend and I know what it was a specialty ceremony or something like that. And all he could answer was the bowl keep spinning, and the messenger went back and said the master says the bowl keeps spinning.

On another occasion, he did very very interesting calligraphy. Though nobody can read it except very great experts because it looks as if an inky spider had crawled on the page. And but it’s highly prized, and today specimens of real comes writing sell for thousands of dollars. And people were always there for asking him if he would do a specimen and he was kind of cagey about it and reluctant. So one day a very cunning nobleman invited him to his house. And laid out on the mats some absolutely gorgeous writing paper great long strips of it with ink stone already full of ink, brushes and everything just sitting there. And Riokan went into the room and sat waiting for the house to arrive and he walked over and looked at this gorgeous paper of the brushes and sniffed around. And then absolutely couldn’t resist the temptation to write a poem down the scroll. Then suddenly he realized he’d done something awful. Because after all this was the most expensive paper you could get. And he didn’t realize that it was laid out for him to do something. He just thought, you know, it was there somehow and he’d And then at that moment the host walked in. And Riokan said “Oh I’m so I’m horrified I’m so sorry I just couldn’t resist the temptation.” The host said, “That’s perfectly all right don’t worry about it at all please he removed the feet try another one. And Riokan also loved to play with children, all crazy people do. Because you can get away with things with children that you can’t with other people.

And I while I just want to put us out of interspersed remark here I don't approve really of baby talk because I think that's insulting to children. It somehow makes them into dolls. But absolutely different from baby people, is play talk is that and what I mean not play talk is distinct work, talk about dancing talk you know you can do things you can make faces at children you can. Let yourself go in the company of children in a way that you can't with other people and that's there is a certain point in life as children grow up somewhere around five, six, seven but they become spoiled. And they become embarrassed by your really hassling with them anymore in that way. So Riokan loved to play with children, and he used to play all sorts of games of hide and seek with them. And one day he was it, and he had to go off and stay in a certain place and all the children went to hide and then they would say you-hoo and he'd start the fun so he went off to hide. And I know you. So he waited. For you-hoo, to stay there all night. Waiting for this the children does later joke on him and run off. Well one says You see that's not a very practical man. So, but he was adored by everybody. He was a kind of cherished village idiot, who was yet very much respected because everybody knew that in truth he was the only person in the village who was without basic fear. And who was therefore living life as a Zen monk who is called an un-sui. This is the two words, un, cloud, sui, water. And he's given this name every month he's called and I'm sorry because he's supposed to drift like a cloud and flow like water.

And this is exactly the see the same spirit. As not being anxious for the morrow and going along with the grass of the field in the fowls of the air. One day Confucius was out for a walk with his disciples. And he saw an old man fall into a big mountain stream, and thought alas he is sick and old and tired of life and he's making off with himself. For below where the point where he fell in there was an enormous cataract and then rocks and rapids underneath. But suddenly, the old man appeared way down below the rapids call out of the stream and went strolling along the banks. Confucius was amazed and he immediately sent a disciple to run after the old man so that he could talk to him. He said I thought you were about to make away with yourself but I see now that you must be a spirit. And he said 'No I'm not a spirit I'm just a perfectly human being.' Well then how did you survive the cataract he said in no special way I just went in with the swell and came out with a well. I did nothing I simply adapted myself to the nature of the water.

And so in the same way we have it connected with the Taoist and Zen, early Zen traditions many instances of famous monks who were quite mad on the Esalen announcement for this series of workshops and seminars there is a drawing of hunch on. And he and his companion shutter all the Japanese say Han-Shan on and Jitoku. They were two mountain hermits, who are favorite subjects of Zen artists because they are shown. Wandering about together in the woods laughing at falling leaves. And, Sang-Gi used to like that to draw them with the sutras open. Chanting away with their hair all frazzled and laughing chanting the sutras. And really not paying any attention to what they mean at all but just having a ball making these noises. But as a matter of fact, Han-San was an extraordinarily competent poet, in perfect control of the language when he needed to be. But all that controlled mastery was somehow based on. The attitude of what we will call fundamental nonsense, fundamental goofing off because you really don't need to make life work.

The point is you see these two ways of being. And not incompatible. They appear to be incompatible, when you think that the foundation of everything is the tough discipline. That that's basic. It is not basic, it's secondary and it's an important secondary. But you can't really make it work. Unless you build it on top of the primary which is the goofing off attitude of the child. To learn an excellent discipline and to learn it well you've got to goof your way into it. In other words, you have to learn. say in drawing, how to make very fine lines, by getting absorbed in doodling them. You see, do it not because there's anything special to be accomplished but just because it's such a it's such a gas to make the brush go in a certain way, like that when you practice calligraphy for example Western calligraphy or Chinese calligraphy you begin to dig the in amazing shapes that a brush can make and you play with your hands just as it just goes so you're not trying to please anybody the master all that make an impression you're just digging that brush. Chinese are very clever about this because they they make writing such a delight. For example, they puff you in the ink and it has a very subtle perfume is extremely great and then they rub the ink on a stone in water and it makes a beautiful blue black mixture and the feeling of sliding the stick back and forth on the stone is, is just as groovy as can be. Especially when the ink begins to get thick and smooth and the feeling of rubbing that and you get this satisfactory of sense then when you feel it's

just right you pick up the brush in for a while you play with the brush with the point getting it just to the right quality that you want. And then, to write, you learn to dance with the brush on the paper and here again is the thing of knack that when you write correctly you feel it is doing it. Now do you see the spirit in which underneath the accomplishment is playfulness. That it doesn't matter, and I found in studying the bringing up of children, education and so on, that a child gets completely discouraged when you tell that child that it is absolutely important that success be attained in a certain task.

Well, it just has to be done, I mean there is no wall down to if you've got to do it see you've got to be able to build it, to learn it to which this this distinction or whatever it is and that's like pushing the child and knocking them down. It's totally discouraging. Because if you must do it. The feeling is I don't think I will ever be able to. So instead every good teacher stirs up interest. Makes it, takes it that goofing off is basic. But subtly, by a kind of Judo, arranges the goofing off to go in this way. So then the world may be taken then to be fundamentally mad, crazy. All basic life is crazy life because it's nonsense. The death poem of a great Zen master was 'I have uttered nonsense from the bathtub to the bathtub.' All the time in which the baby is washed at birth in which the corpses washed before cremation, that's the two terms of life. And so all his Zen teaching and all his carryings on were just he said to start this stuff and nonsense. Because here we are, you know, we think we make sense.

I'm talking English to you and you understand the meaning of my words, but let's just drop this situation into another context what is the meaning of your understanding what I'm saying. We're all sitting around here. And you are listening to these signals and you are interpreting them into signals of your own, but look at the situation from above. What a crazy assembly, because what we're doing gathering here making noises, very complicated noises, is essentially no different from what this tree is doing out here spreading out its branches with all these little twigs and things sticking out and my job what is it doing well you say if we look at it from a practical point of view. Those leaves have a purpose and they are to absorb moisture and sunlight and to sort of go down into the tree and help the sap to come up and. Then then the real object of this is that it grows some kind of flower

or cone and that gets fertilized a little seeds inside and they come out and fall on the ground and get blown about and some get picked up by birds and distributed and they make other trees, you see. That's the thing, that's what it's all about, that's very very important function, actually it's sheer nonsense. Is this tree is going to say wow isn't that great you know let's spread this around and get everybody else going to do it but you know. What we're doing exactly the same thing. And the trouble with the loss of civilized people is we don't know it. He think we're being serious. And we know we have tremendously important schemes going on and that it's desperately vital that, for example, the human race survives. And that we go on with this great thing called Circle I think the United States of America the U.S.S.R.. Whatever it is we think that's the great thing we have to do but that's what's destroying us. Because it's nobody is going to blow up the world with an atom bomb for the sake of da-do-da-do-da-do-da-do. Know life is this fundamentally directionless wandering cloud like River drifting play and yet I casually use the word we should understand. And just as I pointed out earlier on this the problem that when you see that the world is like this and that you are all one with it and it's your doing and then you get it absolutely clear in your mind it is very clear indeed and you suddenly want to explain it to somebody and you find there are no words for it well so in just the same way, when one is trying to say this is what we should do, there seems to be a complete contradiction. And it's there's a verbal and logical hang up here that it's difficult to get across if you keep on using words it's only words that are making the difficulty. There is no difficulty in practice.

So I'm saying in words you should do something that you really can't help doing anyhow. Because you're thinking about it in words you don't realize it. You don't realize that you are doing it anyhow because you are thinking about it in words. And therefore the problem arises why am I saying you should do it when you can't help doing it anyway. So the words I'm using are getting in the way of the message or the meaning. So that this this could be called understanding is to be so, that we should be madmen in the sense of abandoning this whole project of the survival of the race, civilisation and so on. That this is the only way in which we can really structure human life and unplug various purely abstract and political engines that are totally destructive. But you see, you can't, you can't unplug them if you're still

afraid of them. If you are still fundamentally worrying about what is going to happen to civilisation. It's only when you see, in your own inner experience, that it simply doesn't matter. That what is important is what is unimportant which is the jazz. And that is important not that it should go on. But in the doing there off.

So this creates, what I would some people might call a new political strategy. Which we will call the politics of diversion. That is to say living a style of life. Which everybody sees that we're enjoying, that is so great. They'll say oh I wish we could be like that. No, but we've got to be earnest, all that kind of thing is easy. But that doesn't really achieve much except trouble. It is through application and study and earnestness that we have the atom bomb. We say well now look at all the things we civilized people have achieved. But sure about to blow up the planet that seems to be the prize of it. But here again let me underline the fact that I'm not trying to talk down technical skill, I'm only trying, and let me repeat the point that you cannot employ. Non-hostile, nondestructive technical skill. Unless you realize basically that you yourself are this whole domain of nature that's the real you. You are not in a fight against nature, you're not here to conquer nature because there's nothing that conquer it's all you. And so when you use technology to bulldoze everything into submission, you're fighting yourself. You're all tied up, clutched up, like the person trying to lift himself off the floor by his own bootstraps. And in that process, you're dissipating all your energy. On something that can't be done. And therefore you're just getting tired out need to drop dead. So I know you see that there are paradoxical elements in this, but I repeat, the paradoxes appear because of the nature of the language. When we try to explain these things, we run into contradictions for the simple reason that we are trying to explain it. To put it into a language with either-or categories in it, where you say either you try or you don't try. Either you let things go as they will or you do something about it. Either there is something you can do and therefore you should do it, or there's nothing you can do and therefore no one search would say 'Should.' No one should say should look how messed up you get. But that's what the way these difficulties arrive at the linguistic level these difficulties are not a rising at what I will call for the moment the material or the real level. Because there, at that domain, you will find yourself acting in a way that is in many ways more intelligent than you act

when you make up your mind. But that you see that simply living in complete natural spontaneity that's the way of the child. That may be the way of the animals, we don't know. But certainly, as a child is irresponsible, in that sense, and begins to learn responsibility and so on we must be terribly careful to realize. That irresponsibility is the basis of responsibility. That if we destroy the basic irresponsibility then the consequent style of responsibility that we learn is useless because it's all for nothing. It's all a process of continuing with anxiety and guilt and uptightness and making more and more and more and more of it by a kind of Parkinson's Law. You see what's happening, if we succeed in business in the ordinary way, what does that lead to? More Business.

So I say we don't get rid of this business and handed over the computers so they will do all the accounting then what Or you think up some new kind of business see and then we have to hand that over to computers because it's a boring. And that means new more investments bigger things going chicky-chick to get it, but it's all machinery. You think this is a great erection! It never comes off.

The Cosmic Drama

After long consideration I have come to the conclusion that there are four fundamental philosophical questions which have been debated for as long as we know anything about intellectual history. The first one is 'Who started it?' The second is 'Are we going to make it?' The third is "Where are we going to put it?" The fourth is "Who's going to clean up?" But when you consider all of these together they prompt a fifth question which is perhaps more fundamental than all of these: "Is it serious?" And when we say to the doctor about someone we love who is in some ghastly kind of sickness "Doctor, is it serious?" That means is the person in danger of his life. Because it is almost the fundamental supposition of western thought, at any rate, that life is serious. That we have an obligation to survive. And that there is therefore something shameful about dying. Life, in other words, is not a game. If it is a game, the first rule of this game is that this game is serious.

I remember some years ago counseling a woman much older than myself who was afraid of dying, and she wanted to know why she was afraid. She couldn't figure it out. And we had a long discussion, and she was clear that it wasn't the idea of being annihilated, and she had really outgrown her childhood fears of hell. She didn't really, wasn't really terrified by the pain of death, but she said "Do you know I finally realize I think what it is? I'm afraid of what people are going to say. They're going to say at the funeral, I can see them all there, 'Poor old Gert, she couldn't make it.'" Because you see, we all labor under this obligation to live. And this comes from our earliest training in childhood where we are taught that we must live, and it comes about in very odd ways. We run into a basic confusion about the meaning of the word must and the confusion is as to whether this word expresses a state of affairs, a condition that is, or whether to precept the commandment. In order to be human, you must have a head. That's obviously not a precept, nobody ever attempted to have a head. But when a mother says to a child, "Darling you must go to sleep. It's for your health." This is taken by the child as a commandment. And so the child tries to go to sleep which is an infallible method of staying wide awake.

So likewise, you must have a bowel movement every morning after breakfast. This too is taken as a commandment instead of simply a condition of being healthy. The worst one of all is the commandment, 'You must love me.' Not darling of course because I say so, but I would only want you to do it if you really want to. That is one of the most discombobulating, subversive things that you can ever say to another human being. You must love me. In other words, I command you to do something which will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily. And so imagine it how often this happens when one spouse says to the other darling do you really love me. What answer you're looking for? 'I'm trying my very best to do so.' Oh dear me, no. You want the spouse to say 'Darling, I can't help loving I love you so much I can eat you I'm out of my mind about you.' In other words, you want them to express a state of affairs which is a matter of fact anything but voluntary. You want the person who loves you to say. That they love you in the same way as they exist they didn't ask to exist, they can't help it, and there it is, for better or for worse. And that is one of the basic paradoxes in which we all get tied up and it's

called, been christened by the ethnologist Gregory Bateson, a double bind. And we are always being tied up in this thing.

And I gave you one right at the beginning when I started to be the first rule of this game is that it's not a game. The supposition of this drama is that it's not a play. Of course, every great actor will try to put that over on you. You know that here stands the Proscenium Arch. When there's a performance going on, and that what happens on the stage is in jest, is in play. It isn't somehow real, and yet the actor is going to use all the skill that he has to convince you that what's going on the stage is real life. He wants you on the edge of your seats with anxiety, he wants you crying, he wants you laughing, because he's taken you in completely.

Now the Indian Hindu theory of the cosmos is precisely this: that the universe is a play. A dramatic act. Which they call Lila. Whence our word lilt. Lila means play or sport and the universe is looked upon as the playfulness of the Godhead, who is playing a game of hide and seek with himself. And that every so often, he pretends that he is not himself and that he is all of us not only the human beings but the animal beings the angelical beings the diabolical beings the vegetable beings, the mineral beings, every kind of being that there is he hides from himself in these forms. And then after four million three hundred twenty thousand years, which is the basic reckoning unit of the in-goings and the outgoings of the cosmic game with supreme self the which then which there is no which or wakes up and discovers who he is after all and that's great. What a relief, because in the end, the thing becomes a nightmare, it becomes a tragedy and the universe finally blows up. In the awful awfuls, just as it does for each of us individually when we die.

But there behind the great show is the actor. And these, this idea is of course fundamental to all the conventions of the stage, because the whole notion of the stage of the drama is that the actor comes out not as himself but as a persona. And the word persona, in Latin, means that through which the sound passes, and refers specifically to that mask worn by actors in classical drama. A mask with a mouth shaped in the form of a megaphone, so that it would project the sound in an open air theatre. And so, at the beginning of a play, the dramatic personae is the list of masks but how to be

won by the actors. And by a curious inversion of the meaning of words the word person has come to mean not the mask, but the real thing. Harry Emerson Fosdick wrote a book called How to be a Real Person. That is incorrectly styled, How to be a Real Fake. In Act In other words how to be a good actor. But it disquiets us, doesn't it, that the idea that the whole world might be a big act. We're also in social life a bit disquieted when we get into the company of stage people people in showbiz, because we're not sure whether in real life they're still acting.

Who are you? That's the great question. One of the most magnificent Indian sages of modern times, Sri Ramana, always faced people with this question, when people came to him and said 'Oh master, who was I in my past incarnation? Will I be reincarnated again?' et cetera et cetera he always used to say 'Who is it that asks? Who are you?' And he asked this question. I've got a photograph of this man, I never met him but I know lots of people who did and he has a funny look in his eyes, a curious twinkle. And you can feel those eyes from the very photograph going right through you, not with judgment, not with condemnation but with a kind of a wicked humane twinkle.

In other words it says 'Listen buddy, don't fool me, I know who you are! And you say me. Why I'm just little me. I'm not a very important person I'm just a poor little human like Houseman's verse 'I, a stranger and afraid, in a world I never made.' The teacher looks at you and so on. Old Shiva don't give me that stuff. I know who you are in your million masks and you look out and say I'm just a poor little me. That's the technique you see of the Awakeners, the people who in Hindu, in the Hindu world are called gurus. The so-called spiritual teachers who kid us out of our egocentricity. Egocentricity being the predicament wherein the universe, and all that is beyond the universe identifies itself with a particular role or part that it's playing in the game.

Now in our culture, You just mustn't get mixed up with that kind of thinking. I've been thinking for a long time what is really a taboo in our culture. And in a good many other cultures besides, what used to be sex, but sex isn't taboo anymore. You can buy books on sex anywhere any child can find out all about it, it's the easiest thing in the world. There's a slight flavor

of Taboo hanging over it from the older generations but it isn't a serious taboo anymore not since Freud. You know there's a two ages B.F. and A.F., and in A.F. sex is no longer taboo. What is taboo? There's always something. The real taboo is what the Hindus call in the immortal phrase *tat tvam asi*, which means that art thou. You lurking behind the mask of being an impermanent human person. Really responsible for the whole thing. But if anybody claims that in our culture we put them straight away into an asylum that is the very hallmark of insanity. But in India, if somebody suddenly wakes up one. Morning says 'My goodness, I'm God.' Everybody says instead of you're crazy or blasphemous they say 'Congratulations, at last you found out.' But of course you see they have a rather different idea of God from ours.

Our popular idea of God, quite aside from any of the ideas of the more profound theologians. Our popular idea of God is that he is the master technician who has created this universe in much the same way that an engineer creates a machine, a carpenter makes a table, or a potter makes a pot, and he knows how he does it. So anybody who says I'm God, we immediately challenge him with technical questions. If you are God how did you create the universe in six days? And all sorts of questions like that, but you see the Hindus God does not need to know in words how he does what he does, in exactly the same way that you don't know how you grow your hair. You just do it and after all can you know how to do a thing better than by just doing it. You may have a physiologist knowledge of how you open and close your hands but that doesn't enable you to open and close them any better than anyone else. Unless of course you've got a wrecked hand and you need a physiologist to put it back in shape. But in the ordinary way of things, you know how to think because you think, but you don't know how you think. You don't understand all the intricacies of the nervous system underlying the process of thought you just do it. So like a centipede who can manipulate a hundred legs without having to think how to move each one so the Hindus can see the Godhead not as a technician but as a cosmic centipede. Who is wiggling all of us. Like so many legs that's why the Hindu gods have many arms there's one Buddhist divinity with one thousand arms. But this thing doesn't have to stop to think how it's done that would be inefficient because thinking is a process of concentrating our attention on what is called One thing that is to say one think at a time. And

that won't do it all for the regulation of complex processes. That's why we're now so fatigued with thinking that we're getting computers to do it for us. Because computers can think of ever so many things at once and that's where they have the advantage of us. So a Hindu therefore feels no kind of blasphemy or inconsistency or insanity in suddenly realizing that he is basically what there is. That you aren't directly aware of this of course just in the same way that you are not directly aware of your brain structure. Nor are you aware of the incredibly subtle interconnected system of relationships balances, networks, whereby your brain, is part and parcel of the whole physical universe. And exists with it, in the same kind of togetherness as a front exists with the back.

So in this sense you see, we are all something that everything is doing. Every wave is the ocean waving the whole ocean waving announcing its presence, so in the same way each one of us is a waving of all that there is saying you there I am. Only it comes and it goes. All waves come and go they have their ups and downs and we have our ups and our downs when we are up then we suddenly see John Doe when we're down there's just a corpse. And works it comes up again as Mary Smith and worked it goes down and so it goes. Like the sparks in the soot on the back of the fireplace, in and out in and out in and out. Every one different than the one before and yet somehow the same.

Now in, as I said, in the Hindu view of the cosmology, this is a drama. And that means it is its basic spirit is playful it is a game. But the difficulty that we have in understanding this idea is that we don't distinguish between the many connotations of the word play or game. A lot of people say to me when I produce this idea, do you mean it's only a game? That all this is somehow therefore trivial. And I say no. Look, when you go to listen to a great pianist play the Beethoven sonatas, you are actually going to an entertainment. You pay entertainment tax to get in. But you wouldn't say would you that this was mere entertainment. There is something about music which is beautifully illustrative of the point that I'm making. Because music is sheer and total play, the highest music that both West and East have produced has no meaning beyond itself. That is to say Mozart Sonatas do not imitate the sound of charging horses tinkling brooks, or screeching

factories. They convey no social message. They are pure delight, in complex orders of sound. Almost mathematical.

And you see music is purposeless in the sense that it has no direction. It is not designed to arrive somewhere. I mean, if the point of music or of any musical composition were to arrive that is to say to reach the finale the best conductors would be those who got there the faster. And in the same way with the dance the dance as a high and lofty art. It is not mere entertainment, but when we dance we do not dance with the object of reaching a particular position on the floor. You see we could go straight there, and cut out the dance. In music and in dancing, the point of it is always the going along of it in a kind of continuing present. Now what about the world. Let's take a look at nature. Is this a musical thing or is it a compulsively purposive thing. Look around at the creatures. The vast variety of insects. The amazing multiplicity of plant forms, of bacteria. Look at the stars, the nebula at night. This tremendous prodigality, this profusion of energy. If we ask the question 'What is it all for?' I think this is the wrong question. It sort of doesn't need that question, it answers itself. Just as when you listen to music. You don't after you what does it mean? You just dig the sound. You swim with it.

And so in exactly the same way, the world may be seen in all the multiplicity of its creatures as fabulous. G.K. Chesterton once made a very profound remark when he said it's one thing to wonder at a fabulous creature like a god or Griffin that doesn't exist but it is of a much higher order to wonder at a rhinoceros, a creature that does exist and looks as if it doesn't. Now you see there are people with engineering mentalities. I don't want to insult and engineers present in the audience but what I will call a certain kind of engineering mentality that has an explanation for everything. Namely, that butterflies have those big eyes on their wings as a kind of survival dodge, that comedians change color in order to affect something or other or they have another way round of putting the same point which is, that because certain butterflies had eyes on their wings they frighten the birds more than other kinds of butterflies and therefore survived. Everything, in other words, is nature is approached from the standpoint of an efficiency expert and the idea is that there is an instinct to survive this is the same old compulsion I was talking about you must go on surviving but

actually, things don't live in order to survive because surviving and living are the same thing. Now you survive until you don't. And that's that. It seems to me altogether more rational to look upon this amazing profusion of existence as poetic and musical, and therefore as playful. But, in order to be a good play, it has to have an element and a subordinate element of seriousness in it. That is to say, we can't have a good stage play without introducing a villain, and the villain has to be convincingly played. There has to be a real big act and they get everybody gets afraid of that villain. That's absolutely essential.

So in the same way there has to seem about life an element, a very convincing element indeed of the ultimately tragic. Only the big question is, is it so? To put it in another way, is the universe a system in which there can occur an irretrievable mistake. As indeed the Christians have conceived in the idea of eternal damnation. That is one of the most extraordinary ideas ever had start of the brain of man. That there might be the possibility of things going wrong for ever and ever and ever. Well the Hindus, of course, when they look at that idea and realise that the Christians hatched up this ghastly possibility to scare themselves with, they rather applaud what they say the Christian, they see that a Christian so in peril of everlasting damnation is actually the Supreme Lord playing this part. And they think now he's really scare the wits out of himself. And this is the most marvelous performance in the whole thing.

In this brief life of four score years and ten, you have set before you the choice, once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide, and the strife quicks true from false, or for the good or evil side that it is the brave man to run the coward stands aside. Ugh, he hasn't made that choice and you don't know how to make it. The suspense of that as a great dramatic move. But the Hindu has that funny look which says, huh! Right now. We've got to get to the bottom of this and I want to really I have I'm a little diffident about this because I don't want to insult anyone's intelligence.

But I do want to give you what should be called the first lesson. What your mother should have told you before you learned about one two three and ABC. There is something underneath all that the something much deeper. And it's about black and white. But now let me introduce it by asking you to consider all your senses as forms of one sense. Basically a sort of sense

of touch. Because seeing is touching at a distance. Our eyes are so sensitive that they can touch light our ears are so sensitive that they can touch vibrations of air. Our fingertips are less sensitive in Western civilization our noses are almost insensitive. But these are all forms of response to touch. Whether they be rather solid things like tables and rocks or whether they be very subtle things like tiny particles in the air or light waves.

So when your senses are touched. They go off and on. Either there's something there or there isn't. Now when you consider for example the phenomenon of sound. There isn't actually such a thing as pure sound. When you hear a sound, a note being sung, you are actually hearing a vibration. You are hearing sound silence, oscillating, because it is the alternation of sound and silence that impresses us. This is so with almost all contacts. If you have a delightful girl sitting next to you and you want to make your presence known to her and you put your hand on a knee and you leave it there, she will cease to notice it. But if you gently pat her on the knee, she'll know you are still there. Because you come and you go. Now you see It, now you don't.

So all physical, all physical manifestations are in the sense vibrating. They are pulses, light is a power. And the most solid rock is also a pulse and you can't put your finger through it for the same reason that you can't put your finger through an electric fan when it's revolving. It's going too fast, so this table is going so fast that I can't done it philosophers are always using tables with a straight something because they speak of classroom gets a little boring but still. It resists because it's going so fast. On Off On Off On Off On Off On Off. So you see, this is the process the nature of the wave. You can't have it is not such a thing in nature as half a wave. A wave that is the say, which has only a crest and no trough. To get a wave you have to have a crest and a trough at the very least. So the up and the down go together. Likewise therefore, the black and the white. So what we call existence is being-nonbeing. So therefore to be on not to be is not the question. To be and not to be are inseparable companions. Just like Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee, who incidentally agreed to have a battle.

So between all these explicit differences, like the top and the bottom, the up in the down, front in the back the light in the dark. Explicit differences have

behind them an implicit unity. That is to say they are always found together. There is as it were a conspiracy under the surface. To look as different as possible and yet to be one. It takes one to produce difference because you see you don't know what you mean by difference unless you know what you mean by unity. You don't know what you mean by is, unless you know what you mean by isn't. You know there is a matchbook in this hand and there isn't one in this hand. Abstract from that and you get the idea of being and nonbeing. But they go together. Now the whole joke that's been played on you, by you of course, is that they don't go together. That in other words black might win. That seems very persuasive. After all when one looks at existence. You realize it's quite an effort. Lot of energy going on. Wouldn't it have been so much easier over there not to have been anything at all? When it once you get that idea existence becomes odd. And so also, when you think about death. What would it be like to go to sleep and never wake up. That thought always makes us intellectually dizzy. And it makes you think about birth the funny event of waking up after never having gone to sleep. You know something distinctly spooky about that.

But you see that this is all part of it. That the black side has to be real genuine black so that the white side can be real genuine White. And it's always seem, as if whenever black turns up that's going to be the end. And this is a conspiracy, so when you when you've got the game, uh-oh black might win, you have to play the next game which is all white must win. And so we start it all out, the battle between the sides. And from this battle come all the complexities of human culture. Just out of black and white. Look how complicated we can make them. The game of heads and tails, is one of the very simplest forms. Will it be heads, will it be tails? That gets boring. We make it more complicated, we make them into dice. We make them into checkers more complicated still chess that's all based on black and white, but how elegant. Even color emerges finally from black and white. Analyze our composite structure down to its final terms and we seem to turn up to be something like a newspaper photograph. You know, black and white dots that stand away from them, and they seem to be light and shadow. The point at least painted saw this. But we are all this buzzing little on off yes no yes no yes no yes no yes no yes no every neuron is either firing or not firing yes no yes no yes no and out of this multiplicity of yes and no. Look at this thing.

But it all depends on this little joke, see. That we forget somehow. That yes or no go together. A person who understands that, you see, is a sort of initiate. He's been let in behind the scenes. He's in what you would call a person who is very far in. There a lot of our most of us are very far out actually. With a person you might call a square is the most far person there is because he really believes that black might win. That white must win, he's completely bamboozled he's altogether forgotten the secret. So he's way way out, lost as lost can get. But Harbor. How magnificent. But so that he doesn't go off his head altogether there are always in societies some foreign people. And they want to call the esoteric people as compared with exoteric people and the foreign people are out of cages. They don't give the show away too easily now you might say you're not being very far in your explaining to us. What the joke is and you really shouldn't do that because if we knew that it was all right and that the whole thing was a joke what would happen to our incentives.

Now I feel I can say all this quite safely because very few people will believe it. Because it's very difficult to believe. The other position, that black might win, is marvelously persuasive. So maybe in this audience there might be a few people who would understand. And then our anxiety is, will such people stop the show? Will they suddenly become inert, be enemies of progress or become frankly immoral because. You know you want to obliterate someone and after all they're not serious they're just a mask of God which is the same as you are having to push them out of the way them not. Will they get like that. Well there's always a gamble you see, for all things again. And there's always danger. Every good thing in this world is dangerous. The moment you teach a child how to walk, you give it the capacity to kick it's mother. The moment you have. Fire to warm yourself and to cook with. You have the possibility of destruction there is no way around danger so of course a person who was in the highest sense of the word disenchanted. You see that it's a marvelous word because it has a positive meaning as well as the usual negative one to be enchanted is to be spellbound. To be fascinated like a chicken with its nose on a chalk line.

So the actor who is really involved in playing the world is fascinated, he is enchanted by his own spell. Spell in the beginning was the word. You see. The chant. So, to be disenchanted is to suddenly recover from a state of

auto-hypnosis, to wake up, that's why a Buddha means that from the Sanskrit word good to waken, to be awakened it is one who was woken up. And who knows. My goodness, it's all a dream. But what a magnificent dream, a beautiful thing a great work of art art in the highest sense. Maya, as the Hindus call the world as well as Lila. Maya means very roughly illusion but it means a lot more besides it means magic it means art it means creative power it means construction, from a root word martyr lay down the foundations of a building hence our word meter. Measure metric. And also matter. Does it matter, means does it put on a good show? Does it amount to something or. Is it a convincing illusion. Illusion likewise connected with the Latin Ludere, to play.

But you see, we have a culture in which words like play illusion and so on have a bad connotation. We don't want to get with an illusion. And we want in the end to know, I wonder if we really do want this, that at least God is serious. Now look, if I say to you I love you. And supposing I say this in a very personal way to a particular individual. The person I says that to turns around to me and says 'Are you serious?' I say no. No no, indeed. But I am sincere. This is a commitment. It's a rash commitment, it's the height of rashness. But it's therefore not serious. Keyserling, in his South American meditations, makes the point that a man of spirit is above all a man lacking in seriousness. He, as a man of courage, plays with his life now to quote G. K. Chesterton again he said the angels fly because they take themselves lightly. Are much more so than the lot of the angels I mean just let me put this in anthropomorphic terms because there's an important thing about talking about God in anthropomorphic terms. A) Nobody takes it too seriously. B) It puts things vividly in ways that escape more abstract intellectual language. I mean, when all those angels and saints around the throne of God in Heaven forever and ever, what sort of a show do you want to be going on everybody going to look at each other. Are they going to stare into the eye of the lord as say yeah. Dante in the Paradiso, describes the Hymn of the angels, and he says it is like the laughter of the universe. In other words they sing Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia. What the devil does that mean? It doesn't mean anything, except it's a kind of celestial whoopee. So you see, what I'm pointing out is this, that even in the tradition of the most serious religion that there is, the one that really takes life seriously, because there's the possibility of ultimate tragedy. Even in this most serious religion

its mythological forms, its symbology, gives a little tweak to give away the show. Just as in those Hindu images of Shiva the Destroyer aspect of the divinity when he is dancing Tandava, the dance that he dances at the end of a cycle when the whole universe is destroyed he showed the ten arms and fierce aspect and in his nine of his arms he has bells unfun the bolts and clubs and knives but one is in this gesture. The hand, palm outwards, fingers up, it means don't be afraid, this is a big act.

So you see, the notion of the world as playful is I think you may agree, the only finally workable and rational solution to our predicament. There is always, of course, the chance that it might not be. But it is indeed the chance that you may wake up. Divine yourself everlastingly down. All that you may never wake up at all. I don't know what that would mean. Except nobody would ever know whether it was serious or wasn't there. But, it seems to me that there are certain metaphysical systems, some of which are good gambles, and some of which are not. Because a great deal of the problems of life resolve themselves to the question, 'What are good game rules?' Ethical questions have to be decided this way, aesthetic questions, and questions of simple political organization. Now you can obviously see can't you that a social order. In which nobody trusts anybody else. Is not set up as a going game. If everybody is spying on his next door neighbor and if we have a big brother who's got a kind of television outlet and a mike in every room everybody is bugged, and there's no game, because the poor old big brother can't even take a walk in the park. He's got to sit there watching everybody. The Hindus work this out in a book called The Afathrastra [sic], where it is a manual of operations, for the perfect tyrant. And it gives minute instructions, how to hedge himself in, with the rings like the rings of a spider's web. How he gets the different ranks of his courtiers and advisors, he puts them all at enmity with each other so that they will all spy on each other, and all report on each other and then right in the center he lives in the super protected room. Where he has guards, but other guards watching these guards. And he has a secret exit out from the middle that goes somewhere down to the river where he's got a fast speed boat waiting. And on the way out there's a keystone he can pull and make the whole palace collapse. Now here is a man living in perpetual paranoia. He can't even sleep, he has to have some valid taste is food for him to be sure it isn't

poison. He's the maximum non-trust, and this is a non workable system. You cannot throw a ball unless you're willing to let go of it.

So in exactly this way game rules have to have play in them, that is to say, they have to be a good game has to involve. A wonderful balance of chance and skill. Randomness and order. And then it has a chance of going on. I was discussing tossing a coin. That's a very boring game. Tic-Tac Toe is a pretty boring game, because if you know how to play it anyone who starts wins, so it reduces itself to tossing coins. On the other extreme, three dimensional chess. Is much too complicated for most people to keep tangles of it. And they lose themselves in the tangle from. But somehow in the middle games like poker, bridge, chess. Even Go. Marvelously intriguing people, can get fascinated you know how it is once you become a chess buff, you can go you go on and on and on and on well that's what we call the instinct for survival. Where you know the math game, the bee game, the bird game the man game you can't let go it's fascinating. So we're all human buffs. A universe that man's all the people started as an apple tree apples. And the apple tree apple serves to go after him because applying is great. So is tree-ing, but you can see different forms of trees and different forms of animals in the same way as you get the difference between Mazurka waltz, Charleston twist, rumba or so not a few partita all Mahjong, chess, dominoes, so it's all like that. The question is to find out the most fascinating thing. See if you play chess, which can become a game of pure skill with the element of chance almost eliminated when a real champion is concerned. It ceases to be fun after a while unless you have an opponent who is a little bit unpredictable. The whole point of it is that you cannot quite figure out the other person's skill and that introduces an element of chance but if a game is pure chance. The fun goes out of it, unless you're out of your mind. And think that there is a serious chance you might win.

So it's in looking for that strange balance that we find a clue to what it's all about. The question is simply fundamentally. Do you have the nerve to follow that through? Can you look black,night, in the face. And say, 'Well I really do know you're the other side of white. You come on pretty fierce. But that's your nature.' And that anxiety which constantly asked the question to be on not to be, and therefore trembles between them, will in the

end turn into laughter the same trembling, when it knows that to be and not to be are inseparable twins.

Spectrum of Love

We know that from time to time there arise among human beings people who seem to exude love as naturally as the sun gives out heat. These people, usually of enormous creative power, are the envy of us all, and, by and large, man's religions are attempts to cultivate that same power in ordinary people. Unfortunately, they often go about this task as one would attempt to make the tail wag the dog. I remember that when I was a small boy in school, I was enormously interested in being able to do my schoolwork properly. Everyone told me that I did not work hard enough, that I ought to work harder, but when I asked, "How do you work?" everybody shut up.

I was extremely puzzled. There were teachers who apparently knew how to work and who had attained considerable heights of scholarship. I thought that maybe I could learn "the secret" by copying their mannerisms. I would affect the same speech and gestures and, insofar as I could get around the school uniform, even clothing. (This was a private school in England, not a public school in America.)

But none of this revealed the secret. I was, as it were, copying the outward symptoms and knew nothing of the inner fountain of being able to work. Exactly the same thing is true in the case of people who love. When we study the behavior of people who have the power of love within them, we can catalogue how they behave in various situations, and out of this catalogue formulate certain rules.

One of the peculiar things we notice about people who have this astonishing universal love is that they are often apt to play it rather cool on sexual love. The reason is that for them an erotic relationship with the external world operates between that world and every single nerve ending. Their whole organism—physical, psychological, and spiritual—is an erogenous zone. Their flow of love is not channeled as exclusively in the genital system as is most other people's. This is especially true in a culture such as ours, where

for so many centuries that particular expression of love has been so marvelously repressed as to make it seem the most desirable. We have, as a result of two thousand years of repression, “sex on the brain.” It’s not always the right place for it.

People who exude love are in every way like rivers—they stream. And when they collect possessions and things that they like, they are apt to give them to other people. (Did you ever notice that when you give things away, you keep getting more? That, as you create a vacuum, more flows in?)

Having noticed this, the codifiers of loving behavior write that you should give tax deductible institutions and to the poor, and should be nice to people, that you should act towards your relatives and friends and indeed even enemies as if you loved them (even if you don’t). For Christians and Jews and believers in God, there is a peculiarly difficult task enjoined upon us; namely, that “thou shalt love the Lord thy God,” not only going through the motions externally, but with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind. And that is, of course, very demanding indeed.

It is as if, for example, we admired the music of a certain composer and, having studied his style very thoroughly, we drew up rules of musical composition based upon the behavior of this composer. We then send our children to music school where they learn these rules in the hope that if they apply them, they will turn into first-class musicians, which they usually fail to do. Because what might be called the technique of music—as the technique of morals, as well as the technique of speech, of language—is very valuable because it gives you something to express. If you don’t have anything to say, not even the greatest mastery of English will long stand you in good stead.

So the question and the puzzle remain: You cannot imitate this thing . . . there is no way of “getting” it, and yet it is absolutely essential that we have it. Obviously, the human race is not going to flourish harmoniously unless we are able to love each other. The question becomes: How do you get it? Is it something that you simply have to contract, like measles? Or, as theologians say, is it “a gift of divine grace” which somehow is dished out to some but not to others? And if there is no way of getting divine grace by

anything you do, as the Calvinists aver, then hadn't we better just sit around and wait until something happens?

Surely, we can't be left in that sort of hopeless situation. There must be some way of getting "grace" or "divine charity" or "divine love"—some sort of way in which we can, as it were, open ourselves so as to become conduit pipes for the flow. And so the more subtle preachers try to see if we can open ourselves and teach methods of meditation and spiritual discipline in hope that we can contact this power. The less subtle preachers say 'you don't have enough faith, you don't have enough guts, you don't have enough willpower...' If you only put your shoulder to the wheel and shoved you would be of course an exemplar and a saint. Actually, you will only be an extremely clever hypocrite.

The whole history of religion is the history of the failure of preaching. Preaching is moral violence. When you deal with the so-called practical world, and people don't behave the way you wish they would, you get out the army or police force or "the big stick." And if those strike you as somewhat crude, you resort to giving lectures—"lectures" in the sense of solemn adjuration and exhortation to "behave better next time."

Many a parent says to the child, "Nice children love their mothers. And I'm sure you're a nice child. You ought to love your mother, not because I, your mother, say so, but because you really want to do so." One of the difficulties here is that none of us, in our heart of hearts, respects love which is not freely given. For example, you have an ailing parent, and you are a son or daughter who feels dutifully that he should look after his parents because they've done so much for him. But somehow, your living with your father or mother prevents you from having a home and a life of your own, and naturally you resent it. Your parents are well aware that you resent this, even if they pretend to ignore it. They therefore feel guilty that they have imposed upon your loyalty. You in turn can't really admit the fact that you resent them for getting sick, even though they couldn't help it. And therefore no one enjoys the relationship. It becomes a painful duty to be carried out.

The same thing would naturally happen if, a number of years after having (at the altar) made a solemn and terrible promise that you would love your

wife or husband come what may forever and ever “until death do you part,” suddenly you find that you really haven’t the heart to do it any more. Then you feel guilty, that you ought to love your wife and family.

The difficulty is this: You cannot, by any means, teach a selfish person to be unselfish. Whatever a selfish person does, whether it be giving his body to be burned, or giving all that he possesses to the poor, he will still do it in a selfish way of feeling, and with extreme cunning, marvelous self-deception, and deception of others. But the consequences of fake love are almost invariably destructive, because they build up resentment on the part of the person who does the fake loving, as well as on the part of those who are its recipients. (This may be why our foreign-aid program has been such a dismal failure.)

Now, of course, you may say that I am being impractical and might ask, “Well, do we just have to sit around and wait until we become inwardly converted to learn, through the grace of God or some other magic, how to love? In the meantime, do we do nothing about it, and conduct ourselves as selfishly as we feel?”

The first problem raised here is honesty. The Lord God says, at the beginning of things, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” What appears to be a commandment is actually a challenge, or what in Zen Buddhism is called a koan, a spiritual problem. If you exercise yourself resolutely, and try to love God or your neighbor, you will find that you get more tangled up. You will realize increasingly that the reason you are attempting to obey this as a commandment is that you want to be the right kind of person.

But love is not a sort of rare commodity—everybody has it. Existence is love. Everybody has the force running. Perhaps the way in which you find the force of love operating in you is as a passionate like for booze or ice cream or automobiles or good-looking members of the opposite sex, or even of the same sex. But love is operating there. People, of course, tend to distinguish between various kinds of love. There are “good” kinds, such as divine charity, and there are allegedly “bad” kinds, such as “animal lust.” But they are all forms of the same thing. They relate in much the same way as the colors of the spectrum produced by the passing light through a prism.

We might say that the red end of the spectrum of love is Dr. Freud's libido, and the violet end of the spectrum of love is agape, the divine love or divine charity. In the middle, the various yellows, blues, and greens are as friendship, human endearment, and consideration.

Now it's said that selfish people "love themselves." I would say that that belies a misunderstanding of the whole thing: "yourself" is really something that is impossible to love. One obvious reason for this is that one's self, when you try to focus on it to love it or to know it, it is oddly elusive.

Let me illustrate why. Once there was a fish who lived in the great ocean, and because the water was transparent, and always conveniently got out of the way of his nose when he moved along, he didn't know he was in the ocean. Well, one day the fish did a very dangerous thing, he began to think: "Surely I am a most remarkable being, since I can move around like this in the middle of empty space." Then the fish became confused because of thinking about moving and swimming, and he suddenly had an anxiety paroxysm and thought he had forgotten how. At that moment he looked down and saw the yawning chasm of the ocean depths, and he was terrified that he would drop. Then he thought: "If I could catch hold of my tail in my mouth, I could hold myself up." And so he curled himself up and snapped at his tail. Unfortunately, his spine wasn't quite supple enough, so he missed. As he went on trying to catch hold of his tail, the yawning black abyss below became ever more terrible, and he was brought to the edge of total nervous breakdown.

The fish was about to give up, when the ocean, who had been watching with mixed feelings of pity and amusement, said, "What are you doing?" "Oh," said the fish, "I'm terrified of falling into the deep dark abyss, and I'm trying to catch hold of my tail in my mouth to hold myself up." So the ocean said, "Well, you've been trying that for a long time now, and still you haven't fallen down. How come?" "Oh, of course, I haven't fallen down yet," said the fish, "because, because—I'm swimming!" "Well," came the reply, "I am the Great Ocean, in which you live and move and are able to be a fish, and I have given all of myself to you in which to swim, and I support you all the time you swim. Instead of exploring the length, breadth, depth, and height of my expanse, you are wasting your time pursuing your own

end.” From then on, the fish put his own end behind him (where it belonged) and set out to explore the ocean.

Well, that shows one of the reasons it’s difficult to love yourself: Your “spine isn’t quite supple enough.”

Another reason is that “oneself,” in the ordinary sense of one’s ego, doesn’t exist. It seems to exist, in a way, in the sense that the equator exists as an abstraction. The ego is not a psychological or physical organ; it’s a social convention, like the equator, like the clock or the calendar, or like the dollar bill. These social conventions are abstractions which we agree to treat as if they did exist. We live in relation to the external world in just exactly the same way that one end of the stick exists in relation to the other end. The ends are indeed different, but they’re of the same stick.

Likewise, there is a polar relationship between what you call your “self” and what you call “other.” You couldn’t experience “other” unless you also had the experience of “self.” We might say that we feel that one’s “self” and the “other” are poles apart. Oddly, we use that phrase, “poles apart,” to express extreme difference. But things that are “poles apart” are poles of something, as of a magnet, or a globe, and so are actually inseparable. What happens if you saw the south pole off a magnet with a hacksaw? The new end, opposite the original north pole, becomes the south pole, and the piece that was chopped off develops its own north pole. The poles are inseparable and generate each other.

So it is in the relationship between the “self” and the “other.” Now if you explore what you mean when you say you “love yourself,” you will make the startling discovery that everything that you love is something that you thought was other than yourself, even if it be very ordinary things such as ice cream or booze. In the conventional sense, booze is not you. Nor is ice cream. It becomes “you,” in a manner of speaking, when you consume it, but then you don’t “have it” anymore, so you look around for more in order to love it once again. But so long as you love it, it’s never you. When you love people, however selfishly you love them (because of the pleasant sensations they give you), still, it is somebody else that you love. And as you inquire into this and follow honestly your own selfishness, many interesting transformations begin to occur in you.

One of the most interesting of these transformations is being directly and honestly “selfish.” You stop deceiving people. A great deal of damage is done in practical human relations by saying that you love people, when what you mean is that you ought to (and don’t). You give the impression, and people begin to expect things of you which you are never going to come through with.

You know of people to whom you say, “I like so-and-so, because with him or her, you always know where you are.” It’s impossible to impose on people like that. On the other hand, if you say, “Can I come and stay over night with you?” and they don’t want you, they’ll reply, “I’m, sorry, but I’m tired this weekend, and I’d rather not have you.” Or “Some other time.” Well, that’s very refreshing. If I feel the person hasn’t been quite honest with me, and I accept their hospitality, I’m always wondering if they would really prefer that I wasn’t there.

But one doesn’t always listen to one’s inner voice: we often pretend that it’s not there. That’s unfortunate, because if you don’t listen to your inner voice, you are not listening to your own wisdom and to your own love. You are becoming insensitive to it just as your hosts are trying to suppress the fact that, for the time being, they don’t want your presence. Likewise, let’s suppose that you are married and have an unwanted baby. It is profoundly disturbing to a child to have false love pretended to it. To begin with, the milk tastes wrong. The smell isn’t right. The outward gesture is “Darling, I love you,” but the smell is “You’re a little bastard and a nuisance.”

Very few of us can accept the idea that we don’t love our children, because it seems to be unnatural. We say that mother-love is the most beautiful and natural thing in the world. But it isn’t. It’s relatively rare, and if you don’t love your child, you confuse him or her. The child will respect you much more if you say, “Darling, you’re a perfect nuisance, but I will look after you because I have to.” Well, at least then everything is quite clear!

I found in personal relations of this kind a very wonderful rule: that you never, never show false emotions. You don’t have to tell people exactly what you think “in no uncertain terms,” as they say. But to fake emotions is destructive, especially in family matters and between husbands and wives or between lovers.

It always comes to a bad end. This, on the occasions when, for personal friends, I perform marriage ceremonies, instead of saying, “I require and charge you both that you shall answer in the dreadful Day of Judgment, etc.,” “I say, “I require and charge you both that you shall never pretend to love one another when you don’t.” This is a gamble. It is likewise a gamble to trust yourself to come though with love.

But there is really no alternative.

Now to trust oneself to be capable of love or to bring up love—in other words, to function in a sociable way and in a creative way—is to take a risk, a gamble. You may not come though with it. In the same way, when you fall in love with somebody else, or form an association with someone else, and you trust them, they may as a matter of fact not fulfill your expectations. But that risk has to be taken. The alternative to taking that risk is much worse than trusting and being deceived.

When you say, “I will not trust other people, and I will not trust myself,” what course remains? You have to resort to force. You have to employ stacks of policemen to protect you, and have to hold a club over yourself all the time, and say, “No, no. My nature is wayward, animal, perverse, fallen, grounded in sin.” What then happens? When you refuse to take the gamble of trusting yourself to be capable of love, you become, if you will excuse this extremely graphic but nevertheless relevant simile, like a person who cannot trust himself to have bowel movements. Many children learn this from parents who do not trust them, and think they ought to have these movements in rhythm with the clock, which is a different kind of rhythm from that of the organism. People who cannot trust themselves to do even this take laxatives endlessly, as a result of which their whole system gets fouled up.

Exactly the same thing happens with people who can’t trust themselves to go to sleep. They have to take all kinds of pills. And so also with people who can’t trust themselves to love, and have to take all sorts of artificial and surgical measures to produce the effect of love for saving face. They become progressively more incapable of loving at all, and they create turmoil and misunderstanding and chaos in themselves and others and society.

In other words, to live, and to love, you have to take risks. There will be disappointments and failures and disasters as a result of taking these risks. But in the long run it will work out.

My point is that if you don't take these risks the results will be much worse than any imaginable kind of anarchy.

In tying up love in knots or in becoming incapable of it, you can't destroy this energy. When you won't love, or won't let it out, it emerges anyway in the form of self-destruction. The alternative to self-love, in other words, is self-destruction. Because you won't take the risk of loving yourself properly, you will be compelled instead to destroy yourself.

So, which would you rather have? Would you rather have a human race which isn't always very well controlled, and sometimes runs amok a little bit, but on the whole continues to exist, with a good deal of honesty and delight, when delight is available? Or would you rather have the whole human race blown to pieces and cleaned off the planet, reducing the whole thing to a nice, sterile rock with no dirty disease on it called life?

The essential point is to consider love as a spectrum. There is not, as it were just nice love and nasty love, spiritual love and material love, mature affection on the one hand and infatuation on the other. These are all forms of the same energy. And you have to take it and let it grow where you find it. When you find only one of these forms existing, if at least you will water it, the rest will blossom as well. But the effectual prerequisite from the beginning is to let it have its own way.

Love of Waters

Do you mind if I talk for a while about something I love? About water and the ocean. Ever since I can remember anything at all. The light, the smell. The sound and motion of the sea has been pure magic. Even the mere intimation of its presence, gulls flying a little way inland. The quality of light in the sky beyond hills which screen it from view. The lowing of fog horns in the night. And if ever I have to get away from it all, and in the words of a Chinese poet, wash all the wrongs of life from my pores, there's

simply nothing better than to climb out onto a rock and sit for hours with nothing in sight but sea and sky. Although the rhythm of the waves beats a kind of time, it's not clock or calendar time. It has no urgency. It's timeless time because I know I'm listening to a rhythm which has been just the same for millions of years. And it takes you out of the world of relentlessly ticking clocks. Clocks for some reason or other always seem to be marching. And armies never march to anything but doom. But there's no marching rhythm in the motion of waves. It harmonizes with the breath. It does not count our days. Its pulse is not in the stingy spirit of measuring marking out how much still remains. It's the breathing of eternity, like the Brahma of Indian mythology, who inhales and exhales manifests and dissolves the worlds endlessly forever.

As a mere conception that sounds appallingly monotonous. Until you listen to the breaking and washing of waves. Just in the past few weeks, I've come to live right on the edge of the water. I have a studio, library, place for writing, in an old ferryboat, tied up on the waterfront of Sausalito north of San Francisco. I suppose it's the nearest thing in America to a Mediterranean fishing village. Steep hills, clustered with little houses. And below, along the rim of the bay, the forest of masts, rocking almost imperceptibly against the background of water and wooded promontories. In some ways it's rather a messy waterfront, not just peers and boats but junk yards industrial buildings. And all the inevitable litter of our culture. But somehow the land and sea scape absorbs and pacifies the mess. Sheds and shacks thrown together out of old timbers and plywood, heaps of disused lumber, rusted machinery, rotting hulls. All of this is transformed in the beneficent presence of the sea.

Perhaps is the quality of the light, especially early in the morning and towards evening, when the distinction of sky and water becomes uncertain. When the whole of space becomes opalescent, the sort of pearly luminous grey and the rising or setting moon is straw yellow. In this light, all the rambling mess of sheds and junkyards is magical. Blessed with a white cries of gods. And with the passions of masts and ropes and boats at anchor, which put me in mind of landfalls a long way away. And of all the voyages of which one has dreamed. I look out now as I talk to you across a wide space of nothing but water and birds, ending in a line of green slopes with

clumps of trees. Right over the edge of the boat, the water contains, seemingly just under the surface, a ceaselessly moving network of reflected sunlight, through which the school of very tiny fish passes delightfully uncaught. And yet only a few yards from where we are moored, tackle shops sell the marvelous salmon and crabs with which this particular area abounds. This is the paradox of the ocean. Sand, flying spray. Pebbles and shells. Driftwood. Sparkling water, space incredibly luminous, with cloud banks along horizons, underlying skies and which one's imagination can reach forever.

But under the surface of both sky and water, there's the grim business of praying. Men and birds against fish, fish against fish. The torturous process of life continuing by the painful transformation of one form to another. To creatures who don't anticipate and reflect imaginatively upon this holocaust of eating and being eaten, it's perhaps not so terrible. But poor man. Skillful beyond all other animals by being able to think in time, and knowing the future, he dies before he's dead, he shrinks from the sharks teeth before they bite him. He dreads the alien germ, long, long before its banquet begins.

Here is a gull that has picked a crab from a tide pool. Sprawled now upon the sand, the crab shrinks from the walls of its shell, resigning to the tap tap top of the gulls beak. Who's that knocking at my door? I suppose the shell of the crab, the clam, or the muscle, is the boundary of its universe. To put ourselves in the position we should have to imagine a knocking sound louder and louder that doesn't come from anywhere in particular from the door of the walls or the ceiling on the floor. Think of a knocking that comes from everywhere. That beats against the boundaries of space and consciousness. That comes as the intrusion of an utterly unknown dimension into our own familiar world. Let me in, let me in, I love you so much I could eat you. I love you to the very core, especially the soft juicy parts, the vitals most tender and alive. Surrender to this agony and you will be transformed into me. Dying to yourself you will become alive as me.

We shall all be changed in a moment in the twinkling of an eye on the morning when the last trumpet sounds. For behold I am He that stands at the door and knocks. There's no way of getting around it is there. The gull isn't rapacious or greedy, it's just that his being alive at all is the same thing

as eating crabs. Sea birds are transformations of fish men or transformations of wheat chickens and steers. And a love for the food is the agony of the food. To object to this inseparability of pleasure and pain. Life and Death. Is simply to object to existence but of course we cannot help objecting when the time comes. Objecting to pain is pain. So far as we know the gull and fish don't philosophize. They enjoy life when they're eating it and hate it when being eaten. They don't reflect upon the process as a whole and say how rough it is that we have to work so hard for a living or is just hell having to wash out all the time for those gulls.

I'm sure that in their world, this is something that just goes along with life like having eyes off eat. But man, with his astonishing ability to stand aside from himself and think about himself. In short, to comment on life. Man has done something which confuses his only existence down to its roots. For the most sensitive he is, the more man finds the very act of living in conflict with his moral conscience. Upon reflection, a universal range that there is no way of living except by destroying other lives. Seems to be a hideous mistake. Not a divine but devilishly creation. Of course, there's the myth that once upon a time things were quite otherwise. That there was no death at the Lion lay down with the lamb. But that since then that has been a fertile vast area which is corrupted the whole of nature. All that must have been eons ago. Perhaps in some other galaxy, where the conditions of life are quite different. Or perhaps the ghastly mistake was just that step in man's evolution, which made it possible for him to comment, to reflect upon life as a whole. In being able to stand aside from life and think about it he put himself outside it and found it alien.

Perhaps thinking about the world, and objecting to its whole principle I think the two aspects of the same mechanism. The very words suggest don't they. Perhaps we must object to everything that becomes an object. But aren't there also times when We speak of something that we know as a subject. The subject of this book the subject I'm now studying. Would it be possible to subject to life instead of objecting to it. Is this playing with words or does it possibly mean something? Now if the gulls or the fish don't philosophize, they have no consciousness of life being either good as a whole or bad as a whole. So when we philosophize and pity the poor fish. That's just our problem. From its own standpoint, the world of animals and

insects doesn't find itself problematic at all. There's not the slightest evidence to suggest that. On the contrary, I'm inclined to feel that all these creatures really swing, and go around living up to the very moment when the game is no longer worth the candle. I'm quite sure they don't lecture each other about their duties. Or worry about where they're going when they're dead.

Isn't it then rather an enormous relief for us men to see that the plant and animal world is no problem to itself and that we are wasting intellectual energy in making moral judgements about it? But of course we can't return to the unreflective consciousness of the animal world without becoming animals. To be human is precisely to have that extra circuit of consciousness, which enables us to know that we know. And thus to take an attitude to all that we experience. The mistake that we've made and this if anything is the fall of man. Is to suppose that that extra circuit that ability to take an attitude to life as a whole, is the same as actually standing aside and being separate from what we see. We seem to feel that the thing which knows that it knows is one's essential self. That in other words our personal identity is entirely on the side of the commentator. We forget that self-consciousness is simply a subordinate part and instrument of our being a sort of mental counterpart to the finger thumb opposition of the human hand. And which is you, the finger or the thumb? Look at the stages of differentiation. First, the organism from its environment and with this knowledge of the environment. Second, the distinction of knowing knowledge from knowledge itself. But all of these, like the finger thumb opposition is a difference which does not divide the thumb isn't floating in the air along side the rest of the hand at the roots that joining. At our roots we are joined to the whole subject of nature. Of course you may say that nature or the universe is just a big abstraction, but tell me, is an orange just an obstruction from its component molecules.

I think our difficulty is that our consciousness is too superficial as if all our sensation were in the tips of the fingers and not in the palm. Are common sense life are insufficiently balanced, by the clear sensation that what we are talking about is ourselves. And our selves in a sense far more basic and real, than that extra circuit which knows knowing. Are we misled by the fact that we move freely on the earth and are rooted to it in the same way as trees to

the ground and fingers to the hand? Were we, as a distant from the earth as one atom of an orange from another. I suppose we should be somewhere out by the moon. Now we know, that the atom, molecule, cell or subordinate organ of any particular organism is what it is by virtue of its place and its membership in the pattern of the whole. Blood in a test tube is rapidly ceasing to be the same thing as blood in veins. In the same way, man must beware. Lest in, cutting himself off psychically from the work that he sees, and so isolating the subject from the object. Lest in doing this he rapidly ceases to be man.

So I think this is why I love the ocean. It's the most difficult part of nature to mess up. With emblems and symptoms of man's dissociated consciousness. It's an environment. In which the awareness of our roots kind of awakened. In which space so real because of the light and color can be seen to be joining things instead of separating them. Yes. And I've just discovered that knocking on the wall of space and consciousness was my own heart beating.

Game of Yes and No

Now it has been announced that I would speak this evening about the I Ching. I should just say then briefly, that the Book of Changes, is thought to be the oldest of the great Chinese classics, and to date from perhaps as early as thirteen hundred B.C. Although perhaps the figures of which this classic is a discussion may be much earlier than that they may go back to the earliest phases of human thought, because I Ching really is the ground plan of the way in which the Chinese think and not only the Chinese. It's almost a mapping of the thinking processes of man. And it may surprise you to know that the system of arithmetic, which is used by digital computers. Came from the I Ching. We have a binary system of arithmetic, in which all numbers may be represented by zero and one in various arrangements. Is you is or is you ain't? So there's a sudden money expected a link between the most sophisticated mathematical machinery and a book originating at least thirteen hundred B.C..

But what the I Ching really goes into is this question is you is or is you ain't?. It sounds terribly simple. Black or White. And we keep saying to

people you know. Life isn't just black and white or black or white there are many shades of gray. True. But against some backgrounds, Gray is dark. In another context grays light. And really all colors, in fact all information whatsoever. Can be translated into terms of yang and yin. For example, when you look at color television, the signals are broadcast to your set as a stream of pulses. They could be put on magnetic tape, in terms of an arrangement of pulses. Indicating either yes or no.

This technique has reached such the sophistication that with the aid of a laser beams, we can translate a physical object; let's take a complicated one, let's take a dandelion flower gone to seed, a dandelion clock. You take a dandelion clock about so big. It can be turned into a formula, passed through channels, enlarged to any size say this big, and with laser beams cut in solid plastic in a matter moments. Third you can get this reproduction of a three dimensional object. But the transition between the two was handled simply in terms of pulses. So likewise the nervous system, is so constituted that the neuron carry a message, either fires or does not fire. as all of us not five. If it is fire or if its activated, that registers as a yes if it is not fire the absence of firing is represented as a no. And so you could say that all your perceptions. In all their variety and all that color and made up of a vast composite of little yeses and and little nos. In every conceivable variation. So after these two come everything.

Yang means the positive and even the negative. Yanni is identified with the South or sunny side of a mountain. Yin with the North or shady side. And note, this mode that you cannot have a one sided mountain. Imagine. And this then is the crucial thing that one must understand about the yang/yin philosophy. And it is represented in the symbol of a circle crossed with an ask one side of which is black and the other side is white. And so they're like two fishes. And in the head of the Black Fish is a white eye and then the head of the white fish the black eye. These two sides are interdependent because the black one is outlined by the white one and the white one is outlined by the black one. And they chase each other in the form which is really the double helix the pattern of the Spiral Nebulae, and also the pattern of love making between many many kinds of creatures. The spiral folding into itself. Black chasing white, white chasing black. Now obviously white and black out as different as different can be. When we say

of someone that he is a awful liar and a conman, he said why he could prove to you that black was white. But strangely enough black is white in a certain sense and white is black if you take the copulating word 'is'. To mean implies. Because black implies white and white implies black. All positive implies negative and negative implies positive, because you can have the one without the other. So to put this into words. We can say explicitly black and white are different, but implicitly that is to say by implication, they are one. So exoterically, outwardly. The positive and the negative of life are very different. Life is different from death and good is different from evil. But the secret is that they are. As God says through the prophet Isaiah 'I am the Lord and there is none else I follow the light to create the darkness I make peace and create evil I the law do all these things. But that if information is not normally handed out from the book. So we have to begin then seriously considering Yarran and he and black and white.

First of all if I have a black background. Somehow I am tempted to make it white mark. If I have a white background, I'm tempted to put a black mark on it. Because if there was nothing to see but black. That would be tantamount to being blind. Because there would be no difference. Nothing would matter nothing would make a difference so there wouldn't be any. Likewise if everything were white. It would be as good as being blind. For there would be no difference. It's only by contrast. When black and white have put together that we know black is black and white is white.

However now, when I look at a small white circle or discover a black background. Or a small black disk on a white background I once get this in my thought which is positive and which is negative. Does black represent the negative because it's dark. Like night. But when I look at the black dot on the white background I think the black dot is the same there so that must be positive. It was put on. And therefore the white represents negative because it suggests nothing. Now Mark like white paper behind the print blank blush the English blank in the French blanche with means white it's a blank, negative. Isn't this mysterious You see that both white and black can play the negative role. But then let's think of white as light. And it's playing the positive role and when we think of black as the think the mark. Then it's playing a positive role see both can play the negative in both the positive.

But still you can't have one without the other. I look at the black with a white dot. And I say is that a white glowing sun in the night or is it an old through a wall? In which case the black will be the thing and the white the absence. I look at the black dot on the white background and say, Yes obviously the black dot is the thing, but all the other hand it may be a picture of a white box with a hole in it. You see, there reversible.

Therefore some reflections about these. It isn't easy for a human being, the way we've been trained, to notice that you can't have one without the other because our attention has difficulty in seeing both sides at once. You know that Gestalt image where you get to faces in profile. And they are drawn as black silhouette. So you get two faces in profile about to kiss. But then look again and you notice the white ground between them and it is a cup like a chalice. What have we got here kissing faces or chalices. People have difficulty in seeing both together you must have one or the other either will do not make your choice. It's like you are going to be a boy or a girl either will do but you have to choose one of them. And yet bodhisattvas are always represented to some Africa. As being the as it were bisexual, transcending sexual differentiation, because after all everybody who exists is the result of a boy and a girl. Boys can't be boys without girls and girls can be girls without borders. They are very different. If lot if they are. But, by reason of their interdependence, they're one.

Talking of the bees and the flowers, where there are bees as there must be flowers. And where there are flowers there must be some sort of insect equivalent. And this implies that the bee on the flower are really one organism. The head of the body looks very different from the feet just as the bee looks different from a flock. But a complete body requires both head and feet. So the head and the foot are obviously one organism is less obvious with the bee in the flower but they are an organism.

What is very difficult for us to see however, is that solids are all of a piece with spaces. Now here comes with thing you see take a situation in which we say of a given figure ground relationship that the black is the thing, the black letter on the white page. We say yes it's the black letter that's a ball that's the thing. But supposing it's a white letter on a black page. Still, we said the letters the thing. That's a ball All right so. He said we look out of

the sky at night and we see the stars and the planet as. We say that's what's there. That's the space around them as darkness and nothingness, corresponding to the area of the magnetic tape which is magnetized which delivers no message and therefore the message zero. That you see does deliver a message. Absence speaks, nothingness is important. But we are brought up we are so brainwashed we are so bamboozled we are so ignorant. That we don't know that. That's the whole trick that we play on ourselves, we don't know that nothing is something. But it's important!

Lao Tzu put it this way. The usefulness of the vessel is not so much in the place around but in the empty space in which something can be carried the usefulness of the window is not so much in the frame is in the empty space through which light can be see. It sounds odd and paradoxical and almost a little contradictory but nevertheless there it is. The space is after all not nothing. I had an argument with Buckminster Fuller about this. And he had to grant me that I was theoretically correct. Because he said so far as I'm concerned space is just negative event. Just negative or the fallacy wasn't in the word negative event that's a beautiful phrase it was in the word just only. This space could be dismissed. And so in exactly the same, when we don't recognize that side of life people complain all kinds of tricks on us. The main trick is, I can scare you with death. You won't be. I can remove you are. You going to get removed anyway these days you just won't be all that people off. Now you just aren't. You know as a person you won't be will be nobody to realize how terrible it is. This is the thing that this is one of the great tricks of life and you have to be watching this as people use it they, because they've all been taught to use it through the fall of man was not recognize the other side. So that everything that we think of as nothing space, empty space, death. Sleep. Dissolution, decay, any sort of weakness. Anything that goes against structure that is against the same that we think is bad bad bad, and we're trying to get a world where that finally things is rendered impotent. Nothingness. Must no longer constitute a threat to something. In other words we want to play black and white. And if we call white the light the positive White must win.

That's the game we're trying to play, not realizing that there cannot be winning without losing. If whiteness when blackness lose. But if black loses we can congratulate black for having helped white to win. Because unless

black loses white one. You can translate this into the difficult ones only question of race relations how would you know you were free white and twenty one. How could you prepare our being a white man that's what black. You wouldn't know you are living on the right side of the tracks unless there were people living on the left side tracks. You know as an I.Q. thing it says up is to down as blank is to left. Or left is to black. As opposed to fill in. I would put taken. Anyways, taken and left. Right and left, right and wrong. These opposites get tricky. But the point is people are afraid afraid of the negative one. Don't be negative. The Power of Positive Thinking. That's all nonsense. The negative is the source of the positive. This is of absolutely fundamental to the I Ching. This is why in the Hexagrams of which is the the I Ching is about, there's about sixty four combination of six black and white symbols. Actually, they use an unbroken line for the positive and a broken line for the negative six such lines there are sixty four combinations of groups of six hexagram. And in all those there is not one bad one. There is no sign of the I Ching which you can draw and the oracle will tell you this is just plain bad. Because you can get to the very end of the night, the blackest pitch black and it is precisely at that moment that the yang, the positive element, is reborn. Because you see, it is recognizing that energy is waves, energy is pulsation. Now you can't have a pulse without a vibration. It sounds if I go "OHHHHHHHHHHMMMM." Something without nothing.

But actually if you listen very closely to that sound you hear. You'll hear pulse. Because without that region which is a past nothing happens so this table which is level and solid and philosophers are always talking about tables because there was a table's environment clusters. That this thing is going to. Have to talk about it kept inside. And I always look at us. And we find that there are cellular structure in wood. Analyze that molecules and my we found to our amazement; if you take a molecule out of this table and it's about the size of my fist. Blow it up with that the next moment you will be while we're with the other side of the room. At that level of magnification. What's in the molecules? Atoms. Take an atom the size of my fist, this where the next Monday I'm in Los Angeles. I mean you know I was talking fancy shapes and figures and they were a long way what's inside the AM. Electrons protons may sound so it's utter and they the size of my fist We don't even know if they're particles or waves, it's difficult to

talk about this, but they are on a long way from each other so we suddenly find that in the solid table there's more space than there is anything solid. Is a little bit of thought but as you VERY did our new go step, step down, it's like approaching a limit in mathematics when you have a curve sweeping towards an axis posing it's an asymptotic curve, it's always getting nearer and nearer and nearer to that axis but never actually collides with it. So we get nearer and nearer as we study substance, nearer and nearer to finally what is the shell around the emptiness near it we never quite catch it. Solid disappears. Into space as at this level of magnification the spaces disappeared into the solid. See, if I just have one thing I better illustration is like a lighted cigarette in the dark I just got one point but I was it around and you see a continuous circle that's how you see a solid table. Because they're in gangs are so fast that your eye can catch the spaces between. Too little, too quick. Zip!

So, looking at things from one point of view we find a lot of emptiness looking at them from another point of view we find a lot of solitude. But what you have to realize is that the solid is based on the emptiness just as much as the end in this is based on the solid so don't be afraid of nothing. It can't bite you. It's only something that can bite you. There's nothing to be afraid of in nothing. And yet mysteriously nothing is the source of something. It's like the womb and the and the seed.

So, yang and yin go together. But, through not seeing that, our life is, as I said geared to the thought that we might be able to make the yang side win. And so, in every thought of human enterprise, we are trying to have white without black. And this connects with what I was trying to get across this afternoon. When you talk about improving the world, you are meaning presumably that you want it more white than black, or whichever one you call the good one. If you think the black is the good, it's all right, it doesn't make slightest difference. You know which side are you going to take in the game of chess the black and white doesn't make much difference except white gets first move. And now I always wait to see what you're going to do. We think, could we get rid of the other one? Now as you know in all matters of practical living. It never works. You think now, I've been miserable all this time as I have enough money. I never know whether I make the payments on the car. I never know whether, you know, it's going to be sickness. And if only I have a little more money I'd really feel great.

So you get it. And in the transition from one stage to the other, you feel very elated, because you feel elated you're going up. Five thousand dollars a year say, it makes a difference. When you've gone up then of course you're on level again. And no longer do you have to worry about making payments. But you get a new worry. Supposing I get sick. And die of it. Supposing someone robs me. They rob me, takes it away from me, you can worry about that. You say oh I feel so much happier if I have a medical examination. And you go to a fancy doctor, and he says I can't find anything wrong with you. Then there might be burglars, so you get an alarm system a new locks file you go to the hours patrol and get a private guard watch you that makes you feel better for a while except that it begins to nag you she five homes, patrolmen out there they all know I've got something. Maybe I'm going to have to manage.

So it grows. You worry. Because you found out that you didn't get yang without yin. You got a new area began instead of the formal little one you haven't you got a big yin with it. It's no joke getting rich. It implies a great deal of responsibility, and you've got more worry about. Don't envy rich people. Great mistake. Don't envy anyone. So in the same way Chuang Tzu puts it, he's Lao Tzu's successor. People who speak of having good government without its Corella to misrule. All right without corroborative wrong. Do not understand the basic principles of the universe one might just as well speak of having Yang without yin, and such people must be either knaves or fools. Because our we know we were wise unless they were knaves and fools.

But here it is, you see. You cannot beat the game. You can have the temporary illusion of winning. But by compensation you will ever so often have the temporary illusion of losing. When you go down a step. From yang to yin, you'll feel I've lost something. When you go up a step from yin to yang, you'll feel I've gained something. How would you know gain without loss? How could you have the sensation of more and less in relation to the sensation less fortunate station is simply. Awareness of contrast. That's what life is.

Now if we realize that we get the same feeling of frustration as I wanted to give you this afternoon. In trying to make it clear that so far as the

improvement of ourselves in the world is concerned, absolutely nothing we can do about it. And this is simply another way of saying the same thing you cannot have more yang than you have yin. You cannot play a game which is win a no lose or a game in which everyone wins. You're stuck with it. Now in just the same way if we recognize that applying yang and yin to all possible situations of life we get this awful feeling of so what's the use. I mean what do you expect me to do, jump into the river and drown? Why at that point do we get the feeling of a what's the use. Simply because we found that our favorite game won't work. And we think that is the only thing for which there isn't a use is the game in which whiteness when. But why not turn, change them around is not a good game has a boing boing boing boing boing, like this, goes in and out is the undulation of a wave, crest and then the trough, you go or you every kid likes a rollercoaster ride. So having both is the game, see there's no game there what we think is the game isn't a game in order. To win all the time when we're winning there's no game. Because the game is always the hide and seek. Now you see, now you don't. The game is the story in which the villain might win and the whole idea of the drama is to make it seem to the audience that it is the villain absolutely must win. There's no way out and then suddenly for whom the secret thing is revealed and the hero wins. Or if you want to good cry have a tragedy and the villain wins.

But don't you see, there is no vitality unless there's that negative element, the one without the nothing the death the art you've lost finish by our. Quits. See, if that's not there, then the other one isn't there. And you all always winning doesn't you know you said I with a wife and you play cribbage. Lots of married couples try to forget holy deadlock by playing games. And if one partner, be it wife or husband, always wins at cribbage, the game ceases to be of interest. Because every good player likes or sprightly opponent who sometimes wins, wins just a little bit less than me mind you, but wins a great deal of the time it's it's OK as the little bit. So, if you don't have the unknown space, death, darkness, negative you don't have the light. So they are life consists of something else than trying to make white win. You didn't sit down because somebody tells you you can't make white when all the time forever and always so the black doesn't exist. Because black my very nature is darkness and it doesn't exist. You're trying to make it not exist. Is there around the very fact that it doesn't exist as our.

Non existence is the necessary condition for existence, just like you have to have a front before you have a back. Or back before you have a front. They come into being together, just like existence and nonexistence. So what a friend got. In trying to get rid of nothing which is already got rid of.

So we think, but surely this is rather monotonous, it goes up and down and down up and down see saw, life, death life, death, or birth, death, birth death. Isn't there some way, I mean must we play this game? It's like a game of one upmanship I showed you earlier this afternoon can't get out of it they're always playing and if you say I want to play it means I got a more interesting game than the odds. Which is just the same game all over again. Would be a way somehow to transcend black and white. So we got black and we got white, that makes it even. When the something else, couldn't be tertian quid. A new new possibility so we can have a three basis instead of two places. Somebody comes up and says. All right you're black and white and beaver constitute the two ends of the base of the triangle I'm the apex How about that? Well you'll say that's odd. Because it's odd because the first two or even. I mean when something happens that's odd, and that's not say it's odd that anything should have happened. During our it's clear ,would have been easier for there to be nothing. And then something happens or said that's odd then they recognize it as something and nothing and then they said all right that's that's right we're even so this is our fellow comes along and says Now what about they say you're our I havenot. You stand over against us, that makes two. We're even, and you're odd. Right so that makes two out of three me three goes to we're together we two we recognize we're black and white. You can't have one without the other so we're together and you say you want to be different. Ok that makes Black and White different from whatever you say you are, so we've got a new yang and yin. You can get out of it make fall in this same all over again make five years same all over again. This was how Liebnez reason and arithmetic you could read it represent any number using just zero and one. Damn. Can't we get out of this? Hey what would it be if you were allowed five minutes with God, and you're allowed to ask one question. What do you want to know? Because you know, you've thought this over now you know less about the opposites about the yang and the yin. And you know you can ask God and say it had to Hey, will you give me a tip to be the game. One. Work. And watch and I ask God. So you can think of all the

things you might ask for. You know an electric guitar. A million dollars. And you know that wouldn't millions because that would be any you would be a beginner along with someone. And I don't know what I ask.

So you go in and say God, beyond positive or negative, what is reality? God says, my child, your question has no meaning. You think oh there it is, got my one chance lost. Using. It a friend of yours say hey look you could. Tell me what he says you ask him what question should I ask. Because it says. Oh God what question should I ask you. God says so you do want to problem. Well you've got one. You thought it up, you wanted to if you want to game in which white only when there's your problem. You may not but you had to have to have that problem. Because otherwise you don't have a problem, you wouldn't know you were here. It's like you carry yourself without something you call other. I want you know you were you were less somebody else or somebody else altogether. In other words, the sensation of I, here, living sensitive the light beaking out beady eyed out of my skin. In time is it with reference to something over that which isn't me I don't want it is but it did was all by itself and this is a pretty is going up and there is and I can have this feeling without that feeling. There's the same hocus pocus going on. If I can't feel me without having other, that's exoteric. Esoteric, that means I am the other. They're inseparable. How can you have self without having to be other without self. You either are me and self on yourself I self on me and other on you.

But you can't as it says you can't have one without the other. Yang and Yin. So in the same way I say well. This other I'd like to manage it, I'd like to control it. And I know these people are are messing up my life. I don't want them to be that much other. I'm going to fix you. And I get on a power kick and there are all kinds of power kicks, let me warn you. It's not just politics and economics and business. The worst power kicks are spiritual. Like astrology you like to know the future. Which you really. It's a power to get to know the future so if you can control it no surprise. If you know the future it's already past. But if you want to know something and add knowledge then there must be the unknown. Just if you want self you must have other. So the future is always the unknown, the past is the known. And what we witness as our present is the magical appearance of the known from the unknown. You know what's going to happen the next second, I

mean there might be another big earthquake right I mean. Any minute now. Or the Russians might decide to release the A bomb. Any the minute we have a heart attack rocked it. You know what's going to relax. And watch watch watch this thing. It's incredible. Just watch it. You, it, self out of its vibration you know. You are using also now wait a minute so often either that means voluntary it versus involuntary. What I do and what happens to me.

Now, what do I do. When I walk, I think, I talk I move my hands. I can be nice to you and I ask you to you I would regard both as my doing. But what about my blood circulation. I normally think that that happens to me. I mean if my heart would stop, I wouldn't say I'd done it, I would have said it happened to me. A Buddhist will say your heart stopped, that was your karma. And karma means nothing else except doing if you're doing your job stop. You know it doesn't mean don't take it literally in a superstitious way because you spat in someone's face in a past life, you know having a heart failure is a punishment for it this time around the universe is not geared to be a kind of judicial system. I mean, a lot of priests figure it that way in order to frighten people.

But karma means simply, if you die in a plane crash or die in a heart attack, it's your doing. Now I've already proved to you that black is white. And I'm going on prove to you that what you do. Is what happens to you. And what happens to you is what you do. Because you can't tell the difference between doing, you can't tell what you mean by doing, unless something happens to you to contrast it with. And visa versa, you can't have family that happens to you unless it feels different from something you do, now let's take a look at our breath. Are you doing it or does it happen? If you do breathing exercises, you can feel I'm doing it, just I'm breathing in, just as I raise my hand. But after a while I breathe out. I feel I'm breathing out, and I forget all about it and goes on and it happens to me. That's why any other which means Yoga means Union joining same as the Latin ungerere. Why in yoga you breath, breathing is the main thing in yoga because it's to teach you that there's no difference between what you do with what happens to you. You learn that through breathing. You can make the very best breath. See, we are in the good Christian terms here, the Holy Spirit, Spirit means breath see. Spiritus in Latin class man and require pretty big. Breath. Now

there's ordinary breath. When you [pants]. You know most people's normal breathing. Or forced breath, you know with people trying to say in their their voices for lost. And then the next breath is called Holy Spirit, Holy Breath, as when the breath is no longer forced, happens when it's nirvana breath blow out same thing as I was very. And then that you see that unforced. [chants]

You go on and on. So that's why when monks chant are devotees of any time chant they have the idea that I am a flute. And the breath of the prana, the spiritus of the divine flows through it, that's what it's is all about. Make yourself a tube for The Divine Wind. But that also means realize. The unity of the voluntary and the involuntary that's really what's meant by doing the will of God. Do the will. It's one reason why we get confused in English as to whether we mean shall. I will drown and no one shall save me.

So, think, behind what you call voluntary, you decide, having reviewed the evidence, I decided it would be best to buy this brand of detergent. I made a decision. How did you make a decision? Now I review the evidence sided uprise I can within an hour I know all that how did you work the machinery. The computer in your hand you know you pushed all these buttons but what's underneath about it. Well I don't know, I haven't had a look. So you see that involuntary growth called the brain underlie underlies your voluntary decision. Because you when you decide you don't first decide to decide. And decide to decide to decide. You just decide that means there's something else beyond. Where you think that's terrible, because if what I do happens to me and it isn't really doing it all that I'm in a fatalistic thing is that I said on the other hand what happens to you is what you do. It works equally that way. You know, you have an earthquake and the thoughts in your head drift about like clouds in the sky. You can't do anything. So in the same way, this old strain, the futility of the strange men white women to improve the world that entire futility. The frustration of it is what you mean by 'I.' Now it goes, it won't work and they are I collapse is everybody is terrified of this happening. Suddenly finding out that you don't have an ego. And heaven forbid, I've been building up this personality of mine all these years I've been very carefully nurtured this personality you tell me doesn't exist. No, because your personality is a phantom even more insubstantial

than your body. Personality is a work of art it's like music which vanishes as soon as it's played.

The Smell of Burnt Almonds

Some time ago, I received a visit from a woman who as a result of listening to these talks, was wondering if I could help her to regain and experience what she had had while undergoing a surgical operation. As is generally known, anaesthetics sometimes induce, peculiarly vivid and unusual states of consciousness. And every now and then a person under anesthesia will undergo a specific and particular experience which is of the utmost fascination. It's the kind of experience which I suppose we would ordinarily call mystical or spiritual, and which, while it lasts, carries the most powerful sensation of understanding with complete clarity and certainty what is the mystery and meaning of the world. This occurs sufficiently often to have been made a subject of experimentation.

Perhaps you know the story of the investigator who took doses of anaesthetic for this purpose and equipped himself with pencil and paper to record, at the moment of awakening, what ever revelation might have been given to him. Fortunately, the expected experience took place, and for a brief period the investigator had the vivid conviction of complete comprehension of this universe, of life and death. He regained waking consciousness with the tail end of the sensation still upon him, grabbed the pencil, and swiftly recorded the essential content of the experience just before it faded. After several minutes during which his mind returned to its normal state, he looked at what he had written. And there upon the paper was the following immensely profound observation: Everything in this universe is the smell of burnt almonds.

And I suppose that all sensible and hard headed people would agree that this is just the sort of inanity to which all these mystical revelations ultimately boil down. In the clear cold light of rational consciousness, the seemingly inspired and utter convincing knowledge, of Dreams, drug delusions, and of mystical experiences comes down to just this sort of idiotic anticlimax. Masked in the poetic or exotic obscurantism of such phrases as "All is Brahman" or "the divine unity beneath the multiplicity of

the world.” It may sound for a moment it as if it meant something. But the essential nonsense of these feelings and the purely subjective character of the sense of insight which they involve at once becomes obvious when Brahman or the divine unity is replaced by the smell of burnt almonds. We might settle for this conclusion, if some of us had not had the same sensation. Not under drugs or hypnosis but when very wide awake. And I for one will not quarrel with the smell of burned almonds as the key to the mystery. I like it much better and feel it makes much more sense than Brahman or the divine unity. And for its very banality, its very inconsequential silliness, brings out the real significance of the experience in question. For the importance of the mystical revelation does not lie in the precise nature of what everything in this universe is. It can be God or Brahman or burned almonds or applesauce or anything you like. Its importance lies rather. In the simple sensation of wholeness in the part of the sentence which runs. Everything in this universe is. No matter what.

For the conviction which has come to the experiencer, is that his habitual sensation of isolation from his environment from the rest of the world is an illusion. And that as a corollary, his own deeds and misdeeds fortunes and misfortunes are the same process as the changing seasons and the circling stars. And unreasonable as it may seem, this gives him the sensation that his whole life, past present and future, is somehow perfectly natural and in order, and that he himself is not just the mind enclosed in the skull. But the total process of the world.

The significance of this experience, and does not I think, lie in any consequences or conclusions which might be drawn from it. It is not an important experience in the sense that it is useful for some other purpose. It's simply like playing or listening to music, which is obviously phony in the very moment that we do it for some ulterior motives such as to appear cultured or to convey an ideological message. Its significance for human beings is not like that of say the Second Law of Thermodynamics, but like that of the Mozart sonatas or the arabesques on a Persian rug. The significance of useful knowledge like the Second Law of Thermodynamics, is precisely that by applying it. Human beings may be enabled to go on experiencing such things as music or love or mystical insight, but what could I say to the woman who under anaesthetic, had once had this

experience and wanted it again more than anything else in the world? Go and have another operation. Get yourself some ether. Mescal in lysergic acid or take up yoga. Or get thee to a nunnery. There are still other and much too pat answers to this question, as that she is failing to revive the experience by the very act of seeking for it. As well tell a starving man, that his very hunger is what prevents him from finding food. For once a person has had an experience of this kind, he is gone. It's easier to get rid of an addiction to heroin. Or to choose something more natural, to get rid of the love of the opposite sex. No I could better say something like this. The answer is in the very experience which you have had. Didn't you know then, for certain, with utter clarity, that your whole life past present and future, was somehow as you yourself put it part and parcel of that universal harmony which the Chinese call the Tao.

I feel sometimes that phrases like universal harmony are so hackneyed, so almost slushy and sentimental, that it's terribly difficult to begin to find the right word for this kind of thing without sounding like Voltaire's Mr. Pangloss, without sort of jumping on this. Best of all possible worlds business. Because the thing isn't like that at all. It's very very much stronger than the feeling that this is the best of all possible worlds. And the curious thing about it it isn't that it glosses over anything. But it makes the most awful things seem that way too, without at the same time making them cease to seem terrible. It's very peculiar.

Well, she had seen then, for certain, at the time of that experience seen with total clarity. That our whole past present and future life. Was in some way part and parcel of what we are perforce driven to call the universal harmony of the. But what one doesn't seem to understand them. Is that this still remains true of what one is today. You are in the stream when seeking for what you have lost and when feeling perfectly ordinary no less than when you were in ecstasy. You are not feeling the experience and your striving to regain it is as a matter of fact the very future which you saw to be in such perfect accord with the process. Let me remind you of a celebrated tale that was told by Sri Ramakrishna. Story of one of his disciples who had learned from the master that all the multiplicity of this world is the illusory outward form of the one eternal divine Brahman underlying the entire process. And having sat and listened to this exposition, the disciple got up and went his

way. And in passing down a rather narrow street, he saw an elephant coming towards him and Marketa riding on top of the elephant. Well the man who saw the disciple wandering down the center of the road and shouted at him “Hey you, get out of the way. This elephant isn’t very nice.” But the disciple thought now the master Ramakrishna has told me that I am Brahman and that everything is Brahman and therefore the elephant is Brahman and therefore it will be perfectly all right if I walk straight along, the elephant will do me no harm, since I realize this to be true. So he ignored the warning of the mahoot. And approached the elephant and the elephant swung his trunk and swatted that disciple hard and threw him into the ditch where he was scratched with the brambles. Well he was very upset, and he came crawling back to Sri Ramakrishna and said “Master, you have deceived me. I understood that everything is Brahman. That I am Brahman and all other creatures, is that not so Master?” and The Master said “yes it is so.” When he said “I was walking out in the road and I saw this elephant coming towards me and it didn’t seem to me to be necessary to get out of the way when the market riding the elephant wanted me to do so because I figured that I was Brahman the elephant was Brahman and I could come to no harm.” “You stupid man,” said Krishna. You didn’t realize that the voice of the mahoot was also Brahman and you should have heeded that too.

So also in this case, the one who is trying to regain the vision is the disciple. And the vision they’re trying to regain is the elephant. But the way you are actually feeling now. And which you are ignoring because if you’re going to feel some other way. That is the voice of the mahoot. And that too is Brahman. Nine times out of ten, an observation of this kind will mean nothing. And will fall as flat as being told that everything in this universe is the smell of burnt almonds. But the tenth time, it will dawn upon you as a statement of total and luminous clarity. I do not think we need have any fear that this tense time will never come. For in other circumstances, it has come again and again. Think back to school days. When with the utmost care your teacher explained over and over, the mysteries of percentage or sentence structure or Daylight Saving Time. And you consistently failed to see the point. And then suddenly something clicked in your mind. And the principle became clear. There is a Chinese poem as “Words do not make a man understand. It takes the man to understand the words.”

Spiritual Alchemy

Now today, we are living in an age which is quite peculiar, because in the world of science, there are no longer any secrets. Because the method of science requires that all scientists be in communication with each other. And therefore, that every scientist, as soon as he has discovered something or got a good idea, he rushes into print. And it's important for him to do so because some other scientists somewhere else in the world might be thinking about something on the same lines and would be stimulated in his work by this man's speculations even if not by discoveries.

And so the whole scientific world tries to remain in communication, and for this reason, it was an absolutely impossible to keep atomic energy a secret. In former ages, that might have been managed because there were many secrets once upon a time. And people were not admitted to these secrets, unless they were in some way tested and found capable of handling them without running amok. We live in such a dangerous age because all the secrets are out in the open and anybody can run amok with them. And that's just the situation we have to face and that is just the situation we have to handle. It is too late to stop it, because that would be as they say, locking the door after the horse has bolted.

The vice president of an extremely important corporation in the United States, very progressive and very vital, a few months ago said "There are two major forces operating in the world today, for good or for evil: one is Red China, the other is L.S.D." And there is a certain reason why such a thing as a certain chemical, which is capable of opening people's minds in a certain way, should be something extremely disturbing. Because this particular chemical, in common with a number of others that have been known for centuries, but have been rather played cool through those centuries, is capable of doing something which simply cannot be tolerated. That is to say, capable of letting probably prepared individuals, or sometimes improperly prepared individuals, in on a secret which is very closely guarded, and which is, as a matter of fact, the deepest and most fundamental of all our social taboos. I have just finished writing a book which I have had, with a sort of tongue in cheek attitude, had the temerity to

call The Book. And it is subtitled The Book, you see on the taboo against knowing who you are. Because that is really the thing that cannot be let out.

Ask yourself this, for what reason would a person be considered hopelessly insane. What sort of claims. Must a person simply not make. Well there is one. And that is if anybody claims that he is God. That simply isn't done. Certainly not in our culture although it's very frequent in India. But in our culture that is simply not allowed because we are most of us from a Christian background and it's not that from a Jewish background and there's a great deal in common because both Christians and Jews are deeply concerned about somebody called Jesus Christ. Both Christians and Jews are in a way followers of Jesus Christ in different ways. He is a problem to both. Because he was the man who came out and discovered he was God. And that simply is impermissible, the Jews handled it in one way. The Christians handled it quite as effectively and another way the Christians handle Jesus perfectly even more tactfully than the Jews. By putting him on a pedestal and say this was the only man who ever was God and nobody else was really so before and certainly nobody can be so afterwards. Stop right there. Put him on the altar, bow down to him, worship him, so that everything he had to say will be null and void.

And it works beautifully. But you see the trouble about deep secrets is they can't be repressed indefinitely. As a certain president of the United States wonder of months remarked. You can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. And we human beings have been systematically fooled by ourselves it isn't as if there was some deep dark conspiracy it was somebody else to blame for quite a number of centuries into the notion that we are strangers in the universe. That the world that lies beyond the border of our skins is not ourselves. And it's something quite alien mechanical contraption into which we arrived. And from which we will disappear. And we really have nothing very much to do with it it's something about which we can take an objective point of view, we can look at it, we can measure it we can calculate it but it all turns out in the end to be some sort of stupid-stupid mechanism in which we are involved because as bodies we are part of it.

But it is common sense for most individuals that they themselves aren't even their bodies. They are alienated spokes. Which have bodies like people have cars. And in which they go around. And confront the external world. As if it was something in which you were trapped. And children can say to their parents, I didn't ask to be born. Just because of your funny love affairs and all that I got mixed up in this world and you are responsible. And we don't even think that we had anything personally to do with the fact that our fathers once had an evil gleam in their eyes. But that evil gleam was you coming on. Only you see by this idea of our own identity that we have we're able to disclaim responsibility for all kinds of things. And say "No it was my parents. See it as a fellow taken in juvenile delinquency and he knows a little Freud. He can say "Well I had to couldn't help it because. I was psychoanalytically fouled up when I was a baby even before perhaps I was born my mother had all sorts of complexes." And then if it gets away with that people in the press say for juvenile delinquents, the kid should not be punished but the parents and the parents say "Hey, wait a minute we got fouled up by our parents and we-we're pretty bad parents we had met but our parents before us brought us up in a certain way that we are hopelessly neurotic and we can't really raise children but we have to. So everyone can pass the buck all the way down the line. The woman that thou gave is me she tempted me and I did eat. And then when God Where goes finger at the serpent. Serpent didn't say anything, because the serpent knew the answers. And he knew the thing which must not be admitted. That the left hand goes with the right hand.

That black goes with white and that you wouldn't know what white was unless you knew what Black was. And that you know it wouldn't know what is was unless you knew what isn't is. And you wouldn't know what here is, unless you knew what there is, and you wouldn't know what you meant by self unless you knew what was meant by the other. And that is so simple. But everybody contrives to ignore it.

Now here's the problem, you see that there are certain processes. Some of which are what you might call spiritual exercises. Others are simply chemicals others are just tossed sense. Whereby one comes to see very clearly indeed that black goes with white and self goes with other. And as this becomes clear to you, it's rather shaking. Because look, if what you

define as you are is inseparable from everything which you define as not you, just as front is inseparable from back, then you realize that deep down between self and other there is some sort of conspiracy. If these things always occur in combination. And look very different from each other and feel quite different. Nevertheless the feeling of difference between them, allows each one to exist. And so underneath the opposition all the polarity between self and other all between any other pair of opposites you can think of, there is something in common, as there is for example between figure in the background. You can't see a figure without a background. You can't have an organism without an environment. Equally, you can't have a background without a figure or an environment without organisms in it or without things in. You can't have a space, which is unoccupied by any solid you can or cannot have solids not occupying some space. This is absolutely elementary and yet we don't realize it. Because for example the average person thinks that space is nothing. But is a just a sort of not-there-ness, in which there are things.

And we are slightly afraid that not there notice that nothingness that darkness that the negative poles of all these oppositions will win. That they will eventually, swallow up every kind of being and every kind of thereness. But when you catch on to the game you realize that that won't happen. Because what is called not existing is quite incapable of being there without the contrast of something called existing. It's like the crest and the trough of a wave. You can have a wave that is all trough and no crest just as you can have a wave which is all crest a no trough. Such a thing is never been manifested in the physical universe. They go together. And that is the secret, there really is no other secret than that. But it is utterly repressed.

And therefore we are all educated to feel. That we've got to fight for the White. Because the black might win. We've got to survive. You must survive. That's the great thing, we're all working on and pounding it out day after day in anxiety. Because this is a description of anxiety and anxiety is the fear that one of the pair of opposites might cancel the other. For other. And if by any chance by any means you'll find out that that is not so. You have an entirely new attitude to what human beings are doing. Which may be very creative but which also maybe the dangers. You see through the game. The game call white must win. Because you know. That neither black

nor white are going to win. Because they belong to each other. So one of the problems of the various chemicals which can. Change the human mind in certain ways so that it becomes apparent that inside and outside go together is that they do rather give the show away and people who take these chemicals and see through the human game, cannot be trusted. They may decide to be a good sport. And go back into the game and play it as if it were for real or they may not. And if they don't. What's going to happen? Wowwee, that's pretty serious. Now you see what is let me speak specifically for a moment I said the subject of this is L.S.D.. L.S.D. is one such chemical, that does produce this curious effect of making you aware of the polarity of things. It does lots of other things. It does lots of rather an essential and trivial things and these of course and all the publicity in the various national magazines about L.S.D. get throughly emphasized. In other words when somebody says something's real psychedelic they mean bizarre. And when the national magazines try to illustrate the effect of these chemicals with various photographs they come on with blurred photographs of all sorts of things higgledy- piggedly, messed together naked girl seen through prison. And people don't like this. In Life magazine that all series of photographs of people like this you turn over a few pages in the air with a wire so the astronauts in front of the television when their husbands are out there in space they were again at this total so. You couldn't tell any difference if you didn't read the headlines.

Well that's absolutely nothing to do with it. If you want it some sort of appropriate illustration for a Life magazine article on the effects of L.S.D. you would have one very simple solution. You would publish the most gorgeous color reproductions of Persian miniatures. And of a Moorish Arabesques and of the illuminations of Celtic manuscripts that would give you the story. So far as changes in human sensation are concerned. But there would be one thing very difficult to put across in pictures because the people who looked at them, if they didn't get the point of view wouldn't see it. And that is what I will call the sensation, as well as the intellectual understanding of polarity. That is to say that the inside and, the outside the subjective, and the object of the self and the other. Go together. In other words, what there is a harmony, an unbreakable harmony I'm when I'm using the word harmony I don't necessarily mean something sweet. I mean absolute concordant relationship between what goes on inside your skin and

what goes on outside your skin. It isn't that what goes on outside is so powerful that it pushes around and controls what goes on inside. Equally so, it isn't that what goes on inside is so strong that it often succeeds in pushing around what goes on outside. It is very simply that the two processes the two behaviors are. What you do is what the universe does. And what the universe does is also what you do. Not you in the sense of your superficial ego. Which is a very small little tiny area of your conscious sensitivity, but you in the sense of your total psychophysical organism, conscious as well as unconscious. This is not something that arrived in the world from somewhere else altogether that confronts an alien reality. What you are, is the universe and that in fact the works, what there is and always has been and always will be for ever and ever performing an act called John Doe. And this is such a subversion of common sense. But is a fact matter of fact something if you stop to think about it that is completely obvious. Only everything conspires to prevent you from seeing that obvious thing. Because when you were babies practically. All your parents and your teachers and your aunts and uncles and your older brothers and sisters got together and they told you who you were. They defined you as Johnny. Was just Johnny a no no no and don't you come on too strong Johnny because. You know you've got elders and betters around. But you're responsible! You're a free agent! You'd better be. And so when you are told from childhood. That you are expected and commanded to behave in a way that will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily. You remain permanently mixed up. That, if anything, is permanent brain damage.

But that's the idea you see because that's the game we're playing you started it I did. Hahaha that's the game we play and we can make all kinds of complexities out of that and really in a way have enormous fun. But once anybody sees through that. Well what we're frightened. Once you get the sense of polarity of your inside being the same process as your outside and your ego being one and the same process as the whole universe going on, then we are afraid that people may say. Well good equals bad. And we can do anything we like and we didn't in any way be further subject to the ordinary rules of human conduct. And we can wear what clothes we like or no clothes at all. We can have what sexual life we like we can do anything and we are going to generally because the world is being rather presaged

the waters challenge the whole thing and run amok and a lot of people are doing just exactly that.

So I want to introduce into this whole problem some ancient wisdom. I have really two things to talk about. How cultures which always did know in some way, or among whom a large number of people always did know the secret. Handled it and then I want to make some observations about how we are trying to handle it and how it's not going to work. Among the Hindus and among the Buddhists. This view of the real identity of a human being has always been known. At least by a very influential minority. The central doctrine of the Hindu way of life, I call it that rather than a religion is, in Sanskrit *tat tvam asi*, you're it. To put it in a kind of colloquial way you're it. And it is the which then which there is no which or which they call the Brown or the up man with a capital A meaning the self. You are only just kidding that you're just poor little me, see the function of a guru that is to say a spiritual teacher in India, is to look give you a funny look in the eye. Because you come to him and say, "Mr guru I have problems. I suffer and it's a mess and I can't control my mind and I'm miserable and depressed," and so on and it gives you a funny look. And you feel a bit nervous about the way he looks at you because you think you know he's reading your thoughts and this man is a great magician, he can read everything that's in you he knows right down into your unconscious and you know all the dreadful things you've thought and all the awful desires you have and you are rather embarrassed that this man looks right through you and sees them all. That's not what he's looking at. Hes giving you a funny look for quite another reason altogether. Because he sees in you the drama the Godhead, just claiming it's poor little me and he's going to eventually buy all sorts of subtle techniques that are called in Sanskrit. That in politics means chicanery and in spiritual education means skillful pedagogy. He is going to try and kid you back into realising who you really are. That's why it gives you a funny look. And why he seems to see right through you. As if to say Shiva ol' boy Don't kid me I know who you are but you're coming on beautifully in this act. That they're just somebody else altogether. And I congratulate you you're doing a wonderful job. Playing this part which you call the person my person you know a person is a fake it the book the word means a mask so if you read books on how to be a real person or reading books on how to be a genuine fake. The word

persona as you know means a mask worn in Greek or Roman drama. So if you I said come on to the Guru and say well if you ask you who you are Sri Ramana Maharaji, when anybody came to him and they said to him it's people do who was I and my last incarnation or will I be reincarnated again he always replied who's asking the question. And everybody was irritated because he wouldn't give them answers about what they were in their former lives to decide who are you. And he looked at you if you looked at photographs of this man I keep a photograph of him close by because of the humor in his eyes they're looking at you with the dancing twinkle saying come up. Now that. In these Asiatic traditions it is well recognized. That people who get the knowledge that you're it. May very well run amok. And therefore they always couple any method of gaining this, whether it is yoga whether it is smoking something or drinking something or whatever is the method they always couple it with a discipline.

Now I know the word discipline isn't very popular these days. And I would like to have a new word for it, because most people who teach disciplines don't teach them very well. They teach it with a kind of violence. As if a discipline was something that is it going to be extremely unpleasant and you're going to have to put up with. But that's not the real secret of discipline. I would prefer to use the word skill. And discipline is a way of expression. Say, when you want to express your feelings in stone. Now stone doesn't give way very easily/ It's tough stuff, and so you have to learn the skill of the discipline of the sculptor in order to express yourself in stone and so in every other way whatever you do you require a skill and it's in no. Honestly important especially for American people to understand that there is absolutely no possibility of having any pleasure in life at all without skill. Money doesn't buy pleasure. Ever. Look, if you want to get stoned drunk, and go out and get a bottle of bourbon and down it you can't do that except for people who have practiced the distillers art. You can't even make love without art. Where I live in Sausalito, we have a harbor full of ever so many pleasure craft, motor cruises sailing boats all kinds of things and they never leave the dock. All that happens with them is their owners have cocktail parties there on Saturdays and Sundays, because they discovered having bought these things that the discipline of sailing is difficult to learn and takes a lot of time. And they didn't have time for it so they just bought the

thing as a status symbol. So in other words you can't have pleasure in life without skill. But it isn't a unpleasant task to learn a skill.

If the teacher in the first place gets you fascinated with it. There is immense pleasure in learning how to do anything skillfully. To make carpentry things, to cook, to write, to calculate anything you want it can be eventually pleasurable to learn and at the discipline. And it is completely indispensable. Because look, you may be a very inspired musician. I am not a musical technologist, you see, and I regret it but I'm a word word technologist. But I can hear in my. Head all kinds of symphonies and all kinds of marvelous compositions but I don't have the technique to write them down on paper and share them with somebody else. Too bad, maybe next time around. But you see, so far as words are concerned, I can express ideas because I have studied language. And I work very hard not that I didn't like it I intensely enjoy the work of writing a book although it is difficult. But it's fascinating, to say what could never possibly be said.

So, we do see what's happening what you have to do you have inspiration but then you have to have technique to incarnate to express your inspiration. That is to say to bring heaven down to earth. And to express heaven in terms of earth. Of course there are really one behind the scenes. But there's no way of pointing it out unless you do something skillful You see we are all at that moment absolutely, in the midst of the it is a vision. We are all one with the define or something I don't like that sort of wishy washy language. But, we are all of that but we're so much of there are that we like fish in water they don't know they're in water like the birds don't know they're in the air because it's all around them and in same way we don't know what the color of our eyes is I don't mean where you got blue or brown eyes but the color of the lens of your eyes you call that transparent no color see because you can't see it but it's basic to being able to see anything.

So in order to find out where you are there has to be some way of drawing attention to it. And that involves skill. Upaya in Sanskrit skillful means. So, it's all very well anybody can have ecstasy. Anybody As a matter of fact can become aware that he is one with the eternal ground of the universe. But since that what's what you are anyway I'm going to ask so what.

When a hero goes on an adventure and he leaves his people and is going to a strange land he can go away and just hide himself around the corner in an obscure house, and then appear a year later and say I've been on a heroic journey and tell all sorts of tales and they said prove it. Because they expect him to bring back something something which nobody has seen before then they believe you've been on a journey. So in the same way exactly anybody who goes on a spiritual journey must bring something back. Because if you just say oh man it was a gas. Anyone can say that. Now this is why in the doctrines of Buddhism, there is a differentiation between two kinds of enlightened beings. They are both forms of Buddha which is to say the word Buddha means somebody who has awakened who has discovered the secret behind all this that in other words all this thing we call life with its frantic concerns is a big act. Which you in your unconscious depths are deliberately setting up.

So you can do one of two things when you discover that you can become what's called a practical border that means a pratyekabuddha, who doesn't tell anything. Or you can become a bodhisattva. Pratyekabuddha goes off into his ecstasy. And never seen again. But is sad but is come one who comes back and appears in the everyday world and plays the game of the everyday world by the rules of the everyday world but he brings with him Upaya, he brings with him some way of showing that he's been on the journey but he's come back and he's going to let you in on the secret too. If you if you'll play it cool. And also come back. To join in the everyday lives of everyday people. Because this is the rule. If the world is dramatic if the world as the Hindu say is a big act put on by the divine self, one of the rules of coming on stage is that you don't come on as yourself. You come on as the part that you're going to play. It's very bad form if an actor always acts the same way. That's what's called a star as distinct from an actor. A real actor can become anything. And so, but in private life, well he's just Mr Jones, and, but he doesn't come on the stage that way so in the same way if you know that behind the scenes in the depths, fundamentally you are it you don't come on that way it always comes on to something else. That's the rule of the stage. Because without that there wouldn't be a play and it would only be reality. No illusion. And the whole point of life is illusion. From the word Latin, Luder, to play. Show biz. The show must go on so don't give it away.

But a truth has a way of leaking. Gets out. But then the important thing is you see when the truth gets out. Those who will catch hold of it. Must find a way of staying in contact with what society calls reality. That is to say, if you have a radio you don't only need an antenna you also need a ground. So what happens in the world of mysticism of a psychedelic visions and so on needs to be grounded. So there are always two directions in which such a discipline works. One, preparatory. In other words those who taught disciplines for awakening in the Orient were always careful to screen, first of all to screen those who applied, and then after screening them to make them sensible. So that they knew how to handle the game of ordinary human existence and played by the ordinary human rules. In other words, that they had strength of character. And were not the sort of people who would be wiped out because they had no strength of character by an overwhelming experience. Then they let them in. But there are certain disciplines such as Zen where you'll get into the essential secret very early on in the discipline. And after that they are concerned with much more training in showing you how to use it, how to use the power to use the vision which you have acquired. And so it is with the current, what we would call L.S.D. scene, that is raging through the United States. It unfortunately lacks discipline. And I'm not trying to say this in a kind of severe, authoritarian, paternalistic way, but only that it would be so much more fun if it had it. In other words, when people try to express what they have seen in this kind of change state of consciousness. They show five movies going on at once. Projected upon torn bed sheets, with stroboscopic lights going as fast as possible at the same time and eleven jazz bands playing. And they're going to blow their minds baby.

When ever everybody else who hasn't seen this thing look around and say well it's a mess I don't like the looks of it. Let's suppose that while you were very very high on L.S.D. you looked into a filthy ashtray and you saw the beatific vision. Which is of course the case because wherever you look if you I your eyes are open you will see the face of the divine. Then you come out of your ecstasy it with a dirty ashtray and say to everybody here it is. No. There is a possibility if you are an extraordinary list skillful painter or even photographer. After presenting the dirty ashtray so that everybody else will see almost what you saw in it. But you will have to have a technique which will translate every grain of ash into a jewel. Because

that's what you actually saw. But that requires mastery of an art. And I'm afraid people think that all it's necessary to do is just throw out any old thing because under that transform state of consciousness any old thing is that is the works. But nobody else can see it if they haven't shared that point of view.

So then, this becomes for us in the United States an extremely important social problem. The cat is out of the bag. We are living in a scientific world where secrets cannot be kept. And anyone, anytime, can pick up something which will be short circuit all the ancient religious techniques yoga practice meditation and etc, etc this all very embarrassing but it will happen not for everybody but for a lot of people and they will see what all those sages and buddhas and yogis and prophets saw in ancient times, and it will be very clear.

So what. So you see, you can say, look at all these people. Who haven't seen it. This is a temptation. Look at them all going about their business earning money. And grinding it out at the bank or the insurance office or whatever it is every day and how serious they look all about it and they don't really know it again. And you can narrow you can cultivate a certain contempt for people like that. But it's a very very bad to do that. Because of course don't forget they have a certain contempt for you. You see always the nice people in town, who live in the best residences. They know that they're nice because there are some people on the other side of the tracks who are not nice. And so at their cocktail parties they have a lot to say about the people who are not nice, because that boosts their collective ego. Would be no other way of doing it, you don't know that you're a law abiding citizen, unless there are some people who aren't. And if it's important to you to congratulate yourself on being law abiding. You therefore have to have some criminal classes outside the pale of course of your immediate associates. On the other hand, the people who are not nice, they have their pariest. And they don't lose their collective ego by saying that they're the people who are really in. Whereas these poor squares who deliver the mail faithfully and who will carry article responsible jobs, they're just dupes. Or when they earn their money all they do is it by Toy rocket ships with it and go roaring around and so on and that's they think that's pleasure. So the people who are not nice boost their collective ego in

that way. Neither of them realize that they need the other just as much as a flower needs a bee and bee needs a flour.

So you when you see the people who you think are not in on the secret. You if you really understand you have to revise your opinion completely her and say that the squares are the people who are really far out, because they don't even know where they started. See an enlightened Hindu or Buddhist looks at the ignorant people of this world and says, my respects. Because here I see the divine essence having altogether forgotten what it is. And playing the most far out game of being completely lost. Congratulations, how far out can you get? So if you understand that you don't start a war with people you might say are square. Don't challenge them, don't bug them, don't frighten them. The reason is not because they are immature or because they are babies and you mustn't scare babies, it's nothing to do with that you mustn't frighten them because they are doing a very far out act they're walking on a tightrope miles up. And they've got to do that balancing act and if you shout they may lose their nerve. So that's what we call the responsible people of the world are doing it is an act it's a game just like a tightrope walker, but it's a risky one, and you can get ulcers from it, and all sorts of troubles but you must respect it. And say congratulations on being so far out.

Ways of Liberation

On Buddhism

I want to start by reemphasizing the point that what are called the religions of the east the ones we're discussing Hinduism Buddhism and Chinese Taoism are not what we in the West understand as religions. They don't involve that you believe in anything specific. And they don't involve any idea of obedience and to commandments from above. And they don't involve any conformity to a specific ritual. Although they do have rituals, but their rituals vary from country to country and from time to time. Their objective is always not ideas, not doctrines, but a method a method for the transformation of consciousness.

That is to say, for a transformation of your sensation of who you are, and I emphasize the word sensation because it's the strongest word we have for feeling directly. When you put your hand on the corner of a table, you have a very definite feeling, and when you are aware of existing, you also have a definite feeling. But in the view of these methods or disciplines, the ordinary person's definite feeling of the way he exists and who he is is a hallucination. To feel yourself as a separate ego, a source of action and awareness that is entirely separate and independent from the rest of the world somehow locked up inside a bag of skin, is seen as a hallucination. That you are not a stranger in the earth that comes into this world either as a result of a natural fluke, or being a sort of spirit that comes from somewhere else altogether, but that you in your fundamental existence, you are the total energy that constitutes this universe, playing that it's you. Playing that it's this particular organism. And even playing that it's this particular person. Because the fundamental game of the world is a game of hide and seek. That is to say that the colossal reality, the energy that is everything, that is a unitary energy, that is one, plays at being many. At manifesting itself in all these particulars that we call you and you and you and you and you and you and you and you and this and that and all around us. And it's fundamentally a game.

And you can say that this goes really for all the systems that I'm talking about. It's the basis of Hinduism, of Buddhism, and of Taoism, this intuition. Now today we're going to talk about Buddhism. Buddhism is an offshoot of Hinduism. You could in a way call it a reform of Hinduism or Hinduism stripped for export. It originates in northern India, close to the area that is now in a Nepal, shortly after six hundred B.C. There was a young prince by the name of Guatama Siddharta, who became the man we call the Buddha. Now the word Buddha is not a proper name, it's a title. And it's based on the Sanskrit root Budh. B-U D-H.. Which means to be awake. And so you could say the Buddha is the man who woke up. From the dream. Of life as we ordinarily take it to be. And found out. Who he was, who he is. It's curious. That this title was not something new. There was already in the whole complex of Hinduism the idea of Buddhas. OF awakened people, and curiously they are ranked higher than gods, because in the view of Hinduism even the gods, or the angels, the Devas, are still bound on the wheel of the sort of squirrel cage of going round and round and round in the pursuit of success. And the idea is that if you pursue. Something that you can call success, pleasure. Good. Virtue which originally of course means strength magical power. All these positive things. You are under illusion, because the positive cannot exist without the negative. To be, you only know what to be is, by contrast with not to be, so if we say now there is a coin in the left hand, there is no coin in the right. And from this you get the idea of to be and not to be. And you can't have the one without the other So if you tried to pursue to gain the positive and to deny get rid of the negative it's as if you were trying to arrange everything in this room so that it was all up and nothing was down. You can't do it, you said just self an absolutely insoluble problem. Because the basis of life is spectrum. I'll consider the spectrum of colors. When you think of a spectrum in what form do you think of it most people think of it as a ribbon with red at one end and purple at the other. But the spectrum is actually a circle. Because purple is the mixture of red and blue. It goes right round, and so in this way all sensation, all feeling, all experience whatsoever, is moving through spectra. You don't only have the spectrum of color, you have a spectrum of sound. You have various complex spectra, of texture, of smell, of taste. And you're constantly operating through all the possible variations of experience. And it implies that you can't know one end of the spectrum without also knowing the other. So if you wanted to say

your favorite color is red. And you wanted only red. And you had to exclude therefore blue and purple. Without blue and purple you can have red. Behind of course, all the various colors in the spectrum, is the white light. And behind everything that we experience, all our various sensations of sound, of color, the shape of touch, there's the white light. And I'm using the phrase the white light rather symbolically. I don't mean it literally.

But there is common to all sensations, what you might call the basic sense. And if you explore back into your sensations, and reduce them all to the basic sense, you are on your way to reality. To what underlies everything to what is the ground of being, the basic energy. And to the extent that you realize this and know that you are it, you transcend, you overcome, you surpass. The illusion. That you are simply. John Doe. Mary Smith. Or what have you. So then, the Buddha, as the man who woke up, is regarded as one Buddha, among a potentiality of myriads of Buddhas. Everybody can be a Buddha, everybody has in himself the capacity to wake up from the illusion. Of being simply this separate individual. The Buddha made his doctrine very easy to understand. Because in those days there wasn't very much writing being done, and people committed things to memory, and so he put his doctrine, or method, in various formulas which were very easy to remember, and I'm going to explain it in those terms so that you can remember it just as well. He of course practiced the various disciplines that were offered in the Hinduism of his time. But he found in a certain way that they had become unsatisfactory. Because they had over emphasized asceticism. Had over emphasized putting up with as much pain as you can. There was a feeling you see that if the problem of life is pain. Let us suffer. And this is the root of the ascetics you see who lie on beds of nails who hold a hand up forever and ever and ever, who eat only one banana a day, who renounce sex, who do all these weird things because they feel that if they head right into pain, and don't become afraid of it but suffer as much pain as possible they will by this method overcome the problem of pain. And they will set themselves free from anxiety. There's a certain sense in that as you can obviously see.

Supposing for example you have absolutely no fear of pain, you have no anxieties, you have no hang ups. How strong you would be. Nobody could stop you. You would have ultimate courage.

But the Buddha was very subtle. He is really the first historical psychologist. The great psychologist, psychotherapist. He is very subtle, because he saw that a person who is fighting pain, who is trying to get rid of pain is still really fundamentally afraid of it. And therefore the way of asceticism is not right. Equally, the way of hedonism, of seeking pleasure, is not right. So the Buddhist doctrine is called the middle way. Which is neither ascetic nor hedonistic.

So it summed up in what are called the Four Noble Truths. And the first is called Dukha. Dukha means suffering in a very generalized sense. You could call it chronic frustration. And it is saying that life as lived by most people is Dukha. Is an attempt in other words to solve insoluble problems. Try to draw a square circle you can't because the problem itself is meaningless. Try to arrange the things in this room so that they're all up and none of them dumb it is meaningless such a problem cannot ever be solved. So try to have light without dark or dark without light. It can never be solved. So the attempt to solve problems that are basically insoluble and to work at it through your whole life that is Dukkha. Now he went on to analyze this that there are what we call three signs of being. The first is Dukha itself, frustration. The second is Anitya. And this means the the letter A in Sanskrit at the beginning of a word is often the equivalent of our non. So nitya means permanent, anitya means impermanent, that every manifestation of life is impermanent. And therefore our quest to make things permanent, to straighten everything out, to get it fixed is an impossible and insoluble problem, and therefore we experience Dukha, or this sense of fundamental pain and frustration as a result. Ald of trying to make things permanent. And the third sign of being is called an Anatman. Now you know our from my talk on Hinduism that the word Atman means self. Are not man means therefore non-self. That there is in you no real ego.

Now I've explained that already I've explained in talking about Hinduism that the idea of the ego is a social institution. It has no physical reality. It is simply, the ego is your symbol of yourself. Just as the word water is a noise which symbolizes a certain liquid reality so the idea of the ego, the role you play, who you are, is not the same as your living organism. Your ego has absolutely nothing to do, with the way you color your eyes. Shape your body, circulate your blood. That's the real you, but it's certainly not your

ego. Because you don't even know how it's done. From the standpoint of your conscious attention. So the idea of Anatman is firstly that the ego isn't real there isn't one.

Now then, this then as the first truth there is the situation that we have to of frustration because we are fighting the changing-ness of things, and because we don't realize that the ego, the I, is unreal. The second of the four noble truths then called Thrishna. Thrishna is a Sanskrit word again and is the root of our word first. And it's usually translated desire. But it is better translated clinging, grabbing. Or, there's an excellent modern American Slangy word, a hang up. That is exactly what is the hang up. Thrisha now is clutching. As for example what we call smother love. When a mother is so afraid that her children may get into trouble that she protects them excessively. And as a result of this, prevents them from growing. Or when they when lovers cling to each other excessively and have to sign documents that they will curse and swear to love each other always they are in a state of fish not. And this is the same thing as holding on to yourself so tightly that you strangle yourself. Now the second truth then about Krishna is that the cause of Dukha is Trishna. Clinging is what makes suffering. If you don't recognise that this whole world is a phantasmagoria. And amazing illusion. A weaving of smoke. And you try to hold on to it, you see, then you start suffering, seriously suffering. Krishna is in turn based upon. The same negative. Avidya. From the root vid means knowledge, as in the Latin video and the English vision. Avidya, therefore is ignorance. Gnosis means of course, to know, it is the same thing as good Gnosis in Greek. To know so this is not to know to ignore. To overlook. And I explained in the first talk in the series how we ignore all kinds of things because we notice only what we think noteworthy. And therefore our vision of everything is highly selective. We pick out certain things, and say that's what's there, just as we select and notice the figure rather than the background. Sometimes I draw this on the blackboard. Now ask the question, what have I drawn? What would you say, What have I drawn? The circle and the other suggestions all oh. Yeah you're getting the point. I'm drawing a wall with a hole in it you see, but ordinarily—you've been reading my books—but ordinarily people see the ball the circle the ring or whatever and never think of the background. Because they ignore the background. Just as one thinks that you can have pleasure without pain. You

want pleasure, the figure, and don't realize that pain is the background. So Avidya is this state of restricted consciousness, restricted attention, that moves through life unaware of the fact that, to be, implies not to be. And vice versa. So now the third noble truth is called Nirvana. This word means blow out. Nir is a negative word again like 'a', vanna is blowing. So it's a kind of out blowing.

Now, in breathing, you know that breath is life. The Greek word, you may pronounce it pneuma or pneuma, is the same as a spirit. And spirit means breath. In the book of Genesis, when God had made the clay figurine that was later to be Adam, he breathed the breath of life into its nostrils. And it became alive, because life is breath. But now, if you hold your breath, you lose it. He that would save his life will lose it. So Breathe in, Breathe in, Breathe In get as much air as you can and Trishna clean. And you lose it. So Nirvana means breathe out. What a relief that was. The sigh, really let it go. Because it will come back to you if you let it go. But if you don't let it go. You will just suffocate.

So a person in the state of nirvana is what we might call a blown out person. Like blow your mind. Let go, don't cling, and then you're in the state of nirvana. And I reemphasize the point. This is not, I'm not preaching, see, not saying this is what you ought to do. So me pointing out a state of affairs that is so. There's no moralism in this whatsoever is simply pointing out like [that] if you put your hand into the fire you'll get burned. You can get burned if you want to. That's OK. But if you so happens that you don't want to get burned. And you don't put your hand in the fire so in the same way if you don't want to be in a state of anxiety all the time, and again I emphasize, if you like to be anxious it's perfectly all right. If that's what isn't never how is anyone and they say you've got all eternity through which to live in various forms. And therefore you don't have just one life in which you've got to avoid eternal damnation. You can go running around the wheel in the rat race and play that game just as long as you want to, so long as you think it's fun. But if there comes a time when you don't think it's fun. You don't have to do it. So I wouldn't say to anyone who disagrees with me and who says Well I think we ought to engage the forces of evil in battle and put this world to right and so on and so forth, and arrange everything in this world so that it's all up. Try it, please, it's perfectly OK,

go on doing that. But if you see that it's futile, then you can let go. Don't try to cling, relax.

And if you do that, you're in the state of nirvana. And you become a Buddha. And of course it means that you become a rather astonishing person. You may of course be subtle about it, and make like you're a very ordinary person. So that you don't get people mixed up. Because if you are a very astonishing person, everybody wants to be like you. And they use you as an object of Thrishna, of clinging. They rely on you, you get a transference on everybody comes running around says please help me I'd like to be like you are. And then you have to get rid of them. See that's the difference between a doctor and a clergyman I shouldn't say things like this but doctors try to get rid of their patients. Clergymen try and try to get them hooked on the medicines so that they will become addicts to the church, and that's too bad because there is a saying in ancient Christianity. Crux est mundi, which means the cross, the medicine of the world. But you don't make medicine a diet. And so, in Buddhism, the Buddha explained that his doctrine, his method, was a raft. It's sometimes called a Yana, Y-A-N-A, means a vehicle a conveyance. And when you cross a river on a raft. And you get to the other shore you don't pick up the raft and carried on your back you leave it behind. But people who are what I would call hawked on religion, are always on the raft. They are going back and forth back and forth back and forth on the raft so that Clergymen tends to turn into a fairy man. Who is always on the raft and never gets over to the other shore himself. Now there's something to be said for that because how are we going to get the raft back to the first shore to bring over the other people see somebody has to volunteer to take the back journey. But he must be awfully careful, to realise that the real objective is to get the people across and set them free. If you dedicate yourself to ferrying people across, don't ask them to come back on the raft with you, because you get overcrowded, and people will think that the raft is the goal rather than the other shore.

So when are I find this in in actual practice that when clergyman do not ever ask for money. And it's all right you know like a doctor who simply charges a fee says, 'You come to me, you pay me so much.' But the clergyman says he doesn't say pay me so much he says 'We would like your pledge of voluntary contribution.' And then nobody knows what to

give. And but he has to go calling around all sorts of places. He becomes a fundraiser for this big project, the church. And it's a bad scene because if any church were really successful in liberating people, there would be no problems of economics at all. Because people would keep coming soon as you got rid of people like a doctor a doctor who gets rid of people becomes famous. Because they're cured. And so if they know a certain church scene, people are cured and they all therefore leave the church more come in there's a potential tide of more people so you get a huge overturn turnover. And that's the way to work it. That's the idea of the raft.

Now then the fourth noble truth. It's called Magga. This word means path. And the way of Buddhism is often called the Noble Eightfold Path. Because there are eight phases, I won't say steps, because they're not sequential. They're all simultaneous. Once upon a time, there's a very very great Japanese scholar, D.T. Suzuki., who was giving a lecture at the University of Hawaii on Buddhism, and was explaining, he'd come to the fourth noble truth. And he said, 'Today we come to for that noble truth. Called a noble eightfold path. First step of a noble eightfold path called Shoken, Can he was using Japanese name shoken can mean the right view. Or of Buddhism, is right view. Right you mean no particular of you. Know fixed view. Or Buddhism Shoeken, right view, second step of Noble Eightfold Path, oh I forget the second step, you look it up in the book.' This man was one of the most terrific scholars in Chinese, Sanskrit, Tibetan, Japanese and so on. So I'm not going to bother you with the individual steps of the eight fold path it. All of them are subsumed under three headings of which you can say the right view. Which in Sanskrit is Samyak. And Samyak is a very curious phrase, it doesn't mean right in our sense of correct some is the same really as our word some. Total, complete. All inclusive. We might say we might use the word integrated, as when we say a person has integrity. That a person who has integrity, we mean is all of a piece, is not divided against himself. So in this sense of Samyak, there is, his is related to the word. Darshan which means a point of view of viewing when you go to visit a great guru or teacher you have Darshan, you look at him. And you offer your reverence to them. [There are] many senses of it, but it means simply to view look at the view. So the summing up Gulshan is the complete view. For example let's take the constellation called the Big Dipper. We look at it from a fairly restricted zone in space. And it always seems whatever the

season of the year because we're so far away from it that the stars in the Big Dipper in the same position. But imagine looking at it from somewhere else in space or together, and those stars would not look like a Dipper. They would be in another position. Now then what is the true position of those stars. Don't you see there isn't one. Because wherever you look, the position alters. You could say that the true situation of those stars is how they are looked at from all points of view, all possible points of view. Inside the constellation looking outwards, outside the constellation looking inwards, from everywhere and everywhere. But you see there is no such thing as the truth. The World, in other words, is not existing independently of those who witness it. Because the world is precisely the relationship between the world and its witnesses. Just as the sound of a drum is the relationship between a striking hand and the skin. If there's no skin on the drum, it doesn't make any sound.

And so if there are no eyes in this world, the sun doesn't make any light. Nor do the stars. So what is, is a relationship. You can, for example, prop up two sticks by leaning them against each other and they will stand. But only by depending on each other. Take one away and the other falls. So in Buddhism, it is taught that everything in this universe depends on everything else. That we have a kind of a huge network and this is called the doctrine of mutual interdependence. All of it hangs on you and you hang on all of it, just as the two sticks support each other. And this is conveyed in a symbol, which is called Indra's net.

Imagine a multidimensional spider's web, in the early morning covered with dew drops. And every drop contains the reflection of all the other dew drops, and in each reflected dew drop, the reflections of all the other dew drops, in that reflection and so ad infinitum. That is the Buddhist conception of the of the universe in an image. The Japanese call that jijimuge, means a thing-event. A happening. So between happening and happening, mu, there is no ge, separation. Jijimuge.

Now, or so, the first phase of the Eightfold Path has to do with one's view, understanding, of the world. The second phase has to do with action. How you act. And here we get the Buddhist view of behavior. A Buddhist doesn't base his ethics on the idea of commandments, of orders from a

higher echelon of authority. Buddhist idea of ethics is based on expediency. If you are engaged in the way of liberation. And you want to clarify your consciousness, doing that is inconsistent with certain kinds of action. So every Buddhist makes five vows. Five precepts. And you may perhaps have heard the Buddhist formula of taking what is called conscious which five precepts. And they take what are called the sadhana the three refuges and the five precepts the refuges are the Buddha, the Dharma, the doctrine, and the Sanga, the fellowship of all those who are on the way. So the priest of the bikkhu, the Buddhist monk, and the laypeople will chant the formula. [sings] Those are the three refuges the border the Dharma and the Sanga, then they take the five precepts. [sings]

So they take these five precepts, I depart, I undertake the precept to abstain from taking life.. I undertake the precept. To abstain from taking what is not given. I undertake the precept to abstain from exploiting of the passion. I undertake the precept to abstain from falsifying speech. I undertake the precept to abstain from being intoxicated by Surya, Mariya and Majipayana, mother tongue or whatever they were. I presume tardy which is alcohol. I don't know I don't know what else it was nobody does know. Because if you see if you start killing people. Or taking life you're in trouble you set up an opposition and you've got to become involved in taking care of it. If you start stealing you worry people you upset people's orientation in life because if you suddenly come into the back home for dinner and find somebody stolen your table where you going to serve dinner. If you explode your passions. It means that when you are when you feel bored. And somehow that life is a little bit empty you say well our what are we going to do this evening that's go and get stuffed. A lot of people who suffer from obesity are trying to simply fill their empty psyche by stuffing themselves with food. Well it's the wrong cure. So, likewise most of Arda if you start telling lies to everybody you know what happens when you start telling lies you have to tell extra lies to cover up the first one and you get into the most hopeless misunderstanding. Speech collapses, and of course the intoxication is the same problem as the exploitation of the passions.

So there's a purely kind of practical, expedient, utilitarian approach to morals. There's another side to this which doesn't enters into the into the

precepts which I will explain later. So that's the third phase of the Eightfold Path then, no, the second phase. Then the third phase has to do with your mind, with your state of consciousness. And this has to do with what we would ordinarily call meditation. There are the two final, the seventh and eighth, aspects of the path. Are called Samyak Smriti, and Samyak are some of the reedy means recollection. That's the best English word for it now do you understand the word recollect. Is to gather together what has been scattered. What is the opposite of remember? Obviously dismember. What has been chopped up, and scattered becomes re-membered. So in the Christian scheme, do this in remembrance of me. You see the Christ has been sacrificed. Chopped up. But the mass is celebrated in remembrance. One of the old litigious says 'The wheat which has been scattered all over the hills and grows up is gathered again into the bread.' Remembered. Go back to your Hindu basis. The world is regarded as the Dismemberment of the self, the Brahman, the Godhead. The one is dismembered into the many. So remembrance is realizing again that each single member of the many is really the one, so that's re-collection.

Introduction to Hinduism

Now today I am going to go into the very fundamental guts of Hinduism. But what I want to do is to begin with certain documents that are known as the Upanishads, and these documents constitute what is called Vedanta. V-E-D-A-N-T-A. and that is compounded of two words, Veda, Anta. Anta means end or completion or summation. Veda, of course is related to the Latin video, to see. Veda is the fundamental revelation of the Hindu way of life, contained in its earliest scriptural documents, which are generally dated in the period between fifteen and twelve hundred B.C.. The Upanishads, as being the summation of the Veda, found from over a long period of time, beginning perhaps as early as eight hundred B.C. Some of the Upanishads are much much later than that.

The basic position of the Upanishads is that the Self is the one and only reality without a second, that all this universe is finally Brahman, and appears to be a multiplicity of different things and different events, only by reason of Maya, which is illusion. Magic. Art. Creative power. So then, it is basic to the Vedanta that Brahma, this intangible Nama objective ground of

everything that exists, is identical with the ground of you. And this is put in the formula tat tvam asi, t-a-t, tat, same as our word that. Tvam, T-v-a-m. Same as the Latin tulips, thou. Asi, art. We should translate that into a modern American idiom as 'You're it'.

This of course is a doctrine which is very difficult for those brought up in the Judeo Christian traditions to accept, because it is fundamental to Christian and Jewish theology that whatever you are you are surely not the Lord God. And Christians feel about the Hindu doctrine that we are all fundamentally Masks of God, that it's pantheism. And that's a dirty word in Christian theological circles, because of the feeling that if everything is God, then all moral standards are blown to hell. Because it means everything is as good as everything else everything that happens is really God in this must include the good things and the bad things. And that seems to them a very dangerous idea. Actually all religious doctrines contain very very dangerous ideas.

However we won't worry about that for the moment, because what the Hindu means by God when He says Brahman is not at all the same thing as a Jew means by The Lord Adonai. Because of the Jew and the Christian means the boss. To whom divine honors a view as above all others. The Hindu, on the other hand, does not mean the boss. He doesn't mean, the king, the lord, the political ruler of the universe. He means the inmost energy, which as it were, dances it's the whole universe. Without as it were the idea of author of governing some intractable element that resists his or its power.

So, if a Christian or a person in a Christian culture announces that he has discovered that he is God, we put him in the loony bin. Because it's unfashionable to burn people for heresy anymore. But in India if you announce that you're the Lord God, they say 'Well of course. How nice that you found out.' Because everybody it. So then, why the great problem arises does it appear that we're not? Why do we think why do we have the sensory impression that this whole universe consists of a vast multiplicity of different things, and we don't see it all as one. Well, what would you think it would be like to see it all as one. I know a lot of people who study oriental philosophy hear about attaining these great states of consciousness.

Nirvana, Moksha which they can do is use liberation Satori, Zen Buddhist word for enlightenment or awakening I what would it be like to have that what how would you feel if you saw everything is really one basic reality.

Well, a lot of people think that it would be as if all the outlines and differentiations in the field of vision suddenly became vague, melted, and we saw only a kind of luminous sea of light. But rather advisedly, the Vedanta philosophy does not really seriously use the word one of the Supreme Self. Because the word and the idea one has an opposite many, on one side and another opposite none, on the other. And it is fundamental to Vedanta, that the Supremes Self is neither one nor many. But as they say non-dual, and they express that in this word. Advaita is a negative word, like non divine is from the same as the man. So Advaita is non-dual. And this a fast far western US is a difficult conception. Because you naturally as a Western magician would say the non dual is the opposite of the dual, therefore it has an opposite. True, but the Hindu is using this term in a special sense it's like this. On a flat surface I have only two dimensions in which to operate so that everything drawn to the man. To the man. How therefore, on a two dimensional level can I draw anything but two dimensions how it logic in human rationality can I possibly think except in terms of opposites. All rational discourse is talk about classification. The classification of experiences of sensations, of notions. And the nature of a class is that it's a box and if a box has an inside, it has to have an upside, is you is, or is you ain't, is fundamental to all classification and we can't get out of. It's almost as if you see whatever we see to be different is an explicit difference on the surface. Covering an implicit unity.

Only, it's very difficult to talk about what it is that unifies black and white. Of course in a way the eyes do. Sound and silence are unified by the ears. So you can see, can't you, that, if you can't have one without the other, it's like the poles of a magnet, North Pole and South Pole. You can have a one-pole magnet. True, the poles are quite different ones north of the other south. But it's all one magnet. And some such idea is that is what the Hindu is moving into when he's speaking of the real basis or ground of the universe as be you will. Take it, the fundamental opposition that I suppose all of us feel, between self and other, thou and it. There is something that is me there's an area of my experience that I call myself and there's another

area of my experience which I call not myself. But you will immediately see that neither one could be realized without the other. You wouldn't know what you meant by self, unless you experience something other than Self. You wouldn't know what you meant by other, unless you understood self they go together. They arise at the same time you don't have first self and then other office other and then self. They come together. And that shows you see the sneaky conspiracy underneath the two, more or like the magnet between the two different poles.

And so more or less that, sort of what isn't classifiable but which lives between all classes. The class of elephants, opposite the class of non elephants, has as it were, the walls of the box joining the two together, just as your skin is an asthmatic membrane that joins you to the external world by virtue of all the tubes in it and the nerve ends, and the way in which the external energies flow through your skin into your inside and vice versa. But, we do, don't we see and feel and sense all we think we do. The world as divided into a great multiplicity a lot of people would. Think of the universe as a collection of different things a kind of cosmic flotsam and jetsam washed together in this particular area of space. And prefer to take a pluralistic attitude and don't see anything underlying. In fact, in contemporary logical philosophy, the notion of any basic ground or continuum in which all events would be considered meaningless, for obvious reasons. If I say that everybody in this universe every star every planet is moving in a certain direction of a uniform speed, that will be saying nothing at all, unless I can point out some other object with respect to which they are so moving. But since I said the universe, that includes all objects whatsoever, therefore I cannot make a meaningful statement about the uniform behavior of everything that is going on. True. But on the other hand, every sound you hear on the radio, whether it be a honking horn, a Bach sonata, or a newscast, is the vibration of the diaphragm in a loud speaker. The radio doesn't tell us this, the announcer doesn't come on first thing in the morning and say, 'Ladies and gentlemen, from now until closing time all the sounds you will hear will be vibrations of the diaphragm in the speaker.' That is taken for granted and ignored.

So, in the same way your ear drum is basic to all that you hear. Your lens in your eye, the retina is basic to all that you see. What is the color of the lens

of the eye? We say it is no color, it is transparent, in the same way as a mirror has no color of its own. But the mirror is very definitely there, colorless as it may be. The eardrum, unheard as it may be, is very definitely basic toward hearing. The are transparent as it maybe is very definitely basic to all seem so therefore if there were some continuum in which everything that is going on and everything that we experience occurs we would not notice it. We would not be able, really, to say very much about it, except perhaps that it was there. It wouldn't make any difference to anything, except the one all important differences, that if it wasn't there there wouldn't be any differences. But you see philosophers nowadays don't like to think about things like that. It stretches their heads and they would rather preoccupied themselves with more pedestrian matters.

But still you can't help it if you are a human being, you wonder about things like that. What is it in which everything is happening? What is the ground? But you say, obviously it's not a part because I think that is a part is a classifiable thing, and so very often the Hindu and the Buddhist will refer to the ultimate reality as no-thing. Not nothing but no special thing. Unclassifiable. Can't put your finger on it, but it's you, what you basically are, what everything basically is. Just as the sound of a automobile horn on. Radio is in one way an automobile horn but basically it is the vibration of the diaphragm. Okay, so you are all in the Hindu view vibrations of the entire cosmic diaphragm. Put it like that, that's analogy, one using sudden a language or cataphatic language from the point of Christianity. The best language to say nothing! But to experience it. How can you experience it that's the whole thing? As I pointed out, last time the nub of all these oriental philosophies is not an idea not a theory not even a way of behaving but it's basically a way of experiencing a transformation of everyday consciousness so that it becomes quite apparent to us that that's the way things are, but you, when you it when it happens to you it's very difficult to explain it.

So in exactly the same way, when somebody has that sort of breakthrough which transforms consciousness and it happens all over the world it's not just a Hindu phenomenon when somebody suddenly realizes it's all one, or technically non-dual. And really, all this coming and going and all this frantic living and dying, grabbing, struggling, fighting, suffering all this is a

fantastic phantasmagoria. He sees that, but when he trying to explain it he finds his mouth isn't big enough. Because he can't get the words out of their dualistic pattern, to explain something non-dualistic. But why is this so? Why are we under this great magnificent hallucination?

Well, the Hindus explain this in Saguna language as follows. Very nice explanation, a child can understand. The fact of the matter is that the world is a game of hide-and-seek. Peek-a-boo. Now you see it, it becomes very obvious. If you were the supreme self, what would you do? I mean, would you just sit there and be blissfully one, forever and ever and ever. Well, obviously not. You would play games. You would in other words for the very nature of the fact that I said no energy system is an energy system unless it lets go of itself, so you would let go of yourself. And you would get lost. You get involved in all sorts of adventures. And you forget who you were. Just as when you play a game, playing poker. And although you are only playing for dimes off the chips you get absorbed in the game. And you move, nothing really important to win nothing really important to lose and it becomes fantastically interesting, who wins and who loses. And so, in the same way it is said that the supreme Self gets absorbed, through ever so many different channels which we call the different beings, in the plot, just like an artist or a writer gets completely absorbed in the artistic creation of what he is doing or an actor gets absorbed in the part in the drama.

At first, we know it's a drama we go to a play. And we say 'It's only a play.' And the Proscenium Arch tells us that what happens behind that arch is not for real. Just a show. But the great actor is going to make you forget it's just a show he's going to have you sitting on the edge of your chair he's going to be crying he's going to be trembling because he almost persuades you that it's real. And what would happen, if the very best actor, was confronted by the very best audience. Why, they'd be taken in completely, and the one would confirm the other. So, this is the idea of the universe as drama. That the fundamental Self the Sarguna Brahma, plays this game, gets involved in being all of us and does it so damn well, it's so superbly acted that the thing appears to be real. And we're not only sitting on the edge of our chair, but we start to get up and throw things. We join in the drama, and it all becomes whatever it is that's going on here. Then of course, at the end of the drama, because all things have to have and end that have a beginning. The curtain

goes down and the actors retire to the green room. And there the villain and the hero cease to be the villain and hero, they're just that they actors. And then they come out in front of the curtain and they stand in a row and the audience applause of the villain along with the hero the villain for having been a good villain here over having been a great hero. The play is over, and everybody heaves a sigh of relief. Well that was a great show, wasn't it.

So the same idea the green room is the Narguna Brahma. That behind the whole show, where there are no differentiations of I and thou, subject and object, good and evil, light and darkness, life and death. But within the sphere of the Sarguna Brahman, all these differentiations appear because that's out in front that's on the stage. And no good actor when on the stage performs his own personality. That's what's wrong with movie stars they try to cast a person to act a role which corresponds to his alleged personality. But in a great actor, can assume any kind of personality, male or female, can suddenly convert him self right from the audience into somebody who takes you in entirely. But in the green room, he's as usual self. So Hinduism has the idea that it's all the conventions of drama, go right along with it, that all this world is a big act. The play of the supreme Self. And it's therefore compared to a dream, to a passing illusion. And, you should not therefore, take it seriously. You may take it sincerely perhaps, as an actor may be sincere in his acting but not serious, because that means it throws you for a loop. Although that of course is involved. We do take it seriously, but you see one of the great questions that you have to ask yourself, when you really get down to the nitty gritty about your own inmost core, is are you serious? Or do you know deep within you, that you're put-on.

On Taoism

This afternoon, I'm going to talk to you about Taoism, which is one of the principal forms of Chinese philosophy. As it were, the opposite number of Confucianism. For these two ways of thought lie at the roots of Chinese civilization. Both of them having a kind of common origin in the attitude to life expressed in the Book of Changes, or the I Ching, which maybe as early as about thirteen hundred B.C. Everybody today seems to be reading the I Ching. It's a very strange book. It is a commentary on sixty four symbols. Which are made up of broken and unbroken line, it's the unbroken line, like

this, and the broken line like this. And this unbroken line is called Yang. Yang. And the broken line is called yin. And if you make a figure in which there are six lines. You can obviously have sixty four variations. And this is ostensibly a method of decision making. When you flip a coin to make a decision you've only got two choices heads either heads or tails, but imagine having a sixty four sided card the flip to help you make decisions. Is rather an interesting idea because when we do make decisions we are always eventually reduced the flipping a coin. However well you think it through, you don't have time enough to think it all the way through. You know that there are always possibilities that you didn't take into consideration or couldn't take into consideration, and although you plan and wonder and work out the data, it eventually comes down to the point where you flip a coin because you've got to make up your mind.

But in some respects, you see, a sixty four sided coin would be more suggestive shall we say than a two-sided coin. Well anyway, these hexagrams as they're called in the I-Ching are made up of fundamentally two symbols, yang, the positive and yin, the negative. And the words yang and the yin seem to refer originally to the south and north sides of a mountain. The south side is the sunny side, the north side the shady side. And note that you cannot possibly have a one sided mountain. And therefore it's always understood that the yang and the yin are the explicit differences of an implicit unity. The Poles. Yang is called male, yin is called female, and another way in which they're represented aside from these two lines is in this familiar symbol, in which one tadpole is black, and the other white with the eye of the tadpole, the opposite color. And so they constitute a unity. Behind this unity, is sometimes something represented by an empty circle. Which is called. Tai-Chi. The great ultimate. The word Chi refers to the ridgepole of a roof on which of course the two sides of a roof depend. On which they are propped together like the two sticks that I talk to you about which support one another. Take one away, the other collapses.

So underneath the whole philosophy of China there lies this recognition of the polarity of the universe. That the opposites go together or as Lao Tzu puts it in the second chapter of his book The doubt it. When all the world understands beauty to be beautiful there is already ugliness, when all the world understands goodness to be good there is already evil. For to be, and

not to be arise mutually. And this interesting Chinese remark. To be, also means to have. Not to be, and also means no, nothing. Arise mutually. And neither one is before that or after the other. They come into being together. And this has to do then with the yang this is yang and this is aeon.

So now when it comes to Taoism, this is a point of view. That becomes explicit in Chinese history. Probably in the neighborhood of four hundred B.C.. It used to be said that Lao Tzu, L-A-O T-Z-U was or was originally thought to have been a contemporary of Confucius who lived between six and five hundred B.C. But the general weight of scholarly opinion today is that the Lao Tzu book is about four hundred. And the book is called the Tao Te Ching. If there were an apostrophe after the T, you would pronounce it Tao, but if there is no apostrophe you pronounce it Dao, because our scholars made up a way of Roman eyes in Chinese which only they could read and they could have spelled it or do you know W. but they didn't want the laity to be initiated. The next word is done because again there's no apostrophe after the T. so it's pronounced and Jing there is no apostrophe after the C.H. So if there were, it will be pronounced changed but it's Jing, like a J.

And so Ching, in Chinese, means a classical book, a scripture. Tao is usually translated the way. But I would prefer to call it the course. The course of nature. And Te means virtue but in the sense that we use the word virtue when we say the healing virtue of a plant. It has a magical connotation, or a connotation of power and peculiar skill. Of Tao and Te, and it is written by Lao Tzu, which means the old boy. The legend, of course, is that Lao Tzu was the librarian of the Imperial Court. Who when he became an old man and sick of the intrigue of court life, decided to vanish into the mountains but he was detained at the city gate by the captain of the God who said 'We cannot lose you without your leaving behind some record of your wisdom.' And so he prevailed upon him to sit in his gate house and write down this book which is a very short look conical book. And it is divided into two main sections one about dower and one about the. He was followed in due course by a number of successes of which the most important is somebody called Chuang Tzu. And this man is really marvelous. He's one of the very few philosophers who have ever lived who is a great humorist.

And if you get the Modern Library edition of The Wisdom of Lao tzu, translated by Lin-Yutang, you will find in that lots of Chuang-Tzu, translated as a commentary on Lao Tzu. And he is really delightful, he's a delicious person to read. Because he has a kind of humor wherein he caricatures his own philosophy and takes it to observe extremes just for the joke of it. And he puts a lot of his philosophy into the mouth of Confucius just to confuse everyone. He's a really witty man and he, you must read him. So then, what I want to do is to discuss the main ideas of Lao Tzu, and of course naturally we have to start with Tao. This word in Chinese is made up of this part of the character here, is called the radical. And it means, it is connected with motion, going on and stopping, or rhythmic motion. On and off. And this other part of the character here means intelligence. So you've got intelligent motion, the course of nature. But the character also means to speak. And so it's rather like the Greek Logos.

The first verse of Lao Tzu's book starts out by saying something that you really can't translate so you have to see it in Chinese. It says Tao, and this character means can, can do, can be. Again Tao. The Tao which can be Tao. Not this character means regular or eternal now. And so we normally translate this the down which can be spoken is not the eternal Tao. It could mean also the way which can be wayed, traveled, is not the regular way. But in most commentators agree to the first translation. The Tao which can be described is not the eternal Tao. Then why go on to write a book about it. Well consistency is a virtue a small mind. So you have in the idea of Tao. The flow of life, the flow of events, the world considered as a stream. And water is very often used by Lao Tzu, to give the idea of Tao, because water always takes the line of least resistance. Water is very soft and yet one of the strongest things in the world. You can chop water with a sword but leave no wound. You can't squeeze it, you can't compress it. Wonderful stuff. Elsewhere he says, man at his birth is supple and tender but in death he is rigid and hard that's suppleness and tenderness are the marks of life and rigidity and hardness the marks of death. Tao is always gentle, you see, always yielding, it is feminine in a way. Lao Tzu says although you may be a male always have a certain feminine quality and thus he will become a universal channel that has particularly to be learned by men in the United States who tend to overcompensate masculine. To be ashamed of

gentleness, and to emphasize a kind of ra-ra-ra-ra attitude to life. Which usually indicates a fear of incipient homosexuality.

And as a result we have a lot of misunderstanding between men and women because each one is so busy being their particular sex that they have nothing in common. So this idea then, is the strength of gentleness. And of course, it is ultimately on this philosophy that the Japanese worked out the science of Judo. Do is the way the Japanese pronounce Tao. Ju means gentle, judo, the gentle way, whereby a strong man is alarmingly defeated by the use of his own strength against himself. And the analogy is of course of the pine tree in the willow tree. The pine tree is a muscle man. And when the snow piles up and piles up and becomes icy the pine tree branch cracks. But when the willow get snow on it, after a little while the branch drops and the snow falls off from the branch springs up again. That's Judo. They teach you in Japan a mysterious science called Aikido. Again do meaning Tao. Aikido is the inner or the esoteric aspect of Judo, and they can teach you for example to hold out your arm in such a way that no one can bend it. However strong. But it all depends on your not using effort to hold it out, you must not resist. There is a certain way of doing that.

So this Tao cannot be defined. That's basic. Just because it is the flow of nature, you can't capture it, you can't shut up wind in a box and expect it to be wind. You can't catch flowing water in a bucket because the minute it's in the bucket it's no longer flowing. Now Tao then is means what roughly what we would mean by the basic energy of the world. But there are two things to be said about it. And the first is that it is not a governing energy. Here we clearly come up against the principle or a concept of nature in which there is no government. This is an anarchic view of the universe. Not in the sense of chaos, but equally not in the sense of what we mean by order. The Tao does not rule Lao Tzu says, the great Tao flows everywhere, goes to the left and to the right it loves and nourishes all things but does not lord it over them. And when merits are accomplished that is good things are accomplished it lays no claim to them. In fact the Tao is always self-effacing, always disappears, always indefinable, always behind the scene. And so in a way the Lao Tzu's book is written as a manual of advice to rulers. And his idea of a good ruler, is one who is never in evidence. Do you know for example in Hindsale the name of your sanitation chief? I bet you

don't. These are very, very important officials. And Lao Tzu would advise the president of the United States to behave like the chief of sanitation. To be unobtrusive. And to generally leave things alone. Let things take their course. And not in the sense of—well it's like this, it's the difference between rowing and sailing. When you row, it's a relatively stupid method of propulsion, because you have to use effort. When you sail, you use the wind. But you don't have to go the way the wind is blowing you can tack. And tacking in so as to go in an opposite direction to the wind is the art of Taoism. Anyone who really understands sailing understands Lao Tzu. So the next thing is that the Tao has a kind of order, but it's not quite what we mean by order when we speak of order we usually tend to think of something symmetrical. Of something like a library you know, where all the shelves the rectangular. But the Chinese have a word for order, for the order of the universe. Which is this. They pronounce it Li. Now this sign has the original meaning of the markings in Jade, or the grain in wood. Or the fiber in muscle. So now, when you look at a cloud, or foam patterns, or at grain patterns in wood, you know for some reason or other that you're not looking at a mess. You're looking at something decidedly wiggly, but aesthetically pleasing. But you can't figure it out, there are no rules which it follows. This word it has been translated, the principle or rationale of nature almost the law of nature, but the Chinese have no word for the law of nature. They do have a word for law, the word Zu. And this word Zu. Was originally written and that represented a cauldron, an iron cauldron with a knife beside, it the scratching on the cauldron because in very distant times certain emperors had the laws of the land written on the sacrificial cauldrons to which the people brought offerings so that when they offered the sacrifices, they could read the laws. But certain sages said you should never do that, because if you write the laws down, people will develop a litigious spirit, and they will always be yakking over what it means, and therefore lawyers will have to define them are carefully, and then other lawyers will drive a carriage with six horses right through that, and then other lawyers must again define the laws more carefully. And that's the state we're in today, where we are utterly hamstrung by law.

So the Tao is described as being. Wu-Tzu means is this character non-Legal. The Tao is non legal in its nature but it is this it is Li and that means orderly in a way that cannot be defined. Just like your own nervous system

is certainly orderly but nobody has been able to figure out the principle of it. But you know it once, without being able to say how, the difference between Li, rigidity and Li, mess chaos. So what you might call. The best way of translating Li into English is to call it organic patterns. That's what it is. But we don't really know what that is because we are it we are organic patterns and just as we can't bite our own teeth we cannot define our own organization. We are it and that's all we need to be, because the teeth don't need to bite themselves, a sword doesn't need to cut itself, the sun doesn't need to illuminate self. So then this is the principle of Tao, but it is not law. If it were a law of course the Tao which could be spoken would be the eternal Tao. But it can't be uttered. So Tao then is the principle of nature. And in Chinese nature is called really spontaneity.

We use the word nature for the Chinese expression Tzu-Jan. Tzu-Jan, they pronounce J like a sort of unrolled R. I mean, that's the scholars, did this to confuse you. Tzu-Jan, means of itself so. Self-so. Almost our word automatic, except that automatic has a mechanical sense and this doesn't. When you have belly rumbles or hiccups, you don't intend to have them it happens of itself. In the same way, you don't intend to beat your heart, it happens of itself you didn't intend to get born it happened of itself this is done. And so this means nature died of the Japanese pronounce it Shizen is roughly when they point to all the things happening around us that's done and you see that Tzu-Jan that that which is so of itself implies no boss.

So in the same way they would look at the human body. Chuang-Tzu discusses the human body and says which organ do you prefer? And shows there is no chief organ. There could be an argument between the brain and the stomach. One school of thought would say, well obviously the stomach is the most important organ because that's where the food goes and is distributed to everywhere else. And stomachs came first. Then later, on the upper end of the input channel to the stomach there were evolved ganglia of nerves to enable the stomach better to scratch around for things to put into it, and therefore the brain serves the stomach. The other school of thought would say, well no, it isn't that things which come first are necessarily the most important. The stomach is to the brain as John the Baptist was to Jesus. The stomach is there but to nourish the brain, the stomach is the servant of the brain, which is of course preoccupied with higher things that we call culture.

But you see both arguments will stand up and both will fail. Because the stomach and the brain have a mutuality between each other, they arise mutually. And there is no way of deciding which of the major organs of the body is top dog, because the body is a sort of democracy. In which, by mutual cooperation things happen without any preconceived plan. We think in the West that the order of nature has a plan underneath it. That there was, as it were, the original blueprint in the mind of God. Which is the logos, the Second Person of the Trinity. But the Chinese don't think that way. They would agree with a limerick—well I mean they wouldn't—but they would agree with the humor of it there was a young man who said 'Damn it certainly seems that I am a creature that moves indeterminate grooves I'm not even a bus I'm a tram.' But the Chinese do not think of any rails laid down as it were, or rules laid down upon which nature has to travel. They think simply that it organizes itself. But doesn't know how. Again we're back to the centipede which manages one hundred legs without thinking because thinking would embarrass it. That sort of thing is called in Chinese, putting legs on a snake, you see, a snake needs no legs. And explaining the universe by a governor who dominates it is called legs on a snake. It's like saying we have an instinct to do this that and the other. When people talk about instincts watch out, they're invoking ghosts. When we say we have an instinct to survive, it means simply, that we do survive in fact until we don't. And if you want to explain the curious fact that people seem to want to survive you call it an instinct to survive. And this is learned gobbledygook there was a time sometimes when you showed a physician or a scientist some peculiar thing which he didn't understand, he would look at it, put on his spectacles examine it and various points of view and make a few notes and then say it is Eleusis Natori. And it was a wonderful in those what it is Eleusis Natori, but it means it is a game of nature. A freak. And you will find that many many medical people practice this sort of gobbledygook you have a pain this. It's neuritis. It means simply that neuritis means your nerves hurt.

So, it's always good to translate medical language back into English and you begin to get some idea of what's happening. Now the next thing to take up is the word Te. And as I said this means virtue, power, sometimes magic. When we say a person is a virtuoso. We have something of the meaning of Te in it. Marvelous accomplishment. And in opening the section under Lao

Tzu says superior virtue is not virtue and thus is virtue inferior virtue cannot let go of virtue and thus is not virtue. Or we might say, a person who really has virtue is not striving for virtue, and thus really has it. A person of inferior virtue is so trying to be virtuous that is not virtuous in other words when the person is trying and striving for virtue he is being self-conscious and artificial and we say well so and so is very good, but he is the rather forced. Isn't he a bit phony. And it's so often the case that people who are reputedly very virtuous are very boring. You'll feel that sometimes people are so good that you are sitting on the edge of your chair in their presence and that you can't relax with them or let your hair down, because they are full of judgment and disapproval. Because they're always judging and disapproving of themselves. A really virtuous person doesn't show his virtue. He is like, well there's a poem in Chinese which says, entering the forest he doesn't disturb a blade of grass, entering the water he doesn't make a ripple. He looks very ordinary. And so his virtue can't be detected. He doesn't stink of that virtue. So Te then, is the virtue. Of the great artist, say, or craftsman, who creates marvelous works of art but, always as if he was making no effort. And so we say of great art that it's, artless. That it seems to come naturally. That he does it as if he were falling off a log. Now of course we know that it isn't that simple. But nevertheless it does seem to be.

So what everybody wants to know then is how to acquire that great naturalness in everything. So that we in our human lives manifest the Tao. Tao manifested through man is Te. How do you do it? So the transitional word, which shows The Way from to realize Te in one's life. (I don't need to write the character again because it's already here.) And then this is pronounced Wu and and this one is wei. Wu-Wei. Wu-Wei means to act, to strain, to strive, or to interfere. And so the Taoist manner of life is wu-wei. Don't force it. Always go with the stream. You may need to use a rudder, but don't ever go against the stream. If you are swimming, and you're caught in a very strong current, you will be lost if you try to swim against it you miss swim with it an edge to the side. That's Wu-Wei. This is been very well understood, even by the samurai in Japan. Who when they became very great real masters of swordsmanship. Always found out and belong to the no-sword school. Because the real master of the sword never uses one.

There is a story. That there were in Japan in ancient times two master swordsmen. And there was a great debate as to which of them was the better. So some soldiers took a sword made by each master and decided to test them out. They first took a sword made by the man who in general opinion was perhaps a little inferior. And they went to a stream, and they dipped the sword in the stream with the edge of the blade facing upstream, they dropped a piece of paper on the stream. And it floated towards the sword, and as it floated the sword simply divided it into two pieces of paper joined together on the other side and went on down the stream. They then took the blade of the man reputed perhaps to be the greatest master and thought well they'll be pretty difficult to improve on that. But we'll try it anyway, so they gave the same test. But as the piece of paper approached the sword, it moved over to one side skirted it altogether and went on. So the true master will never have to be in a fight. And for that reason Aikido, as an athletic technique, is learning how to be unattackable. Is to always avoid the fight. And so however hard people strike at you, they will always be hitting the air. That Te, you see, that's a magical power. But it all comes about through not using effort, not straining, at anything, never straining, like you never force a key in a lock you just bend the key you jiggle and jiggle and jiggle until it turns smoothly. Or put oil on it, or something, but never force it. Same way, when you use your eyes don't stare at anything in order to see it clearly, because you'll just tie your eyes and make the image fuzzy. If you want to see the time on a distant clock. You close your eyes, you imagine black and relax your eyes, then look at the clock lazily, and you'll see that the detail is clearer.

So when you sing, you mustn't force your voice. Once upon a time, a great choirmaster was in the presence of William Temple, one time Archbishop of Canterbury, teaching a group of slum children how to sing. And he asked them first the singing some song with which they were all familiar and wanting to impress the archbishop. They sang it very lastly in a fast way and it sounded terrible. Now he said I want to show you something. There was present on this occasion a trained choir. And he said now we're going to sing with this choir a song you people don't know. But listen to it and the choir sang it very professionally. The choir master then turned to the group and said now look. When you sing this song, the one thing you must not do is to try to sing it. You just think of the tune and let it sing itself. And they

sang and did it very well. And he turned to the archbishop from whom I had the tale, and said that's good theology isn't it your grace.

Now that's Taoism, that's Wu-wei. And so now there's another story with which I will exemplify this. A later than Lao-Tzu there was another Taoist sage called Ye-Tzu. And he had the reputation of being able to ride on the wind. Of course that's metaphorical. We say walking on air. Walking on air, never a care, something is making me sing. And so when Suzuki was asked what it's like to have the experience of Satori or enlightenment, he once said It is like ordinary everyday experience except it's about two inches off the ground. Where you don't feel burdened by your own body, you don't feel you were something that you have to lug around and hold a club over and generally boss. So the sense of lightness, that's the meaning of being able to walk on the air. But he told a story of how he managed to do it. He said he went to a great guru. And this guru paid no attention to him. So he just sat outside the door of his hut. And a year went by, and still this man paid no attention to Ye-Tzu went away disgusted. But then he thought it over a bit and realized this man had a terrific reputation and that if perhaps he'd been a little bit more patient. He would have had some teaching. So he went back. And the great sage looked at him and said, 'Why this ceaseless coming and going?' So he sat down again at the entrance of the heart and for a further year attempted to control his mind in such a way as never to think of profit or loss or advantage or disadvantage. And then at the end of that year, the teacher looked at him.

For another year he practiced, and at the end of that the teacher invited him to come in the hut and sit on the mat. Then for the next year however, he did something quite different, and he says this. I let my eyes see whatever they wanted to look at. I let my ears hear whatever they wanted to hear. I let my mouth say whatever it wanted to say and I let my mind think whatever it wanted to think. And at the end of that year I didn't know what was subject and what was object. I didn't take any account of time. I was riding on the wind but I didn't really know whether the wind was riding on me or I was riding on the wind. And this was when he got to float, you see. But seeing as how what he did he finally did. He allowed democracy to prevail. He said to his eyes, I'm not going to try and control you. You know how better how to see than I do to his ears I'm not going to force you to listen to

anything you know how to hear better than I can direct you and so on to everything he trusts his own brain he trusted his own organism. And so this is wu-wei. So in exactly the same way if you practice meditation. Don't try to meditate like the choir was told not to try to sing, don't force it. When you meditate let your lungs breathe the way they want to breathe. Let your mind think anything it wants to think about. Don't try to repress thoughts. Let your eyes see whatever they're looking at. And let your ears, your ear drums vibrate to any oscillations there may be in the air. Let go. You think that's very risky. It isn't. It really isn't. It's like a ship in a typhoon, they always shut the engines off, and drift. Because if the propellers are going and the tail end of the ship is thrown up so as to be above the water level, the whole ship will vibrate and be shaken to pieces by those revolving propellers. So in a big storm, and life is a big storm all the time, you let it go and you become like a cork on the water or a ping pong ball in a mountain stream.

So that's that's the art of Taoism. That's the whole thing, that's wu-wei. Chuang-Tzu has the funniest tales about this. He often says 'People who are trying to help things along are a nuisance.' All the Do-gooders. He has a conversation between Lao-Tzu and Confucius in which Confucius is prating about charity and duty to one's neighbor. And Lao Tzu to him this is nonsense he is just binding things on to people putting burdens on them with charity and duty to one's neighbor. He says to Confucius look now at the universe. The trees grow up words without exception. The stars always follow their courses and the migrating birds of the various seasons always cluster with complete regularity, but they don't say anything, they don't have any religion. And your idea of eliminating yourself is a positive manifestation of self. You have brought much confusion to the kingdom, because you are like one who beats a drum in search of a fugitive. Or we would say like the police driving to a raid with their sirens on. And of course when the fugitive hears the drums he conceals himself and so when you sound all sorts of drums and promise to be virtuous and make resolutions to be virtuous, you're in for trouble. Because the devil hears you coming.

Now this is something that's very important. There is a Zen story which describes a woodcutter working in the forest chopping down trees. And he

suddenly noticed in a bush over there an animal that was watching him and this animal is a Satori animal. And he thought I'm going to get that animal for lunch. But the animal could read his thoughts. And the animal said to him 'You think you're going to catch me don't you?' And the woodsman looked around in the made for it, and the animal vanished. And then appeared at the opposite end of the clearing laughing, saying 'You can't catch me.' He thought the next time I see that animal I'm going to move to the opposite end of the clearing from which it appears get it that way. And the animal said you're thinking to aren't you to go to the opposite side of the clearing for me to see me. And for a while the man tried by going in various directions with his axe to catch this animal all to no avail. He got disgusted and went back to chopping the tree. And the animal laughed at him again and said 'So you've given up.' And just that moment. The axe head flew off the axe. And killed the animal. You see. He had to get it without intention to do so. That's what's called purposelessness and Taoism which is a form of wu-wei. And Taoist texts says, 'When purpose has been used to achieve purposelessness,' the point has been grasped.

So it's the same problem we have in India you know there's a superstition that if you think of a monkey while you're taking medicine the medicine won't work. So you are in the predicament of trying not to think of the monkey while taking medicine. And that happens to us whenever we try to be natural. Everybody can see it's it's forced, it's faked. And so you think then, ,how can I be genuinely natural. How can I really slow with the course of nature? How can I let my mind think whatever it wants to think? Because the moment I start doing that I realize I'm doing it with an ulterior motive. I'm trying to meditate, I'm trying to grow spiritually. And that ruins the whole thing.

Well, when you've tried for a long time to get the right attitude, and you find that all the attitudes you get are phony ones, then you come to the realisation there's nothing you can do about it, it really doesn't make any difference. And again the principle that I've emphasized all along you give up. And in so, doing gain the strength and energy that you were looking for. You see it's like trying to live in the present. Gurdjieff used to set his students the exercise he called Self- Remembering. That is constantly, all day long, be completely aware of what you're doing. Has your mind always

on the immediate moment. When it's tough, tough, tough, tough to do that you get distracted all. To one fine day you realize to your astonishment there is no way. At all of having your mind anywhere else but in the present moment. Because even when you think about the past or the future you're doing it now aren't you? And that results in a very curious transformation of consciousness. You feel that you are that the present moment is flowing along and carrying you with it all the time just like the flow of the Tao the flow of the Tao is as it what we would call the flow of the present. And you're with it, there's nowhere being anywhere else the journey on the boat called or the unwobbling pivot says the doll is that from which one cannot deviate. That from which one can deviate is not the Tao. Or to put it into the form of a Zen story, the Master Jo-Shu said to Nanzen and 'What is the Tao?' Nanzen replied, 'Your everyday mind is the Tao.' Jo-Shu asked, 'How do you get into accord with it?' Nanzen replied 'When you try to accord you deviate.' So, that's the principle, and this, although we're again in the paradox, you see this sounds like a completely laissez faire, spineless attitude to life but it is precisely Taoism which underlies in common with Buddhism in conjunction with Buddhism it underlies the greatest achievements of Chinese art and culture. It underlies judo, it underlies the Zen arts of Japan, calligraphy, architecture, gardens. It is the form of Chinese philosophy which in subsequent years became most interested in science and in the study of nature. The Confucians never had any interest in science because they were bookish people. They were all absorbed in texts. They were essentially scholastics. And never open the book of nature. But the Taoists were always observing natural phenomena, how they worked. They were interested above all in manual skills. And using the Tao to perfect manual skills. And therefore these lazy people achieved the most interesting results, because they were like water, which is lazy and always seeks the line of least resistance. But that is almost the same thing as intelligent.

Way of Liberation

When I was a small boy I used to haunt that section of London around the British Museum, and one day I came across a shop which had a notice over the window which said 'Philosophical Instruments'. Even as a boy I knew something about philosophy, but I couldn't imagine what philosophical

instruments could be. So I went up to the window and there are displayed where chronometers, slide rules, scales, and all kinds of what we would now call scientific instruments. Because science used to be called natural philosophy. Because as Aristotle says 'The Beginning of Philosophy is wonder.' Philosophy is man's expression of curiosity about everything, his attempt to make sense of the world primarily through his intellect. That is to say, his faculty for thinking. And thinking, of course, is a word used in extremely many ways and is a very vague word for most people but I use the word thinking now in here after you must understand this in a very precise way. By thinking, as distinct from feeling, or emoting or sensing, I mean the manipulation of symbols, whether they be words, whether they be numbers, or whether they be other such signs as say a triangle, squares, circles, astrological signs or whatever. These are symbols. Sometimes a symbol is a little bit more concrete and less abstract than that as when you get a mythological symbol, like a dragon. But all these things are symbols in the manipulation of symbols to represent events going on in the real world is what I call thinking.

So, philosophy in the Western sense, means generally and exercise of the intellect, and the manipulation of symbols is very largely until we come to poetry and music, an exercise of the intellect. But what philosophy has become today in the academic world is something extremely restricted. By and large in the academic world of both the United States and England, Germany, France to some extent, philosophy is falling into two other disciplines mathematical logic on the one hand, and linguistics on the other. And the departments of philosophy throughout the academic world have bent over backwards to be as scientific as possible as William who was Professor of Philosophy at Northwestern University said in an essay called Notes on the death of a culture, that an academic philosopher today must above all things avoid being edifying. He must never stoop to lying awake nights considering problems of the nature of the universe in the destiny of man because these have largely been dismissed as metaphysical or meaningless questions, so unworthy of a scientific philosopher who arrives at his office at nine o'clock in the morning dressed in a business suit carrying a briefcase and does philosophy until five in the afternoon at which point he goes over to cocktails and dinner, and dismisses the whole matter from his head and William Earl adds, 'He would wear a white coat to work

if you could get away with it.' This is of course a little exaggerated, but this by and large is what departmental academic philosophy has become, and Oriental philosophy is simply not philosophy in that sense.

These things Hinduism, Buddhism and so on, are sometimes also called religions. And I question the application of that word to them. Because I like to use the word religion rather strictly. I'm not going to be so bold as to venture a definition of religion which is supposed to be true for all time all I can do is to tell you how I use the word religion and I want to use it in an exact sense from its Latin root, which really means a bond or rule of life. And therefore, the most correct use of the word religion is when we say of a man or woman that he or she has gone into religion, that is to say has joined a religious or Monastic order, and is living under a rule of life living a life of obedience. For religion if Christianity is a religion, if Judaism is a religion, if Islam is a religion, they are based on the idea of man's obedient response to a divine revelation. And thus religion as we understand it in these three forms of religion consist really of three things. We will call them the three C's. The Creed, the code, and the cult. The creed is the divinely revealed map of the universe. The nature of things, the revelation of the existence of God, of our Allah or Yahweh, or as we say God. And his existence and his will and his design of the universe, the creed. To this we add, the second C, the code. The divinely revealed law, or exemplar, which man is supposed to follow. In the case of Christianity there's a certain variation in this because the principal revelation of the code aspect of things in Christianity as well as the cult is not so much a law as a person. God is said in Christianity to be supremely revealed in the historic Jesus of Nazareth. And so the code here becomes really, the following of Jesus of Nazareth. Not so much in a obedience to a law as through the power of divine grace. Then finally the cult. This is the divinely revealed method or way of worship so that man relates himself to God by prayers, by rights and by sacraments, which in these particular religions are not supposed to be so much man's way of worshipping God as God's way of loving himself, in which man is involved. So in the Christian religion, say in the mass, we would say that we worship God with God's own worship following the saying of Meister Eckhart, that great German mystic, "The love with which I love God is the same love wherewith God loves me." So too in the when monks in a monastery recites the divine office, using the Psalms as the basis

of it the Psalms are supposed to be the songs of the Holy Spirit and so when using the Psalms The idea is that you worship God with God's own words, and thereby become a sort of flute through which the divine breath plays.

Now, neither Hinduism, Buddhism nor Taoism can possibly be called religions in this sense. Because all three of them significantly lack the virtue of obedience. They do not conceive the Godhead as related to mankind or to the universe in a monarchical sense. For you see, there are various models of the universe which men have used from time to time. And the model which lies behind the Judeo-Christian tradition, if there really is such a thing, is a political model. It is based on, it is a kind of using the metaphor, of the relation of an ancient neareastern monarch to his subjects. And he imposes his austerity and his will upon his subjects from above by power, whether it be physical power or spiritual power. And so it is thus that in the say the Anglican Church when the priest that morning prayer addresses the throne of grace he says 'Almighty and everlasting God, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, the only ruler of princes, who does from the throne behold all that well as upon earth most heartily we deceived the with favor to behold, our sovereign Majesty Elizabeth the Queen and all the royal family.'

Now, what are these words? This is the language of court flattery. And the title King of kings, as a title of God, was borrowed from the Persian Empress. The Cyrus of Persia, the kyros, hence kurieos. Lord have mercy upon us is a kind of image drawn from things earthly and applied to things heavenly. God as the monarch, and therefore between the monarch and the subject there is a certain essential difference of kind. What we might call an ontological difference. So that God is God. And all those creatures whether angels or men or other kinds of existence which God has created are not God. There is this vast metaphysical Gulf lying between the two domains. That gives us as citizens of the United States some problems, because as a citizen of the United States, you have believed and do believe that a republic is the best form of government. How can this be maintained if the government of the universe is a monarchy? For surely in that case a monarchy will be the best form of government. And many of the conflicts in our society arise from the fact, that although we are running a republic many of the members of this republic believe all believe that they ought to

believe, that the universe is a monarchy. And therefore, they are above all insistent upon obedience to law and order. If there should be democracy in the kingdom of God, that would seem to them the most subversive idea ever conceived. Now I'm exaggerating the standpoint a little bit just for effect, because there are some subtle modifications which one can introduce theologically, but I won't go into them at the moment.

Now there are at least two other models of the universe which have been highly influential in human history. One is dramatic. Where God is not the skillful maker of the world standing above it as its artificer and King. But where God is the actor of the world as an actor of a stage play. The actor who is playing all the parts at once. And this is essentially the Hindu model of the universe. Everybody is God in a mask. And of course, as you know, our own word person, is from the Latin persona. That through which comes sound. And this word was used for the masks worn by actors in the Graeco-Roman theater which being an open air theater required a projection of the voice so the actors wore masks with megaphonic mouths. And so the word person, has however in the course of time come to mean the real you. There was a very serious mistake made in translation from Greek to Latin, when one began to talk about the three persons of the Holy Trinity. The three Masks of God wasn't quite the right idea, because the Greek word was apostosis, says not prosopon a word in which would have meant properly translated person, apostosis is a very difficult word to translate. You could say that ice, water and steam were three 'apostosises' of the same thing. And that would be a little better analogy,[but] not too good.

But in Hindu thought, every individual as a person is a mask, but fundamentally a mask of the Godhead. A mask of a Godhead, who although the actor behind all parts, the player of all games, is indefinable for the same reason that you can't bite your own teeth. For the same reason that you can't look straight into your own eyes. You can never get at it, because it's the middle of everything. The circle whose center is everywhere, and whose circumference is nowhere. Then a third model of the universe, which is characteristically Chinese, is that the world is an organism. And the world which is an organism has no boss. Even no actor. Because you see in any organism. There isn't really a boss or top organ. We are accustomed of course in our culture to think of our heads as ruling the rest of the body, but

there could well be an argument about this. I'm going to put up a case that the stomach is chief. Because the stomach, the sort of alimentary tract with a digesting process in it, is surely anterior to brains. There may be some sort of rudimentary nervous system attached to a stomach organization, but it's the the the more primitive you get the more you get a little creature that eats, see, it's a sort of tube and then go things at one end and out the other. And that because that way as the tube out the tube finds means of reproducing itself to make more tubes so that this process of in and out can be kept up but in the course of evolution, at one end of the tube is developed a ganglion which eventually develops eyes and ears and has a brain in it the better to scrounge around for food. And so the stomach point of view is, that the brain is the servant of the stomach to help it scrounge around for food.

But the other argument is this: true, the brain is a later development than the alimentary tract but the alimentary tract is to the brain as John the Baptist to Jesus Christ the forerunner of the big event and the reason for all this scrounging around and stomach and stuff is eventually to evolve a brain. And man shall eventually live primarily for the concerns of the brain, that is, for art and science and all forms of culture and the stomach will be servant. Now cynical people, like dialectical materialists say that's a lot of hogwash, it's really all history is a matter of economics and that's a matter of the stomach. It's a big argument and you can't decide it because you can't at this stage have a stomach without a brain or a brain without a stomach. They go together like a back in the front. So the principle of organism is rather like this: an organism is a system of—a differentiated system—but it has no parts. That is to say the heart is not a part of the body in the sense that a distributor is part of an automobile engine. Because all those surgeons are trying to treat the body as a machine with replaceable parts but the difficulty is. That these are not parts in the sense that they are screwed in, in other words when the fetus arises in the womb the mechanics in there of were lugging in the hearts and stomachs and things and fitting them together and screwing them to each other. An organism develops like a crystal in solution, or a photographic plate in chemicals it develops all over at once. And there isn't a boss in it. Because all of them act together in a strange way. It's a kind of orderly anarchy. And this is the Chinese view of the world fundamentally. This principle of organic growth they call Tao.

That's pronounced 'dow,' if it had an apostrophe after it, it would be pronounced Tao, but 'dow' is more or less the right pronunciation for that word. This Chinese word is usually translated the course of nature, the way. The way it does it. The process of things. And that again you see is really very different from the Western idea of God the ruler of the Tao, Lao Tzu says the great Tao flows everywhere, both to the left and to the right. It loves and nourishes all things but does not lord it over them, and when merits are accomplished it lays no claim to them. And so the Chinese expression for nature becomes a word which we will translate some so on. You know on what happens of itself like when you have hiccups. You don't plan to have hiccups it just happens. When your heart beats, you don't plan it it happens of itself. When you breathe, you can pretend that you are breathing but most of the time you're not thinking about it and your lungs breathe of themselves so the whole idea of nature is something happening of itself without a governor. Is the organic theory of the world so you see we have these two others that we're going to consider in this course on oriental philosophy the dramatic theory and the organic theory.

And therefore I feel that the ways of life which use these models are so unlike Christianity, Judaism or Islam that we cannot really use the word religion of these things. Now what is there in western culture that resembles the concerns of Buddhism and Hinduism and Taoism. Because the trouble is from the outside they look alike. In other words, you go into a Hindu temple or especially a Japanese Buddhist temple, and you'll be pretty convinced you're in church. In sort of a Catholic church, at that, of course there's incense chants, bowings, gongs candles, rosaries and all the things that one associates with a theistic monarchical religion. And yet that isn't what's going on. There isn't the factor of obedience. Even though the image of God or maybe sitting on a throne covered with a canopy and royal honors being done. There's still something different.

Well I suppose that a long shot probably the nearest thing to these ways of life in the West is perhaps psychotherapy in some form. Not all forms of psychotherapy. Because the objective of psychotherapy is as you might say, to change where your head's at. Is to change your state of consciousness. If you in other words you are horribly depressed, if you're terrified if you're under hallucinations you see a head shrinker. And he tries to change your

state of consciousness. And so fundamentally these disciplines, these oriental ways, are concerned basically with changing your state of consciousness. Only here we part company. Psychotherapy is largely focused on the problems of the individual as such. The problems peculiar to this individual or that individual. These Asian ways of life are focused on certain problems peculiar to every individual. On the understanding. That the average human being, and the more civilized he is the more this is true. That the average human being is hallucinating. That he has a delusive sense of his own existence. And it is thus that the very word Buddha, in Buddhism, is from a root in Sanskrit word Budh, which means to awake. To awaken. To awaken from the illusion is then to undergo a radical change of consciousness with regard to one's own existence. It is to cease being under the impression that you would just poor little me. To find out who you really are, or what you really are, behind the Mask.

But we saw, didn't we, you can never get to see what the Self is basically. It's always forever elusive. And so if I ask you. Who are you really? And you say 'Well I'm I'm I'm John Doe.' You think so. John Doe tell me, How do you happen to have blue eyes? Well he says 'I don't know, I didn't make my eyes.' Oh you didn't? Who else? Well I have no idea how it's done. Do you have to have an idea how it's done to be able to do it? After all you can open and close your hand perfectly easily. And you say I know how to open my hand and I know how to close my hand, because I can do it but how do you do. 'I don't know I'm not a physiologist.' Well, a physiologist says he knows how he doesn't become good any better than you can. So you are opening and closing your hand not you you don't know how you do it maybe you blue-ing your eyes, too. You don't know how you do it. Because when you say 'I don't know how I do it,' all you are saying is I do know how to do it but I can't put it into words. I cannot in other words translate the activity it galled opening and closing my hand into an exact system of symbols into thinking. That's all. And actually a to translate the opening and closing of your hand into an exact system of symbols would take forever. Because trying to understand the world purely by thinking about it is as clumsy a process as trying to drink the Pacific Ocean out of a pint beer mug. You can only take it one mug at a time. And so when thinking about things you can only think one thought at a time when after another in series thinking is a linear process, like writing. One thought after another as we

say you can only think of one thing at a time. But that's too slow for understanding anything at all much to slow. And our sensory input. Is much more than any kind of one thing at a time, and we respond with a certain aspect of our minds, to the total sensory input that's coming in. Only if we are not consciously aware of it, but nevertheless you're doing it but what kind of you is this certainly isn't John Doe and that little ego freak. So there's something a lot more to you than you think there is. And that's why the Hindu would say that the real you. Is the self, capital S. The Self of the universe. Because at that level of one's existence one is not really separate from everything else that's going on.

So you see, we have something here which I will call not philosophy, except in the most ancient sense of basic curiosity. I prefer to call these disciplines ways of liberation. Ways of liberation from Maya. And the following of them does not depend on believing in anything, in obeying anything, or on doing any specific rituals although rituals are included for certain purposes. It is a purely experimental approach to life. It is something like a person who say has defective eyesight and is seeing spots and all sorts of illusions. Going to an ophthalmologist to correct his vision. Buddhism is therefore basically a correction of psychic vision. To be disentranced by the game of Maya. Not incidentally, to regard the Maya as something evil, but as a good thing of which one can have too much. And therefore get spiritual and psychic indigestion, from which we all suffer.

On Yoga

I have been emphasizing all along, that the central core of the kinds of Oriental Philosophy that we are talking about is not theory but experience. And the trouble here is that so long as one attempts to communicate this philosophy in words, we remain in the area of theory and do not necessarily transfer over into experience. It is then for this reason that in addition to the scriptures or verbal teachings of Hinduism, there is a discipline whose object is to enable an individual to realize what the words are about. I would use so strong a word for Realization as sensation, because the Realization of the *tat tvam asi*, the Upanishadic proposition that you're it., comes over you if you do have the experience not so much as you feel convinced that the earth goes around the sun, even though you don't

actually see this happen. It's not so much like that as it is like an immediate sensation of the thing which the proposition *tat tvam asi* is trying to say. And so this entering into the experience which is the heart of Hinduism is the function of a discipline called Yoga. The word yoga. Y-O-G-A. Don't say, as many people do *yogi*. *Yogi* is one who practices. And a *yogini* is a female practice of yoga. But yoga is the same word as yoke, Latin *ungere*, to join. And English, union. The yolk between two oxen may be regarded equally as a discipline and as a joining of the two oxen.

So the basic meaning of yoga is something like Union. The realization, in other words, of the union of what we call the separate individual with the ultimate ground of being, Brahman. We don't know how early yoga is in India, but there are statues found in Mohenjo-daro in the Indus Valley dating from at least two thousand B.C.. of figurines in the posture familiarly associated with yoga. The *Padmasana*, or the full lotus posture, in which all almost all Buddhas are seen to be sitting, with the legs crossed, and these feet up on the thighs, soles upwards. It apparently then is something quite ancient, and was in some way absorbed and assimilated to the Aryan civilization which invaded India from the north somewhere between fifteen and twelve hundred B.C.. Yoga was apparently like everything else in those days, handed down as an oral tradition, and was not committed to any kind of written record, until there appeared a book called *The Yoga Sutra*. *Sutra* really means thread, but I suppose through the idea of threaded leaves – ancient manuscripts in India were written on palm leaves – came to mean the scripture or book Sacred Book. And the *Yoga Sutra* is associated with a gentleman named Patanjali. P. A T. A N. J A L I. And is of uncertain date. It may be as early as two hundred B.C. It may be a bit later. But this is the standard text on the practice of yoga.

There are Chinese forms of yoga which probably originated independently at the same time out of the Taoist way of life, and they subsequently had considerable influence on India as did the Indian ways on the Chinese. Now it's important to study the *Yoga Sutra* from its opening, or second to opening phrases second verse. His first verse says now yoga is explained. And the commentators attach particular importance to the word 'now.' Because the assumption is that something else has gone before all. In other words, you are expected to be a reasonably sensible rational mature human

being before you engage on this particular path. In the same way as I pointed out to you in the last session. That the Hindus have the view that a man should fulfill the duties of the householder before he engages upon the spiritual life. So in the same way, there are certain preparations before you start out on yoga. And those preparations usually involve having mastered whatever the disciplines of your culture may be. The essential disciplines of your culture, so that you know how to handle them, so that if you get into the higher states of consciousness which yoga brings about you won't run amok. Because not being able to distinguish between good and bad from a social point of view. The next verse says, in Sanskrit, I'll write it down because it's, important to look at each word. Yoga-citta-riti-miroba. This means yoga is. Chitta is a very difficult word translated into English because in Sanskrit there are about five words for mind. There are one. Or we have nine we have consciousness we have awareness, thought, but they're all very vaguely defined and we use them interchangeably Citta is a more precise word. And I would say awareness. Probably. Griti means to come from a root which means to turn. Turn around. And so you get the idea of turbulence. Vicious circling, whirl-pooling, wavering. Anyway going round and round and round. So your goodness awareness. Turbulence. Stopping. There it is, all in one sentence. You can take this sort of analogy which is used by yoga teachers. Take it that awareness is something like a pool. Of water. When the water is quite still, you can see in it the reflection of the sky, and everything in the bottom of the pool. When it's muddy and turbulent, you can't. So in the same way, your awareness of the world is like reflecting pool and if it's turbulent. You don't see clearly you're not clearly aware you don't have a mind like a mirror. You have a mind like a distorting mirror, which keeps wiggling.

So, yoga then is the art of stilling the mind. There are various schools of thought about what is a still mind is. According to one school of thought, the goal of yoga, is Samadhi. Well, everybody agrees that Samadhi is what it's all about. What is this word Samadhi? It refers to a state of consciousness which is sam. Don't say san, that's different. Sam, related to our word sum. From the Latin, eventually Sanskrit sam. Complete. Total. Also related to the word same. Looking on everything equally, having an equal mind towards all events, Samarasa. In Sanskrit, equanimity, calmness. Having as it were the same attitude in victory and defeat. Also same, in the

sense of the knower and the known are the same. There is no further division between myself on the one now, and what I'm aware of on the other. It's all one. Samadhi.

In yoga, there are differentiated differentiated two kinds of samadhi. One is called the vikalpa. And the other is called nirvikalpa. The word vikalpa means an idea or concept. So it could be samadhi with an idea of some kind of concept. Nirvikalpa would mean without a concept, or somebody produced by way of the gimmick. The technique and the ideal somebody. Look ma no hands. No gimmick. But some schools, as I was saying, there are different opinions about what this all means. Interpret nirvikalpa samadhi as being a state in which there are is such a degree of absorption, or of trance, that there is no awareness left of the physical world. You are completely, well if a psychologist looked at you he would say you were catatonic. Sitting in that posture, immobile absorbed rat. And this is held by one school of thought to be the highest attainment of the human mind. I don't agree with this point of view. I follow another school of thought, which has a different idea of Nirvikalpa samadhi. And this, in my view and that of others, it is not the total sensation of sensory input, but simply the sense at the cessation of conceptions. Of thoughts about what you are experiencing. And therefore that the meaning of citta, vridi, naroda. Is not as the other school interprets it getting a perfectly blank mind. But it means two things, in my interpretation: one, a mind that is not going in vicious circle, and two, the mind free from the hypnotic influence exercised by thoughts, ideas, words.

So then let's consider first of all what is a mind in the group of vicious circles. Well one of the most obvious instances that we all know is the phenomenon of worry. The doctor tells you that you have to have an operation. And that has been set up so that automatically everybody worries about it. But since worrying takes away your appetite and your sleep, it's not good for you. So the doctor tells you not to worry because he wants you on the operating table in a state of good health. Well rested, etc. But you can't stop worrying, and therefore you get additionally worried that you are wearing, and therefore will not be in the right shape to be on the operating table. And then furthermore, because that is quite absurd and you are mad at yourself because you do it you are worried because you worry because you

worry. That is a vicious circle. Another form a vicious circle is when a person is convinced that they ought to be unselfish. And are so convinced for selfish reasons. I would like to think of myself as an unselfish person. Because that sort of person I'm supposed to be. So therefore, I have a selfish reason for wanting to be unselfish and because of that no amount of effort will ever succeed in making me unselfish but will only succeed in sending me around in circles. I'll be proud that I'm humbled. Etcetra. That is citta vriti, pretty turnings of the mind, see.

So now, yoga is initially stopping that. Can you allow your mind to be quiet? Isn't it difficult? Because the mind seems to be like a monkey jumping up and down and jabbering all the time once you've learned to think you can't stop. And an enormous number of people. Devote their lives to keeping their minds busy. And feel extremely uncomfortable with science. When you're alone., say in a doctor's waiting room, which may be very uninteresting. Nobody saying anything, there's nothing to do. This is good this worry this lack of distraction I'm left alone with myself and I want to get away from myself I'm always wanting to get away from myself that's why I go to the movies that's why I read mystery stories, that's why I go after the girls or anything that you do or get drunk or whatever I don't want to be with myself. I feel queer feel like you know it is when you run your fingernails up a blackout on a cold. Creepy.

So well, why do you want to run away from yourself? What's so bad about it? Why do you want to get this, why you want to become absorbed? Because you are addicted to thoughts. This is a drug will dangerous one. Compulsive thinking going on and on and on all the time. It's a habit. Cause you keep telling yourself where you are, who you are, what's going on, how good it is, how bad it is. Reading the newspaper of your mind you know a lot of people they get hold of a newspaper and the newspaper reads them they don't read it. Newspapers designed to read you type of rivers the layout people very carefully calculated how to carry your eye from one end of it to another. So there's a difficulty about stopping. That activity and you really have to stop it if you want to be sane. Because, if I talk all the time, I don't hear what anyone else has to say. And then I'll end up in the situation of having nothing to talk about that my own talking. Or so, in exactly the same way, if I think all the time, I won't have anything to think about

except thoughts. And that's the academic fallacy. See when you add words to the library, the great many of the books that are added to the library of books about books. They're not necessarily books about life, some of them are, but most of the books especially Ph D. dissertations are books about books about books about books. And that doesn't really get us very far.

So in order to have something to think about, there are times when you simply must stop thinking. You can learn later on in yoga. How to be in the state of samadhi and think at the same time. But first of all you have to learn how to stop thinking. Well how do do that? The first rule is don't try to, because if you do, you will be like someone trying to make rough water smooth with a flat iron. And all that will do will stir it up. So, in the same way as a muddy turbulent pool quiets itself when left alone. You have to know how to leave your mind alone. It will quiet itself.

There are certain things however which help. And the yogis tend to use two techniques for assisting their minds to become calm. One is breathing. That is called pranayama. Prana means breath or the vital force of the body, pranayama, the discipline of breath. And the other is called mantra It's all, it's connected with pranayama, with breathing but it's chanting, chanting sounds. And both of these have a slightly auto hypnotic effect which helps one to quiet thoughts. These days many hippies go around wearing beads. Any of you got beads on? What do you wear beads for? If you know why you are you know what beads are for? Beads are for yoga. This is a Tibetan rosary has been blessed by the Dalai Lama. And they wear them on their hands rather, they carry them around the neck, but they usually use them in the hand. And they will do for time you got your yoga practice. Of the day and so many rounds of the beads will time you. And either you use the beads for breathing in-ut on one bead. in out on the next bead, in out on the next, and so. Now they have essentially the breathing in yoga is not forced, you don't do the kind of breathing exercises in a forced way. You have first of all, to find out how your lungs want to breathe. Let them do that, and count your breath, with your fingers, rather than using numbers try and keep away from concepts and numbers are concepts that's why you use your fingers on the beats instead and for every in breath and out breath you use one bead. Just experiencing breathing and experiencing the sensation of the beads passing your fingers. Don't think about it, don't try not to think

about it, but the bead and the breathing will distract you from thinking. And you will find that in due course the breath will automatically become slower and slower and slower with great ease, until it seems that you are hardly breathing at all, it's so slow.

Now for some people that is not so easy to concentrate on. So it makes it easier to concentrate if you add to the breathing a mantra. And so, the mantra means, the chanting of certain syllables. Which, although they do have a meaning in the end they are maybe the names of the divinity. They very soon cease to have a meaning as you use them. So, the Tibetans use such a mantra as ommmanipadmeuhm. Or Hindus use sometimes those would be "RamRamRamRam...". More complicated ones "OmRama Srirama..." or many varieties of these mantras. And if you keep doing that, you find you're getting into another state of consciousness. You're not thinking in the ordinary way. As the Word says take any English word. Take the word yes. We know we think we don't yes means we means yes, I will. It's a set up. yes yes yes yes striking we use that funny noise yes yes yes yes yes yes and after a while it stops meaning anything has become synonymous. That's the way you through using thought symbols, you free the mind from thought. It's like using a thorn, to pick out a thorn that's stuck in the skin. And so yoga uses those and breathing to help the mind to become quite still.

Now those who see are not the vikalpa in that they are gimmicks. So through breathing and mantras and so on you get samadhi and it's samdhi, samadhi, samadhi, with gimmicks. And that means that you have a crutch. For your religion, it depends on some kind of an extraneous device, but the ideal of yoga is called of the natural state. Which in Sanskrit is sahaja. To be in the state of realization without having any religious gimmickry. What's Spiegel of Stanford used to call the religion of no religion. Again, it's 'Look ma no hands.' So that you don't need to do anything special or to think any special thought or to say any special prayer out or have any particular ritual. On which YOU to pad for getting into the realize state of consciousness but you're in it naturally all the time that's nirviKalpa Samadhi And this means then, that you could seem to the outsider as living a perfectly normal life. That you eat when you're hungry, and sleep when you're tired. And you go about your business. And nobody can tell you

from just anyone else, unless they know you very well. And that's considered in all Hindu and Buddhist thinking very, very fine achievement. It's compared with a bird flying through the sky and leaving no tracks. Or with geese flying over a lake. And although they are reflected in the lake they don't disturb the water. They leave no trace.

So, one might say that the ideal of yoga, is to go through religion and get rid of religion. Because religion is a medicine. And it should not be a diet. That you see is a fundamental difference between physicians and clergymen. A physician tries to get rid of his patients. He gives them medicine in the hope that they will go away and not come back. But unfortunately, the clergyman tries to get you hooked on the medicine so that you'll come to church every Sunday and pay your contribution. To pay off the mortgage. That's a very serious problem with churches. The investment in buildings and such liabilities. But the doctor you see, although they have these hospitals, they hope that the turnover will be big enough. To pay for it. And they can't get a big turnover, unless they're successful in getting rid of patients but the patients who have been successfully got rid of gone recommend this doctor to other patients and so they keep coming through because they're always sick people. And the Hindu in a way and especially the Buddhist take very much this view of religion. Religion is not something to get hooked up on. A person hung up on religion or hung up on yoga is felt to be still in bondage. So yoga is to get rid of yoga. And come to the final state here called Nirvikalpa samadhi, where you are in the realized state naturally. Now of course, the doctrine of you Upanishads is that everybody is in the State of Union of yoga of union with Brahman, whether you know it or whether you don't. And so, trying to have that state naturally, is really and truly doing something redundant. You are trying to be where you are to become what you are. But that's because you don't know you're there. And we can see if we go back why you don't know that you're there. Because if you are the Brahman, you in the beginning of things, deliberately pretended you weren't. Only you did it so well that by now you've forgotten you did. And so to wake up again, you have to press on trying to get back although that's unnecessary. You will only learn that it's unnecessary to trying to get there. Sort of making a fool of yourself. Trying to get what you already have. So that in a way, I've been told that there are idiots who sit in padded cells trying to catch their thumb. You

know, you put your hand around your thumb like this, here's your thumb we're going like that and then you say we're still trying to capture one that went away. Nope, see you can't catch it. Because of course it's the thing you're trying to catch is the catch up.

So in the same way when you set out to realize that you are the ground of be the Brahman you're doing just that. You're trying to catch your own thumb, see. And it doesn't work. And you think. Oh dear this is becoming a very difficult task. I must ask my teacher about it. I must be sure he's a good teacher, because I've set myself this very very tough problem. But it's a silly problem, only it in most cases it takes years of sweating at it to see how silly it is. That's all it amounts to. Basically.

So, what happens in the yoga is that you get a set of hurdles disciplined hurdles to go through. And I'm only giving you a very, very sketchy account of this because I could go into all kinds of technicalities. But you can read those in the books. All about the chakras up the spine, and the complicated ways of breathing to awaken the different chakras, or levels of consciousness and all that jazz. But all that is Jazz over certain fundamental principles. What I want to be sure of is that you get the fundamental principles. That in other words, you have lost your sense of harmonious coherence with the whole domain of being. And you're puzzled as to what's the right thing to do, what's the wrong thing to do, how I ought to be, how to control my mind how to do this that and the other. And everybody has contradictory advice for you. He who hesitates is lost. Look before you leap, many hands make work light, too many cooks spoil the broth. New Religion everything wisdom is full of contradictory advice. So they say to you in the end, ahh but you see it, it takes a wise man to know when to do which. Well they say you say how do you become wise. Well it's a matter of experience. Like you apply for a job and they say "Well how much experience do you have?" You say, well I haven't had a job before. "Well you must get one and then we can give you one to him that hath should be given. And that's the same way all these people talk. You ask a question, and the Guru answers "When you know the answer you want to ask the question." That's pretty obvious. All this frustration. But you see the real meaning ins. The question you're asking is a false problem. You're asking, in other words, why do people inquire into religions, why do they go to

teachers, why do they want spiritual exercises and practices? Because they feel unhappy. Because they feel they're not really because they feel, because they think. When you feel unhappy, that's one thing. But when you think you feel unhappy that's much more of a problem. Because you keep repeating over and over and over to yourself "Gee, I feel depressed. I feel just so put down." And you wrap your tongue around that like you know when you've got a filling out of a tooth you can your tooth keeps wandering into the heart I mean your tongue keeps wandering into the hollow left by the filling and you fuss with it. The same piece you get an itch or something you keep scratching it. Some people if they get a pain in a certain part of the body keep moving it's of the pain is there. They want to still there and they cannot do it.

So in this way we talk ourselves into problems. And so all this kind of thing starts up. But actually, the problem is an attempt to solve an impossible conundrum. That's the most frustrating problem of all see all sensible questions have sensible answers. How do you cook swordfish state, problem. Well someone could tell you, it's quite simple. How do I draw a square circle? The question doesn't mean anything so naturally there's no answer to it. So how can I get myself into a state where I'm always happy. How can we arrange things in this room so that they're all up? Silly question, so was the other one. How can I attain peace of mind? Was a Zen story about that, where the master says "Bring out your mind and I'll pacify it." And the questioner says, "But when I look for my mind I can't find it. He said there, it's pacified." And so that's the sort of thing that's going on in yoga you know you think you're a problem to yourself and so the guru says, find you.

There was this great sage in India Sri Ramana Maharshi. And people used to— with he lived in modern times— it's not the same as the Mahrishi which you know about from recent times. ramón. He was a wonderful man the most beautiful big humorous eyes and always sat half naked with a little loin cloth around him, and he would sit in a kind of patio or compound, and read the newspaper. And sometimes he'd meditate, sometimes he'd sleep, and sometimes he would answer questions and throngs of people came from all over the world and sat in this compound just to watch and the chickens around scratching and mothers feeding their babies and dogs and so on and

you took very little notice of it all they just wanted to sit in his presence. And they would come to him and say oh Maharshi, "Who was I in my past life?" And he'd come back and say "Who wants to know?" Maharshi, "How many years will it take me to attain liberation?" He will say "Who wants to attain liberation?" Always he had so every question back on the source of the question. "Who are you?" But that something is you can't get hold of. That's this thing City Wow Well I can't get it. So the yoga teacher sets you to doing this as fast as you can get you go as ruthless that is really that who are you find out when you breathe what is Green find out what you know what is know you Get to the root of the matter! Ask, ask, ask, and enquire, enquire, enquire. And one day, it all becomes clear. And it's so simple, that it's the most difficult thing in the world explained. It's like, you just see, well this is it, this is the way it is. There is no problem about it. Death. Suffering. These aren't problems. They're awful, if they are problems, the worst kind of suffering is that if you think there might be a way out of. When you know there isn't it is easier to bear. So, in this sense of it all being perfectly clear and simple and transparent. This experience now that you're having at this moment is what it's about. This is the beatific vision, this is cosmic consciousness, this is where it's at it. And it just becomes clear like that. But you see when you say that to someone or may not have had such an experience, they say, mmm, so what? Do you mean it's just it's just what's going on now? I would say why do you use the word just for what's going on now. Because that means you're only half awake. If awake at all. You are bolting your life, like some people both the food, and you think you've experience now. What you say I have now after now after now after now after now I'll look up in the dump book that was done book that goes down but that was not the still feel hungry I want a good one I hope that somewhere down on the end of the line in the future it's going to be a sudden now experience which will be noowwwww, that's the thing I wanted! But tomorrow never comes.

Intro to Oriental Philosophy

The very fact that you are here, at all, to listen to this sort of thing, indicates as all philosophy indicates, that there is some unrest. That to be a human being is in some way problematic. That there is such a thing as a life problem. And different people have different ways of expressing it. But

there is the reality of what is called in Buddhism, dukkha, a very comprehensive word generally translated “suffering”. But which might more accurately be called chronic frustration.

And I first of all want to try and identify what this human problem is. And we start out from the fact that most of us have a puzzle with ourselves. Not so much with other people, but oneself. Lots of people say that they do various things, like go to the movies, or get absorbed in work or read novels in order to forget themselves. It’s very commonly said “I want to get away from myself.” And when we are left alone with ourselves in silence and there is no distraction civilized people- whether they belong to the Eastern cultures or the Western cultures tend to feel uncomfortable. This is especially true of Americans who like to live in an environment of constant noise. And to keep their minds busy. What is so much the matter with oneself that you can’t stand it? Well first of all we don’t know what it is, your self is the most difficult thing to get a look at. Because in just the same way that you cannot bite your own teeth. But you cannot look straight into your eyes without the aid of a mirror. That you are not apparently directly aware of your brain. For all this reason your self is too close to you for you to look at. And it always remains an unknown, a kind of of a blind spot in the middle of everything. What color is your head to your eyes? Most people have a vague impression that the high in the eyes there is a blank- It isn’t black, It certainly isn’t white, and you can turn around for all your worth and never see it. What is behind the eyes? We don’t know. But we have ideas about it. And the dominant idea which most people have is that there is something called “I”. When you use the word I, to what sensation do you refer? In what way do you experience “I” as something existing.

Well I’ve made a great deal of inquiries into this. And looking at it from the way most people talk. They think of “I, myself” as a center of awareness and of action- about halfway between ears and a little way behind the eyes. Most people don’t identify myself with their whole body. Because we say in popular speech, “I have a body.” We are not liable to say “I am a body”. We don’t feel that certain things that go on in our bodies are things for which “I, Ego” am responsible. We don’t say “I beat my heart”. We don’t say “I grow my hair,” because we experience the beating of the heart and the growing of the hair as something that happens to us. We feel our bodies are vehicles,

like cars, which were given to us by our parents, and into which at some point in our development, the ego was deposited. Pop. When did you begin to be you? All sorts of theories about that.

But generally speaking, I think of myself as the source of voluntary action and of conscious attention. And therefore outside myself as I both inside the body and definitely outside the skin everything else is experienced as not I, as other, as being very largely beyond control. And as in a way alien to me. In the words of the poet Housman "I, a stranger and afraid in a world I never made." And here lies the root of problems. Because it appears that "I" isn't really very permanent. At least it's messed up with or mixed up with a body that grows old and gets achy and inconvenient and finally dissolves. Then what's going to happen to me? Maybe I'm not afraid of actual death, especially if I believe that death is simply extinction- total unconsciousness is nothing to be afraid of in that. But it's the process of dying that so inconvenient. One is so hard to get rid of.

And so why? I mean why am I trapped in this situation? I didn't ask to come here. We say in popular speech I came into this world. We experience this world as other than ourselves in the sense that we say you confront reality, out there, you must face facts, out there and facts are always of course hard facts, nobody ever talks about soft facts but there are lots of them. So this is a sensation of we could call it generally of alienation from the universe. Now of course, it isn't true that you came into this world. You came out of it, as leaves come out of a tree. As a baby comes out of the womb. You're a symptom of the world, in the same way that when a tree produces apples you call it an apple tree. And a world that produces people is a world that peoples just as an apple tree apples. In fact our whole situation, of feeling that we are strangers in the earth is a hallucination. And a rather dangerous hallucination, because it moves us to act upon the external world, both of people and of things in a hostile spirit. So that we talk about the conquest of nature. And this general feeling of resentment, of being involved in a world where there are such things as death, disease, accidents, strife, war; we feel put upon.

So, the various forms of Asian philosophy address themselves directly to this problem. But they are not like philosophy in the West and they are not

like religion in the West. If religion is something like Judaism or Christianity. Then Buddhism is not a religion. If philosophy is something like this speculations of Kant or Heigel, or even modern philosophers such as Kair and Reichenbach, then Eastern thought is not philosophy. The nearest thing to eastern philosophy in the West is psychotherapy. Because the objective of psychotherapy is to change the way in which people feel. It is, in other words, a technique for changing one's state of consciousness. And so in exactly that way these systems that I'm going to talk you about: Hinduism, Buddhism, and Taoism are primarily methods for changing one's state of consciousness. If, for example, the person is crazy and feels that he is the center of an enormous plot to persecute him, the object of the psychotherapist is to disabuse him of this illusion and get rid of his state of fear.

So in a rather similar way, let us suppose that normal people are simply sharing a collective insanity which because it's normal they think is the ordinary way to be. It is perfectly clear I think, that the world is insane. That we are on a collision course. And that therefore there is something to be said for the idea that the normal person's state of consciousness might do with a change. Especially if it's hallucination. And especially if the way we feel our own existence is in flat contradiction to the way our existence would be described by a scientist such as a biologist, or an ecologist, or a physicist. You know I think ecology is a very important science having to do with the relationship between organisms and their environments. Now, when an ecologist or a biologist looks at a living organism, the business of science is to describe what's happening. And he describes the living organism. He finds out a very funny thing. He cannot describe the organism, defined as something bounded by an epidermis, without also describing its environment. See science describes behavior: what is going on. The man behind the microscope has this advice for you: instead of asking what it is just ask what does it do. So the behavior of an organism cannot be described without also describing the behavior of the environment. If I describe somebody in the act of walking and I say nothing about the floor or the area or room or whatever in which he's walking all I'm describing is a body in empty space dangling its legs. That's not walking. To describe walking I have to describe the other behaviors or processes going on around the organism. Well what does that tell me when I

find that out? It tells me that what I am talking about is not the organism alone, but something for which we've got only the clumsy term "organism environment". Because you see that's what you are. Imagine how could you feel the existence of yourself unless at the same time you felt something other?

How could you aspire any kind of figure, shape, form unless at the same time you saw its background? Supposing the outlines of my body were co-terminus with your whole field of vision. You wouldn't see me. You'd see the microphone, the neck tie or pattern on the shirt that would be the thing you were looking at because you can only recognize anything if it goes along with a background. Which is telling us that figure and ground are inseparable. They are different, yes. You have to get the crucial idea of things being different but inseparable. As for example, the two poles of a magnet are inseparable. You can't have a one pole magnet. But they're different the two sides of a coin are different but inseparable. And so there is a word that I've coined called "go-with". There are certain things that go with each other. And the organism goes with the environment. And incidentally the environment goes with the organism- that's harder for us to see but I shall explain it in due course.

A go-withness is a transaction. For example, when we buy and sell that is a transaction- now obviously you can't buy unless somebody is selling. And you can't sell unless someone is buying. The operations are different. Buying is different from selling, but they're inseparable. And that suggests a certain kind of conspiracy between them. They're explicitly different operations buying and selling but they're implicitly one. You and everything you call "other" are explicitly different. But since you always find these two aspects of experience together there's a there's a kind of something fishy about it. That isn't noticed, that's been overlooked. And that is that they're implicitly one. But you see in the ordinary course of events, as I've explained, we are not aware of this. And we think that everything not-self, Or in other words "other" is not merely different from us- but separate. And therefore have this sense of not really belonging in this universe, of finding nature a problem and that's compounded by the current superstitions of the modern world- the mythology of 19th century science which is everybody's common sense today- that the world itself is stupid. That it's a huge system

of electronic energy buzzing, mindlessly. In which we exist by virtue of some statistical flukes.

You know that if a million monkeys sat with a million typewriters for a million years in some course, in some day they would type out the Encyclopedia Britannica. They'd eventually have to get around to it, by just chance. so there's the feeling among many people that what we are at this moment is just such an event. And that therefore if we are going to maintain the human order, our values, our reason, our civilization, we've got to fight the world to maintain it. Because the world is stupid. So in the philosophy of science in the nineteenth century, you hear people talking about energy lying behind matter as blind energy. Freud defines psychic energy as the unconscious and furthermore calls it libido which means blind lust- it's stupid, the unconscious is stupid, it wants pleasure. And has no sense of reality. And therefore Freud would oppose the pleasure principle to the reality principle. And therefore civilization is always thought of as being against pleasure because if you let people enjoy themselves too much they'll fall apart. Because the pleasure principle the pleasure urge is stupid, by definition.

So you see then we have the sensation of living in an alien world. All this is further complicated by other factors which I must now go on to explain. The feeling of insularity, of being "I, alone and separate" has something to do with the way in which we pay attention to life, and with the way in which we think about it- and these two things go together. The task of any school teacher with little children is to increase- isn't it- their attention span. Little children are allegedly, although this isn't always true, little children are supposed not to pay attention to anything particularly for very long. They run from one thing to another, they look out of the window, they pick their noses, they moon around and so the teacher has to rap the desk and say "pay attention!". And all the little children know exactly what's expected of them. That is to wrap their legs tightly around the legs of the chair and stare at the teacher with a slight frown- that is paying attention. It has nothing to do with paying attention, it is simply an act. But what it does suggest is that we feel that paying attention or concentration involves a certain strain.

And [it] actually has nothing to do with it. Concentration is hindered by strain. But we all say ‘try to pay attention’, ‘try to think’, ‘try to understand what I’m saying’; you don’t have to, your brain will do it for you beautifully if you just give it a chance. Your brain isn’t a muscle. You need effort, yes, to lift something heavy. But you don’t have to make an effort to think a complicated thought, if you do the effort will get in the way of the thinking, that will distract you. But everyone thinks that that’s what you have to do. So what you call “I”, the sensation of I, is among other things a chronic sense of mental strain. And it is physiologically located between the eyes. It’s been found out that if you relax all sense of tension between the eyes you will change your sense of your own existence. But that’s where it is. And that’s why the frown comes. And that’s why of course Buddhas are always depicted with a bright jewel between the eyes. A sign of openness, of illumination. The next thing is you see when you pay attention, don’t we say in ordinary speech that you can only think of one thing at a time? What do you mean that? It raises two questions. Why can we only think of one thing at a time? And what is a thing? I love asking children “what do you mean by a thing?” And they will say “an object” which is another way of saying a thing, it doesn’t help at all. One very smart child once said to me “a thing is a noun”. And she’s quite right. Because you can’t think. And to think and to thing of the same process without using words or notation of some kind. You can think in words, you can think in numbers, and you can think in simple images like squares triangles crosses as when we think in terms of road signs that mean certain things.

But thinking is the process of calculus. It is examining the world bit-by-bit, in series, one after another one bit after another. It’s as if we were looking at a dark room with the aid of a narrow beam spotlight and tracing it out all over the room and then in memory piecing together the bits, the series of bits over which this beam passed, and then we construct from that what sort of a room this is. A floodlight would of course be quite different. With a floodlight like this we see the whole room in a glance and we don’t have to bit it. But we see actually an enormous amount of things of which we never pay attention to. For example, if someone were to say about a particular woman at this gathering: “was Mrs So and So there this morning?” I say “yes she was there she sat opposite me,” “what was she wearing?” Well I tell you I have no idea. I saw it, but I didn’t notice it. Why didn’t I notice it?

Because I wasn't interested, I might have been interested in a face but I wasn't interested in what she was wearing. Therefore I had no notation for it because it wasn't noteworthy. Now you see then when we use notation what we do is we select we pay attention to those features of the environment which we have been taught to regard as significant, important. And then we stick a label on them. That label is a word, a symbol of some kind or number. And in this way we fragment the world into bits called things. Or events, things are represented by noun-labels and events are represented by verb-labels. And so we come to imagine that the world really does consist of separate things and events. And it doesn't. And that's a very difficult idea for people to grasp. The reason is you see that we've found this method of thinking about the world so useful for predicting what will happen, for remembering what did happen, and in order to predict what will happen- it is based on remembering what did happen- that it's run away with us.

And as a species we are seriously in danger of being completely fooled by our own thinking processes. I can give some very simple illustrations of this. One of the main symbols which all civilized people use is money. It's a very convenient symbolism because it gets rid of the necessity for barter. Of having to go down to the store with a truckload of eggs in order to buy some clothes. So we use money instead. And when you go to the supermarket, and you roll up to the cashier a great cart full of goodies and the girl goes tickity tickity tickity this long tape comes out and she says thirty dollars please. Most Housewives feel slightly depressed at parting with thirty dollars. Whereas they've got the real wealth in the cart. That's what you've got. You've got rid of some paper. But you've got edible goodies in the cart. Something's wrong with you. And we are witnessing right now a major crisis economically because of so stupid a thing called Gold. Which has some use for filling teeth and making jewelry but when hoarded in vast vaults and fortresses it is completely useless doing nothing. But the superstition you see that gold is wealth. Or that money is wealth is the confusion of the symbol with the reality. Take it far enough and people will start eating menus instead of dinners. And as a matter of fact are so doing. Our bread, for example, the bread we eat in the ordinary way that you buy in the ordinary grocery, is symbolic bread. It is a purely nothing but squishy styrofoam injected with allegedly nutritive chemicals.

This is a conglomeration of plastic bubbles, which had some vague original connection with wheat. It is it is pure rat poison. The only trouble with it is that it isn't large enough or permanent enough to be used as a bolster. But this is being eaten all over, in the superstition that this is this is food, it's symbolic food. It's an imitation of what mama's new bread used to look like and feel like, you know when it first came out of the oven it was a little squishy. That's what everybody was looking for, but they've been fooled. Same with the car. The average American car looks as if it were a streamlined thundering rocket. Now it isn't, because a an engine of that kind is not streamlined unless it's streamlined underneath as well as on top. And all it is is a fake, imitation of streamlined plunked down with an open bottle on a chassey. They even have Cadillacs have fake rocket exhausts on the backs where the little vents as if there were an engine right somewhere in that thing as a jet engine is in a capsule on a plane. They see the thing is, the thing is front, it's a pose it's it's a- it's a fake. So you see, what is happening to us and is the ability to think has gone to our heads. And we have to go out of our minds to come to our senses.

It's like this has happened in the past in the course of evolution, there was a prehistoric animal called titanithea[sic]. Which was a sort of forbear of the rhinoceros. And it had a nose horn which was of course a very useful weapon. But this thing kept developing the nose horn because it was so useful until it got bigger and bigger and bigger and at last the creature couldn't hold its head up and it became extinct- too much of a good thing. The dinosaurs, became too big, they found bigness was an advantage over other animals but they overdid it- they had to have one brain in the head and another in the rump. So that some caveman you know has a pet dinosaur and when he goes to bed at night he takes his club and bangs it on the tail and it screams in time to wake him up in the morning. So it became extinct. So the human being can become extinct through overdoing his head, by thinking too much.

The very fact that you are here, at all, to listen to this sort of thing, indicates as all philosophy indicates, that there is some unrest. That to be a human being is in some way problematic. That there is such a thing as a life problem. And different people have different ways of expressing it. But there is the reality of what is called in Buddhism, dukkha, a very

comprehensive word generally translated “suffering”. But which might more accurately be called chronic frustration.

And I first of all want to try and identify what this human problem is. And we start out from the fact that most of us have a puzzle with ourselves. Not so much with other people, but oneself. Lots of people say that they do various things, like go to the movies, or get absorbed in work or read novels in order to forget themselves. It’s very commonly said “I want to get away from myself.” And when we are left alone with ourselves in silence and there is no distraction civilized people- whether they belong to the Eastern cultures or the Western cultures tend to feel uncomfortable. This is especially true of Americans who like to live in an environment of constant noise. And to keep their minds busy. What is so much the matter with oneself that you can’t stand it? Well first of all we don’t know what it is, your self is the most difficult thing to get a look at. Because in just the same way that you cannot bite your own teeth. But you cannot look straight into your eyes without the aid of a mirror. That you are not apparently directly aware of your brain. For all this reason your self is too close to you for you to look at. And it always remains an unknown, a kind of of a blind spot in the middle of everything. What color is your head to your eyes? Most people have a vague impression that the high in the eyes there is a blank- It isn’t black, It certainly isn’t white, and you can turn around for all your worth and never see it. What is behind the eyes? We don’t know. But we have ideas about it. And the dominant idea which most people have is that there is something called “I”. When you use the word I, to what sensation do you refer? In what way do you experience “I” as something existing.

Well I’ve made a great deal of inquiries into this. And looking at it from the way most people talk. They think of “I, myself” as a center of awareness and of action- about halfway between ears and a little way behind the eyes. Most people don’t identify myself with their whole body. Because we say in popular speech, “I have a body.” We are not liable to say “I am a body”. We don’t feel that certain things that go on in our bodies are things for which “I, Ego” am responsible. We don’t say “I beat my heart”. We don’t say “I grow my hair,” because we experience the beating of the heart and the growing of the hair as something that happens to us. We feel our bodies are vehicles, like cars, which were given to us by our parents, and into which at some

point in our development, the ego was deposited. Pop. When did you begin to be you? All sorts of theories about that.

But generally speaking, I think of myself as the source of voluntary action and of conscious attention. And therefore outside myself as I both inside the body and definitely outside the skin everything else is experienced as not I, as other, as being very largely beyond control. And as in a way alien to me. In the words of the poet Housman "I, a stranger and afraid in a world I never made." And here lies the root of problems. Because it appears that "I" isn't really very permanent. At least it's messed up with or mixed up with a body that grows old and gets achy and inconvenient and finally dissolves. Then what's going to happen to me? Maybe I'm not afraid of actual death, especially if I believe that death is simply extinction- total unconsciousness is nothing to be afraid of in that. But it's the process of dying that so inconvenient. One is so hard to get rid of.

And so why? I mean why am I trapped in this situation? I didn't ask to come here. We say in popular speech I came into this world. We experience this world as other than ourselves in the sense that we say you confront reality, out there, you must face facts, out there and facts are always of course hard facts, nobody ever talks about soft facts but there are lots of them. So this is a sensation of we could call it generally of alienation from the universe. Now of course, it isn't true that you came into this world. You came out of it, as leaves come out of a tree. As a baby comes out of the womb. You're a symptom of the world, in the same way that when a tree produces apples you call it an apple tree. And a world that produces people is a world that peoples just as an apple tree apples. In fact our whole situation, of feeling that we are strangers in the earth is a hallucination. And a rather dangerous hallucination, because it moves us to act upon the external world, both of people and of things in a hostile spirit. So that we talk about the conquest of nature. And this general feeling of resentment, of being involved in a world where there are such things as death, disease, accidents, strife, war; we feel put upon.

So, the various forms of Asian philosophy address themselves directly to this problem. But they are not like philosophy in the West and they are not like religion in the West. If religion is something like Judaism or

Christianity. Then Buddhism is not a religion. If philosophy is something like this speculations of Kant or Heigel, or even modern philosophers such as Kair and Reichenbach, then Eastern thought is not philosophy. The nearest thing to eastern philosophy in the West is psychotherapy. Because the objective of psychotherapy is to change the way in which people feel. It is, in other words, a technique for changing one's state of consciousness. And so in exactly that way these systems that I'm going to talk you about: Hinduism, Buddhism, and Taoism are primarily methods for changing one's state of consciousness. If, for example, the person is crazy and feels that he is the center of an enormous plot to persecute him, the object of the psychotherapist is to disabuse him of this illusion and get rid of his state of fear.

So in a rather similar way, let us suppose that normal people are simply sharing a collective insanity which because it's normal they think is the ordinary way to be. It is perfectly clear I think, that the world is insane. That we are on a collision course. And that therefore there is something to be said for the idea that the normal person's state of consciousness might do with a change. Especially if it's hallucination. And especially if the way we feel our own existence is in flat contradiction to the way our existence would be described by a scientist such as a biologist, or an ecologist, or a physicist. You know I think ecology is a very important science having to do with the relationship between organisms and their environments. Now, when an ecologist or a biologist looks at a living organism, the business of science is to describe what's happening. And he describes the living organism. He finds out a very funny thing. He cannot describe the organism, defined as something bounded by an epidermis, without also describing its environment. See science describes behavior: what is going on. The man behind the microscope has this advice for you: instead of asking what it is just ask what does it do. So the behavior of an organism cannot be described without also describing the behavior of the environment. If I describe somebody in the act of walking and I say nothing about the floor or the area or room or whatever in which he's walking all I'm describing is a body in empty space dangling its legs. That's not walking. To describe walking I have to describe the other behaviors or processes going on around the organism. Well what does that tell me when I find that out? It tells me that what I am talking about is not the organism

alone, but something for which we've got only the clumsy term "organism environment". Because you see that's what you are. Imagine how could you feel the existence of yourself unless at the same time you felt something other?

How could you aspire any kind of figure, shape, form unless at the same time you saw its background? Supposing the outlines of my body were co-terminus with your whole field of vision. You wouldn't see me. You'd see the microphone, the neck tie or pattern on the shirt that would be the thing you were looking at because you can only recognize anything if it goes along with a background. Which is telling us that figure and ground are inseparable. They are different, yes. You have to get the crucial idea of things being different but inseparable. As for example, the two poles of a magnet are inseparable. You can't have a one pole magnet. But they're different the two sides of a coin are different but inseparable. And so there is a word that I've coined called "go-with". There are certain things that go with each other. And the organism goes with the environment. And incidentally the environment goes with the organism- that's harder for us to see but I shall explain it in due course.

A go-withness is a transaction. For example, when we buy and sell that is a transaction- now obviously you can't buy unless somebody is selling. And you can't sell unless someone is buying. The operations are different. Buying is different from selling, but they're inseparable. And that suggests a certain kind of conspiracy between them. They're explicitly different operations buying and selling but they're implicitly one. You and everything you call "other" are explicitly different. But since you always find these two aspects of experience together there's a there's a kind of something fishy about it. That isn't noticed, that's been overlooked. And that is that they're implicitly one. But you see in the ordinary course of events, as I've explained, we are not aware of this. And we think that everything not-self, Or in other words "other" is not merely different from us- but separate. And therefore have this sense of not really belonging in this universe, of finding nature a problem and that's compounded by the current superstitions of the modern world- the mythology of 19th century science which is everybody's common sense today- that the world itself is stupid. That it's a huge system

of electronic energy buzzing, mindlessly. In which we exist by virtue of some statistical flukes.

You know that if a million monkeys sat with a million typewriters for a million years in some course, in some day they would type out the Encyclopedia Britannica. They'd eventually have to get around to it, by just chance. so there's the feeling among many people that what we are at this moment is just such an event. And that therefore if we are going to maintain the human order, our values, our reason, our civilization, we've got to fight the world to maintain it. Because the world is stupid. So in the philosophy of science in the nineteenth century, you hear people talking about energy lying behind matter as blind energy. Freud defines psychic energy as the unconscious and furthermore calls it libido which means blind lust- it's stupid, the unconscious is stupid, it wants pleasure. And has no sense of reality. And therefore Freud would oppose the pleasure principle to the reality principle. And therefore civilization is always thought of as being against pleasure because if you let people enjoy themselves too much they'll fall apart. Because the pleasure principle the pleasure urge is stupid, by definition.

So you see then we have the sensation of living in an alien world. All this is further complicated by other factors which I must now go on to explain. The feeling of insularity, of being "I, alone and separate" has something to do with the way in which we pay attention to life, and with the way in which we think about it- and these two things go together. The task of any school teacher with little children is to increase- isn't it- their attention span. Little children are allegedly, although this isn't always true, little children are supposed not to pay attention to anything particularly for very long. They run from one thing to another, they look out of the window, they pick their noses, they moon around and so the teacher has to rap the desk and say "pay attention!". And all the little children know exactly what's expected of them. That is to wrap their legs tightly around the legs of the chair and stare at the teacher with a slight frown- that is paying attention. It has nothing to do with paying attention, it is simply an act. But what it does suggest is that we feel that paying attention or concentration involves a certain strain.

And [it] actually has nothing to do with it. Concentration is hindered by strain. But we all say ‘try to pay attention’, ‘try to think’, ‘try to understand what I’m saying’; you don’t have to, your brain will do it for you beautifully if you just give it a chance. Your brain isn’t a muscle. You need effort, yes, to lift something heavy. But you don’t have to make an effort to think a complicated thought, if you do the effort will get in the way of the thinking, that will distract you. But everyone thinks that that’s what you have to do. So what you call “I”, the sensation of I, is among other things a chronic sense of mental strain. And it is physiologically located between the eyes. It’s been found out that if you relax all sense of tension between the eyes you will change your sense of your own existence. But that’s where it is. And that’s why the frown comes. And that’s why of course Buddhas are always depicted with a bright jewel between the eyes. A sign of openness, of illumination. The next thing is you see when you pay attention, don’t we say in ordinary speech that you can only think of one thing at a time? What do you mean that? It raises two questions. Why can we only think of one thing at a time? And what is a thing? I love asking children “what do you mean by a thing?” And they will say “an object” which is another way of saying a thing, it doesn’t help at all. One very smart child once said to me “a thing is a noun”. And she’s quite right. Because you can’t think. And to think and to thing of the same process without using words or notation of some kind. You can think in words, you can think in numbers, and you can think in simple images like squares triangles crosses as when we think in terms of road signs that mean certain things.

But thinking is the process of calculus. It is examining the world bit-by-bit, in series, one after another one bit after another. It’s as if we were looking at a dark room with the aid of a narrow beam spotlight and tracing it out all over the room and then in memory piecing together the bits, the series of bits over which this beam passed, and then we construct from that what sort of a room this is. A floodlight would of course be quite different. With a floodlight like this we see the whole room in a glance and we don’t have to bit it. But we see actually an enormous amount of things of which we never pay attention to. For example, if someone were to say about a particular woman at this gathering: “was Mrs So and So there this morning?” I say “yes she was there she sat opposite me,” “what was she wearing?” Well I tell you I have no idea. I saw it, but I didn’t notice it. Why didn’t I notice it?

Because I wasn't interested, I might have been interested in a face but I wasn't interested in what she was wearing. Therefore I had no notation for it because it wasn't noteworthy. Now you see then when we use notation what we do is we select we pay attention to those features of the environment which we have been taught to regard as significant, important. And then we stick a label on them. That label is a word, a symbol of some kind or number. And in this way we fragment the world into bits called things. Or events, things are represented by noun-labels and events are represented by verb-labels. And so we come to imagine that the world really does consist of separate things and events. And it doesn't. And that's a very difficult idea for people to grasp. The reason is you see that we've found this method of thinking about the world so useful for predicting what will happen, for remembering what did happen, and in order to predict what will happen- it is based on remembering what did happen- that it's run away with us.

And as a species we are seriously in danger of being completely fooled by our own thinking processes. I can give some very simple illustrations of this. One of the main symbols which all civilized people use is money. It's a very convenient symbolism because it gets rid of the necessity for barter. Of having to go down to the store with a truckload of eggs in order to buy some clothes. So we use money instead. And when you go to the supermarket, and you roll up to the cashier a great cart full of goodies and the girl goes tickity tickity tickity this long tape comes out and she says thirty dollars please. Most Housewives feel slightly depressed at parting with thirty dollars. Whereas they've got the real wealth in the cart. That's what you've got. You've got rid of some paper. But you've got edible goodies in the cart. Something's wrong with you. And we are witnessing right now a major crisis economically because of so stupid a thing called Gold. Which has some use for filling teeth and making jewelry but when hoarded in vast vaults and fortresses it is completely useless doing nothing. But the superstition you see that gold is wealth. Or that money is wealth is the confusion of the symbol with the reality. Take it far enough and people will start eating menus instead of dinners. And as a matter of fact are so doing. Our bread, for example, the bread we eat in the ordinary way that you buy in the ordinary grocery, is symbolic bread. It is a purely nothing but squishy styrofoam injected with allegedly nutritive chemicals.

This is a conglomeration of plastic bubbles, which had some vague original connection with wheat. It is it is pure rat poison. The only trouble with it is that it isn't large enough or permanent enough to be used as a bolster. But this is being eaten all over, in the superstition that this is this is food, it's symbolic food. It's an imitation of what mama's new bread used to look like and feel like, you know when it first came out of the oven it was a little squishy. That's what everybody was looking for, but they've been fooled. Same with the car. The average American car looks as if it were a streamlined thundering rocket. Now it isn't, because a an engine of that kind is not streamlined unless it's streamlined underneath as well as on top. And all it is is a fake, imitation of streamlined plunked down with an open bottle on a chassey. They even have Cadillacs have fake rocket exhausts on the backs where the little vents as if there were an engine right somewhere in that thing as a jet engine is in a capsule on a plane. They see the thing is, the thing is front, it's a pose it's it's a- it's a fake. So you see, what is happening to us and is the ability to think has gone to our heads. And we have to go out of our minds to come to our senses.

It's like this has happened in the past in the course of evolution, there was a prehistoric animal called titanithea[??]. Which was a sort of forbear of the rhinoceros. And it had a nose horn which was of course a very useful weapon. But this thing kept developing the nose horn because it was so useful until it got bigger and bigger and bigger and at last the creature couldn't hold its head up and it became extinct- too much of a good thing. The dinosaurs, became too big, they found bigness was an advantage over other animals but they overdid it- they had to have one brain in the head and another in the rump. So that some caveman you know has a pet dinosaur and when he goes to bed at night he takes his club and bangs it on the tail and it screams in time to wake him up in the morning. So it became extinct. So the human being can become extinct through overdoing his head, by thinking too much.

On Hinduism

In the last session of this particular course, which is an introduction to Oriental Philosophy, I tried to condense the fundamental principles of what you can call the central viewpoint of Hinduism, Vedanta. Not so much the

doctrine, as the experiential realization of what you are, is basically it is the same as the root of the ground of the universe. In other words in the Atman, the Self, is Brahman, the ground of being. Now today, I want to relate this way of playing hide and seek, with the very design of Hindu society. Because Hinduism is difficult to characterize as a religion, especially because we belong to a religion where in its institutionalized form, it can very well degenerate into a religion that's for Sundays only. That doesn't apply to every detail of life. In other words, when a Hindu brushes his teeth, it's a religious act. There is not such a thing as a Christian way of brushing the teeth. But in Hindu life, all the details of life, are Hinduism.

So then, underneath all the presuppositions of Hinduism, can be found a transition from one kind of culture to another from my hunting culture to an agrarian culture. And this explains a great deal about this way of life. Now in a hunting culture, which is a culture on the move. Nomadic. Every man knows the whole culture. In other words, you do not get a high specialization, division of labor. A man who is a hunter has to know how to make clothes how to skin animals, how to cook them, how to shoot them, how to train them. He has to know everything kind of skill, because he's often alone. And in a hunting culture, you do not get a special division, of priesthood from ordinary people. Every man, in his own way, is capable of being a priest, but some moreso than others, not by virtue of any ordination all schooling that they have received, but by their receptivity. Because the priest, or holy man of a hunting culture is called a shaman. A shaman is an individual who separates himself from society for a certain period, and goes alone into forests all mountains to commune with what he will usually call the ancestors. That is to say, with his basic origins. And he will find something, by way of a spiritual experience, for himself, not through any teacher, not through any previous authority. He finds it genuinely on his own. And the shaman therefore goes into solitude, to find out who he really is. Because in society everybody is busy telling you are, and you rely on others to see yourself but to find himself in other words to find out what all this really is all about, the spiritually minded man of the hunting culture goes alone. And so the culture of the American Indians, is to a very large extent hunting culture and you will find the spiritual man of the American Indians is a shaman.

However, when the hunting culture becomes settled, it becomes agrarian, there arises farming, looking after the land, and then you get a completely different kind of society. Let me suggest that it's something like this: where do agrarian communities settle? Where do they build a village? Usually at a crossroads, especially if roads be crossed with water. A river. And where the crossing meets, the agrarian village settles itself and protects itself by building a pale. We say a person 'is beyond the pale.' That means he's an outcast, he lives outside that he's a pariah. But in the village notice that the pale having been built around the crossroads, it divides the village into four sections. And oddly enough, there are four divisions of labor, in all fundamental agrarian societies.

And these consist of one, the priests. You know the word clever, clerk, cleric, and clear, are all the same word. It meant, someone who was literate. Clever, or so clear, put it down a clear, you can't do that unless you're literate. And so, if you're a literate person, you're a cleric, and clergy is the same word as a clever in Old English. 'Much conceit of clergy' is an old English phrase meaning, 'he's intellectually snobbish.'

So, that's your process number one, cause number two, warrior, or incidentally, ruler. Three, merchant, or craftsman, and four, laborer. Unskilled. So now what are these? They are four castes, or four roles, and say in society, where the division of labor because an agricultural society is more complex than a hunting culture. We immediately get a division of labor, and we all play different roles. That is to say, we assume different masks, for purposes of living in this kind of community all of you you see are essentially our essentially clerics. You are what the Hindus would call Brahmen pals you are all being trained in the university.

So the Hindu name for this class is Brahmana, for this class Kshatriyas, for this class Vaishyas and for this class, Shudras. So those are the basis for the four castes. And so if you are in the pail, if you belong to the community, you have to be typified. They say 'Is you is, or is you ain't?' into which of these do you fit? And you must fit into one of these. Now caste is something, of course, which has got a very bad then from the modern point of view both modern form the view with us, and with the modern India. Because they say once you get into a caste, you are stuck, if you have gone

to it there are a laborer you must be. If you are born to a warrior, you must be a warrior or a ruler you will never become a character. And we think that's pretty terrible. Because in our culture we work under the assumption that you as an individual are free to choose whatever occupation you will follow.

But unfortunately, this involves going to school. And for certain purposes, going to school is one of the worst things you can do. For example, if you want to become a completely fantastic expert carpenter, you have to begin the trade at the age of seven at the latest. And your father if he is a carpenter is obviously the best teacher you can have. In a very ancient form of agrarian culture, as in India or as in Japan or China. A young man who was son of a carpenter would become fascinated with his father's occupation, and that would mean a very special relationship would grow up between him and his father which does not grow up in our product because most of us do not know what off of the doing. They go away to a mysterious office all factory where they do something called making money, as an incidental, as the main reason for the incidental occupation which they pursue there. But the children on the wife have no active part in that occupation whatsoever. They know Papa only as a kind of clown, who returns home in the evening having made money, and one dad's money is the same as another dad's money it makes no difference except that everybody wants more. They don't give a damn how he gets it, so long as he doesn't complain too much. So the child, instead of learning and participating in his close father relationship in learning an occupation or a trade, is sent off to an impersonalized institution, to be taught to be everything and nothing. And therefore doesn't learn early enough any craft so as to become a true master of it. What is happening, for example in Japan, where a father can no longer apprentices some seven years old to become a carpenter, because he has to send him away to school, to learn to be an insurance salesman. He can't teach his child and then comes high school and then with a kid gets out of high school is interested and girls. And it takes him until he's about twenty-two to be able to settle down and on top of this today. Too late to attain real mastery, because a great Japanese cop and never uses a plan, he doesn't need to draw does it all by. And can fit the most complicated joinery together. By eye. And it's the same with the arts of weaving textiles,

that making superb ceramics, jewelry, any kind of gorgeous craftsmanship, depends on beginning it as a child.

And so, we can't buy it anymore in this country. There is not, on any kind of commercial basis great craftsmanship available here. We have to go abroad to get, to or so-called primitive societies. We must be content with plastics in the way. So it is something to be said for the castes of them I just wanted to present the other side of it. Now however, in going through this system, there are certain stages, whatever class you're in. There are three stages of life, which are called Ashramas. Which really means abode. A Center for Spiritual study for practicing yoga will be called an Ashram, but an ashram also means an abode in the sense of a stage of life. And the three stated in are one, called Brahmacharya That means, the stage of being a student. Two, Grihastha, householder. And the third stage, Vanaprastha, that means forest-dweller. Isn't that funny? Grihastha, householder, Vanaprastha, forest-dweller. Because you see, in this order of society, you come into society and you go through one of its acts as a Grihastha, householder. But when you arrive at a point in life where you have got a son. By Beth from yourself all by the marriage of your oldest daughter and a son who will take over your work. You give up being a householder, and you become a forest-dweller. In other words, you go outside the pail and back to the forest, with the idea of finding out who you really are. While you were in the community, you were playing a role one of the four roles, or its subdivisions and you came on as tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor, richman, poorman, beggarman, thief.

But that wasn't the real you, that was one of the masks of the Brahman, the true Self behind everything. To find out the Brahman, who you really are, in order to get ready to die, you become Vanaprastha. Go back to the jungle, having fulfilled your work with the world. Now in practice in India, this means that the head of the house often moves to a cottage in the backyard. You know it because the time everything sort of becomes going through the motions. But the original idea, was that he became Sramana. From it's almost the word shaman. A Sraman is a person, who's gone back to live in the forest, and therefore he isn't a god to society and up our There also log out. It's those of the Aborigines. The people living in India before the Aryan invasion. Who later became the untouchables. They are not even

Shudra, that outside caste together. Like the Indians in the United States. They are true untouchables in our cost system, and their plight is so much worse than the negroes its unbelievable. But they are costs so with the same thing happening. But the upper outcast is a man who goes wild. And in India society, you have the right to do that, you are respected if you voluntarily abandon the caste, and of course in doing so you give up your name. And you take another name.

Now taking a new name is taking a new identity. An Indian in society may be Mr. Mukupacharya. And that would be a family name indicating membership in a family. When he becomes a Sramana however, he will take a name such as Brahmananda. Bliss of God. He takes a divine name. And the original idea of a Christiannname, when you were baptized, is that you gave up the name. Julius as you might be a Roman, and took on instead the name Mathew. One of the Apostles one of the divine beings of the Christian religion or you might take the name of an angel, named Michael. Or in Spain or Mexico even, Jesus. Jesus Maria would be perfectly reasonable for a man in Spanish culture. But you take on a divine name to indicate a transformation of your identity. But in this case, when you give up caste you see, and return to the forest, you become a nobody. And therefore you take one of the names off that which is no longer, namely the Brahma the supreme Self, because it's no one in the sense that it's all one. And therefore in itself nobody.

So you abandon caste and you abandon name, you give up property and you give up, both the responsibility and society is allowed to give up responsibility for you. If they give you alms if they support you that's for gravy. They don't have to do it, and you don't figure that they go to. But this of this kind of society has a profound respect for people who leave it. And they feel that a society cannot be healthy unless it somehow pays respect to people outside the pail. To non-joiners and outsiders, who have indeed fulfilled some responsibility within society and then abandoned it. They would I think be a little uptight about hippies, who would abandon society before having fulfilled their responsibility in it. But in a sense, every Sramana is a sort of elderly hippie. Now of course, our hippies have a different problem in that they are critical of the very structure of the society in which they are asked to enter because they feel that it is a rat race, a

game which has lost its quality. They might even prefer a caste-like society of this kind, in that it might have a bit more quality. Because you see, in our society one works, not as a vocation, in this scheme of things, every vocation you perform is called svadharma. And this word, the word dharma has many meanings. It means function, in one sense. It means, the thing that is right for you. Here, sva, is the same as the Latin source and so it is one of your own. What we would call your vocation. Svadharma. As we say doing our own thing. That's svadharma.

And so, you have to find your own thing. As it were, a good thing out a job which you do purely for money can never be called svadharma. Because you're doing it for another end, to make money which has a purely symbolic value but when you do a certain work because that is what is your thing to do you want to be a doctor, because you're fascinated with medicine and all its problems and you just you like people so much that you want to heal them from the diseases. Or for the same reason, you might want to be a nurse. But you might be fascinate with problems of law and so become a lawyer or fascinated with religion and so become a minister then you've got a vocation, because you would do that thing whether it paid you very much or whether it didn't, because that's the one thing you have to do. If you're a painter, you have to paint, if you're a writer, you're one of those crazy people who just has to write. I'm a writer! I have to write. Whether it makes me money or whether it doesn't, I would still have to be a writer. That's a svadharma.

And every possible vocation in caste is supposed to be YOUR thing, your svadharma. But we feel in our culture, you see, that we have such a tremendous choice of svadharma, that sometimes it's what the French call on but embarass des richesses. It's like embarrassment of riches when you're confronted with one of those enormous menus in a restaurant which has some of the things on it you can't make up your mind which to pick.

Well now, then you see as a person passes out of this he gives up social. And becomes a nobody he then in that sense he goes back to the forest. He goes back from the organization, the role-playing of the agrarian culture, to the solitude of the hunting culture, to find out who he is alone all by himself. And so he becomes in that sense the upper outcast. The man who is

respected by those people who are still in caste, because they say without this kind of person we should lose our sanity. We should become confused with our roles, unless there's always the homage in the forest to remind us. That man is not his problem that is something deep with him. And that the true end of man is to play the game of hide and seek for a while and to get lost in these roles, but then to return back to nature, back to the way of the forest. And in later life, as distinct from infancy, with all other experience behind [them]. Find out again who you really are so that when death. What a funny thing will happen. Death comes, and will find no one to kill. For while you are identified with your role, with your name, with your ego, there's someone to kill. But when you are identified, with the whole universe, death finds you already annihilated, and there's no one to kill. The problem is, we speak first of all of the unity of life, and then suddenly define the social orders as one, two, three, four, and the stages of life as one, two, three, of course. Because the whole thing about The One is that it pretends to be many. Here, that's, that's the gimmick. The game of hide and seek is dismemberment, falling apart. Losing control. Losing unity. Let's disintegrate. And then, after you've been dismembered, let's remember. And come back to oneself, and know who it really was all the time. So the one implies the many, and many imply one, and so it goes in and out it's the systole and diastole, in-breathing and out-breathing that goes on and on now you see it, now you don't. Can the whole know itself as one? Yes. You suddenly get to the extraordinary state where you see that all the variety in front of you. You know, I look out in this room and it's a great variety, it's a wonderful patchwork of all sorts of different people and colors and things. But you get to the point where you see that that variety means one. Things, the more different everything is, the more it proclaims its basic unity with everything else. It just shouts it. In other words, when I see a bright patch of orange next to a bright patch of blue. The brighter that are in. The more it manifests the unity underlying everything. Now that sounds paradoxical but that's the way I feel it. If all of you wore khaki, olive drab or something, I would feel uniformity rather than unity. I would say well that's a drag. Everybody trying to look the same. That's fake unity. It would feel like a in a plastic champagne glass. Horrible. You know it warms the champagne instead of that cold crystal. And say that fake unity, away with it. But when everybody comes on himself, you know, in a natural way then I see true unity in through the variety.

See in this society, we are exposed to so much information. Radio, television, newspapers, magazines, books tell us all sorts of attractions about things that other people are doing and we're always wishing we were in somebody else's shoes. Because we know so much and we're informed so much. But in this kind of culture, everybody is settled for the fact that one day is just like another, and there they do what has to be done. What is in the course of things, and we don't approve of this because we say it's lacking in friskiness, adventure and get up and go. But on the other hand they turn round to us and say, you are completely unstable. You are so frisky yourself nervous you can't stay still. For two seconds you can't stick to a job you can't do anything stable your utterly unreliable, and you will probably blow up the planet.

And it's legitimate, for the simple reason that technology is getting rid of the need to earn a living. And many of us will soon have to be paid not to work, at which point we can become Vannaprastha right away. So, as technology develops that means the leisure society, and we're going to have to find ways of living in which one self-respect does not depend upon one's productivity.

In Europe, we have the same caste system in the feudal system Lords spiritual, Lords temporal. Commons and serfs. Now, by becoming—anyone from any of the lower caste can become a priest or a cleric. And the minute you became a priest cleric monk or whatever you were at an angle to all the other costs. You could mix with the others. Yes and what about this problem, of the separation of ages in this kind of culture. Well now, it is a little easier for them because the rate of social change is not what it is with us. In a settled agrarian culture, the essential way of living remains the same for centuries. And only violent change occurs when technology is introduced and then everything is blown wide open. But in an Indian village today, they are doing all the essential processes of life exactly the same way they were done a thousand years ago. And for this reason, the tension between the generations is very small. The son and the daughter expect, and know no other alternative than doing what father and mother have done. And of course this brings them close together, especially where the son of the daughter is constantly all day long associated with the work of father and mother. Now you know, that little children today, little boys under the

school age, little girls under the school age, are always interested in what their parents are doing and want to join in. But are not allowed to do so because they can't go to the office with their father and the mother is always in a hurry, because instead of having spent most of the day preparing dinner in the kitchen, she's been up to the coffee klatch, the League of Women Voters, or some such dissipation and comes back and then she's in a hurry and she doesn't want some little girl buzzing around, having to teach her, how to boil an egg or how to bake a cookie. Unless she's patient, unless she gets time for that kind of thing. But little girl is very very eager indeed to find out how to do what mamma does. But she mustn't, because she might make a mess. So instead of that, little girl is given a toy. A toy cooking stove and a toy baby to look after. The child is annoyed that the cooking stove doesn't really work that the toy baby doesn't wee-wee properly, even though they've tried to make it that way, and the little boy is even more annoyed that the toy gun doesn't kill anything.

So every day by about five o'clock in the afternoon, just before the father of the family returns, the entire house is littered with broken plastic and smashed toys have been torn apart in fury. So that develops a knock down drag out battle between the mother and the children to throw all that stuff into a bottom of a closet, mixed up with sucked lollipops, and half chewed bubble gum before Daddy comes home. And because she wants the house to look like a nice home for him. So this awful drama occurs in which the children are addled and have to be gassed with television, and the mother is in no fit mood to be the loving Cook of a superb dinner. So she gets some frozen up stuff that can be thrown together in a hurry, fixes pop or a couple of martinis so he won't know what he's eating anyway. And I don't know if I answer the question. I have got sidetracked.

I think we've got to realize that children benefited by being exposed to a considerable number of adults. And that, in default of the old family relation, households, where, in other words, a mother and father have a grandmother and a grandfather living with them, several aunts, uncles and cousins and it's a big household based on blood relationship. It's very difficult to do that today because the speed of social change makes it difficult for one generation to live with the tastes of another. But what we

are going to do is all couples of the same generation will join together and they will have separate dwelling quarters round a central service area where they have common washing machines, common kitchen, common recreational facilities, and any set of children can be exchanged with any set of parents. So if your children get sick of you they can go to live with somebody else's parents. And I remember as a child that is some of the most educative periods of my life were when I went to live with other families. And we often, you see, as kids we invited other kids to come and stay with us and share our family life I suppose that goes on here just the same but still those are very productive periods. When you find out how another family lives. So, and although this solves the babysitting problem, it's solves the problem of having to own too many cars, too many dishwashers, and all that sort of thing. Your— your dishwasher or your laundry machine is idle most of the day. Why isn't somebody using it?

Zen and Meditation

The Controlled Accident

This morning, I was discussing with you some of the basic ideas and feelings of Chinese philosophy and in particular Taoism, which underlie the development of Zen Buddhism, and which underlie the whole Chinese attitude to life to nature and to art. And I suppose of all these ideas that are discussed with you in the morning, the most important was the one of the mutual arising of things. That is to say, that you and your world go together in the same way as bees and flowers. But that we are not brought up in, at any rate our culture, to feel this. We don't have a sensation of it we have instead a sensation of confronting the world of nature something alien something outside into which we come rather than out of which we come. But it's possible, so to change our everyday consciousness, that you feel yourself. As something that the universe is doing. It's as if you changed your center of gravity. Your center of operations, from that little man inside the head all the ego to the whole works doing it.

Now then, what I want to do this afternoon is shift from Taoism. Later on in time to the introduction of Buddhism into China and the birth of Zen, and to see what Chinese Zen is. We do though first have to have a short look at what Buddhism is. As a product of India. It has been well said that Buddhism is Hinduism stripped for export. See Hinduism is a way of life that goes far far beyond what we in the west call religion. It involves cookery, every day family life house building just everything it's the whole Hindu way of life. And so you can't export it just as you can't export Shinto from Japan. And belongs to the soil and the culture but there are essential elements in it that can be transmitted outside the culture of India. And Buddhism is one of the ways of doing just that. So one might say simply this to try and sum up what Buddhism is about. The word Buddha is derived from the root word and Sanskrit B U D H. which means to be awake. So the Buddha is the the awakened man, the man who woke up. What does he wake up from? Obviously a dream. And what kind of a dream is this. Well I

would call it a state of hypnosis. And the state of hypnosis, although I'm using hypnosis in a rather archaic sense of the word is a state of being entranced. Spellbound. Fascinated. And this is called in the Sanskrit avidya, A V I D Y A. Video is knowledge in Sanskrit. And it is the root from which we get the dairy in Latin to see and so vision in English. So are they putting the A in front of it means not non. Avidya, not seeing ignorance ignoring us I was discussing that this morning where. You see but you ignore. Everything that you're not looking at when you put the beacon of a chicken on a white chalk line and the chicken is fascinated with that we can get away from the chalk line that's avidya.

So in the same way our beaks were put on a sharp climb when we were hypnotized into the notion. Of attending to life by conscious attention alone. By the spotlight to the exclusion of the floodlight. And so we began to imagine that we were separate individuals. What is called in Buddhism [] the view of separateness. And Buddha is one who has overcome that. He has awakened from that illusion from that state of hypnosis and he knows. That... Well I can't put what he knows in any positive terms. This is the special thing about Buddhism. Everything in Buddhism sounds negative. Let's put it this way. Let's suppose you engage yourself in a. Relationship with the, with the Buddha. All with one. I mean there are hundreds of brothers. And one we call Guatama is just the historical bit of that everybody knows about but no one but it leads to another because as a result of his relationships with people you does them in the borders to awaken people you meet one of these people and he's going to give you a rough time. But one of the Buddhas running around these days is Krishnamurti and krishnamurti absolutely destroyed everybody's religion. He came why do you believe this why are you hanging on to that why do you want to insist that this idea is so, see? And he shows you that all your fixed formulations all the ideas to which you cling are spurious. And then you suddenly get into a kind of vertigo dizziness that you feel suddenly that you're no longer standing on the firm ground but that the universe has suddenly turned into water or worse air. Or worse still, empty space there's nothing to hold on to. I see often when one discusses religion with people they say well I learned I need a religion because I need something to hold on to. But that's the way not to use a religion. Because if you are using religion as something to hold on to, your religion is an expression of

unfaith. Faith is where you let go not where you are wrong. When a cat falls off the tree the cat relaxes hissy and so the cat lands with a soft sob. And doesn't get hurt, because the cat has faith. But if the cat in mid-air were to submit to grab itself with all four feet and tighten up see it would be hurt. And that's what people do when they say Rock of Ages care for me let me hide myself and be there they want someone to hold on to see, and that is unsafe.

So the method of Buddhism. It's called the Dharma. Doesn't mean the law, it means the method the method is to knock the stuffing out of you to take away everything to which you cling to cleanse you completely of all beliefs or ideas all concepts of what life is about. So that you are completely let go. So Buddhism has no doctrines at all that you have to believe in. I don't care what background you come from whether you're a Roman Catholic or one extreme or a logical positivists that the other. Both are clinging to something. See? And so the method of Buddhism is to knock out the underpinnings. And say well we're just not only do we not believe in anything we don't even believe in not believing in anything. You know you crawl into a hole and pull the hole in after you. But in this case, you do the exact opposite of that that's a defensive move to crawl into a hole in this way you crawl into a great space and then pull a space out after you. And, to go through this is pretty pretty rough. Because you can do it on what seems at first to be a merely intellectual level. So you can engage a group of people in the discussion and you can start whenever they propose an idea that is their sort of guiding principle of life you demolish it show that it doesn't hold water. And step by step you on Earth by talking with them what are the fundamental ideas they're operating on everybody is. Everybody is a philosopher everybody has metaphysics. All of it may not know what it is so I've never examined it but by this method you bring it out and you demolish it. And this suddenly what seemed like a very nice intellectual discussion turns into sheer murder. People get really anxious they develop all the troubles in the symptoms of extreme anxiety. And so they finally say to the dealer to the the guru to the teacher well heaven sakes what do you believe it is not proposing anything. I didn't set anything up. Well how do you navigate? How to how do you... How do you exist? This is what's the problem. Because you see, what we're moving from and as I suggested a moment ago. We are moving from a state of affairs where we

are accustomed to navigation on land, to a state of affairs where we are in the water. And this is very critical for today because the impact of modern science on Western culture has been very similar to this. Say, in Christianity we sing hymns like how firm a foundation and Rock of Ages and first the book The Mighty Fortress is our God we've something to stand up for the church is one foundation is Jesus Christ her daughter No and it's. This firm thing right suddenly all that disappears or becomes implausible. And we find ourselves winning or sinking. Now, when you find that you're living in the region mystically universe of relativity but there's nothing you can hold on to You gotta learn how to swim. And to swim you've got to relax and stop, stop grabbing.

So this is what Buddhism does. When it says it's the art of let go of non-attachment non-attachment doesn't mean that you lose your appetite for dinner. It means simply that you stop grabbing. You get rid of stickiness. Stickiness in the sense of for example, when a wheel has it at an axle it's too tight and it sticks want to loosen it up a bit you don't want it to lose the money floppy. I a lot of people when they tell them to do it to relax they become like a limb brag it's not relaxing. Relaxing is having still tone. But it's a certain, it's a middle way. So this is what this is entirely what Buddhism is about. It's about learning for example, if I may put it in a vivid way when you were born you were kicked off a precipice. And you are there's nothing that can stop you falling, and although there are a lot of rocks falling with you with trees growing on them and all sorts of things like that you can cling to one of those rocks if you like as it goes down with you for safety but it's not safe. Nothing is safe. Everything is falling apart. Everything is in in a state of change. And there's no way of stopping it. And when you are really resigned to that and when you really accept that then there's nothing to be afraid of. And when there's nothing left to be afraid of and you've given everything up and you know that even you know a lot of people in religion cling to suffering because they know they are right as long as they hurt. And why bless the good Lord for my boils for my mental and bodily pain. For without them my faith all congeals and I'm doomed to Hell of ne'er ending flames. You know a lot of people who know that their rights are long as they suffer but that's an illusion too. Even suffering offers no security. Even suicide offers no security in Buddhism you say. There is

no security at all. You simply have to face the fact that everything is in flux and go go go with it.

And so, the question then is simply, how to convince people of this? If anybody wants to be convinced you know it's not sort of thing you shove down people's throats. You don't convert them to this because if they don't want to be converted they won't let go. So therefore involves a very special relationship between the questioner and the person to whom the question is addressed. The pupil of the teacher. And now then, Buddhism came to China as early as 60 A.D.. But didn't at that time make a very great impression. It was not until about the year four hundred that a very great Sanskrit scholar about the name of Kumara Jiva and started teaching Chinese scholars Sanskrit. And they worked with him to translate Sanskrit into Chinese. And they translated the Buddhist scriptures they didn't of course do them all at that time because the Buddhist scriptures occupy about as many as much space as the Encyclopedia Britannica, in fact a little more. The Indians are great talkers. Well anyway, they found that when they translate this into Chinese, [they] had to find equivalent Chinese words for the Sanskrit ideas and they found these from the from the Taoist philosophy that I discussed this morning.

Well, slowly then, Indian attitudes began to be modified by Chinese attitudes because the Chinese read into these translations Taoist meanings. So things got a little altered. Now here came the alteration that is crucial. First of all in Indian Buddhism has very little humor. But Chinese life is full of humor. The greatest philosopher of Chuang Tzu, or you know, is the only philosopher who is in I think in the whole world who is profoundly humorous there's a book in the modern library. Published by Random House called the wisdom of Lao Tzu, and this is translated by Lin Yutang and he includes along with the translation of huge sections of trance are. And this is absolute. It's fascinating. Because of the humor of it. Indian Buddhism had very little humor some years but very little. Next, it was all tied up with celibacy, which to the Chinese was absolutely incomprehensible. Because in and Chinese civilization is rigged around the family. To a far greater extent than ours is. Which is saying something. And, they just couldn't see any point or any wisdom in celibacy. When Buddhism came to China it still retained a certain element of celibacy. But

for different reasons than than Hindu. The Chinese way of celibacy is not that sex is naughty but it's terribly convenient not to have a wife. In other words the ideal of the uninvolved life. Has a certain appeal but they could never never get through into their heads the notion that sexual desire was bad. Which plays has always played a fairly strong role in Hindu thinking. And not in the same way as it has in the West. They don't have of the Hindus don't have a guilt take on it. But they think that it it dissipates your spiritual energy energies. And you see the in yoga they envisage the idea that at the base of the spine there is what is called the kundalini, the the serpent power of the force of psychic energy and so long as it. Mains at the base of the spine this force is dissipated in sexuality. Now, yoga is to suck this thing up the spine and get it into the head. And so then you withdraw from the manifestation of this energy all the dissipation of it in sexuality and it's put on a higher level only, which end is up? You can do it the other way too they have what's called the right hand way of doing it on the left hand where doing and I'm not going to go into that now.

But the Chinese didn't see it that way. They couldn't see that it was a dissipation of energy. So what they wanted to aim at was a way of living Buddhism and being awake but at the same time remaining active in the ordinary life of the world. It's what's called in their phraseology being king on the outside and the sage on the inside. Managing practical affairs completely involved in whatever life it is but at the same time inwardly living on top of a mountain. Being cloud-hidden whereabouts unknown. So Chinese Zen is the preeminent expression of this because it is the mixture of Indian but ism and Chinese Taoism plus a certain Confucian practicality. Zen developed out of the work of Kumara Jiva, came into China as I said for four hundred or a little before. He had two disciples who began to work on Buddhism from a Taoist point of view. And they were actually the originators of Zen. Then apparently about. The shortly before five hundred as the dates now check out another Indian came to China whose name was Bodhidharma. And Bodhidharma was the person who touched off the Zen as a specific movement. Bodhidharma had a pupil by the name of Aka. And Chinese. It caused Japanese pronunciation like Zen is the Japanese pronunciation of the Chinese Chan. And the story is that when Akan came to Bodhidharma. Bodhidharma refused to accept him as a student all zen masters do this. They reject you. And this stimulates you see to come back

stronger if I mean if you're going to learn it all. And a car came back stronger and stronger and stronger and Bodhidharma resisted him strong and strong and finally he cut off his left arm. And presented it to Bodhidharma and said Look here's my left arm given to you as a token that nothing can win the world matters for me except to find out what you're all about. All right he said. What you want to know? Akan said I have no peace of mind please pacify my mind. In Chinese mind is. This word pronounced Sion. And Shane is here. Shane as the heart mind it's the psychic center. And so Bodhidharma said Bring out your shin here before me and I will pacify. A car said when I look for it I can't find it Bodhidharma said then it's pacified. And Akan immediately understood what all the thing was about that's the experience of Satori in Japanese, Wu in Chinese Mandarin and the Cantonese dialect [grunts]. It's what we call in our modern psychological jargon they are half anonymous the a-ha phenomenon. A-ha! Now I see.

Well now, what was all this? This Zen, which in Chinese is this character. [Zen] is a translation of the Sanskrit word jnana. And so this is being pronounced Chang in Chinese. And then in Japanese is Unfortunately untranslatable in English. It designates a certain state of consciousness. That is sometimes called meditation. But that won't do it all contemplation isn't really the point the Chinese have a different word for concentration. And sometimes one pointedness of mind. I would prefer to translate this word. Within notion of total presence of mind. When we say a person is crazy we often say they're not all there. Now go to the opposite of that and visualize the person who is completely there or who is completely here. A person who lives totally and absolutely now. That doesn't mean he's incapable of thinking about the past or the future because thoughts about the path and about the future are included in the present you have them now. But imagine a kind of person who is not distracted. Who, when he talks to you, he really gives you his whole being. Who doesn't as it were look over your shoulder and wonder after something else. Somebody who first of all he's completely here and he's so much here that you can't phase him. Now this idea of phasing is crucial in them. You see, I referred a moment ago to attachment that Buddhism is living free from attachments and I have made the point that this is not abandoning a sense of a good appetite for dinner. But it's stopping sticking in psychological jargon you

don't block. I mind of no hesitation it's sometimes called in Chinese the phrase mo chir chu is used, you know, going straight ahead. So supposing somebody walks up to you on the street and says I You say. Now most of us who are intelligent people feel embarrassed by such a question. You know was this wretched Salvation Army person or job was witness during asking me whether I'm saved or not and we're all a bit you know what do you do with a nut like that.

So what is in Zen This is a perfect moment to respond see to the most embarrassing question are you sane? But then comes back in a very funny way. In Zen, one doesn't give a philosophical answers to a question like that. You get practical answers. I had a boiled egg this morning. Because whenever you are asked about matters sacred, theoretical and philosophical you answer in terms of things earthly and practical. But then on the other hand when you are asked about things earthly and practical you answer in terms of things religious and philosophical. Is dinner ready? You know. Who's asking this question? Who are you? So, this is then the flame. Sam. Is. You know a Bodhidharma. Is supposed to have meditated so long with his legs cut off, and he's usually drawn this way something like this.

It looks like a Shmu. But in Japan, you buy these toys that are dharmas and they are so weighted in here that you can never knock them over you can bet it on the floor batted this way bat that way but it always comes up again. And so the poem says seven times down, eight times up. Such is life. So this is the principle of not being phased not being attached. So to play the game, you can't phase me. And this is very important in the art of lifemanship. Fundamental gamesmanship, because you see, when the Zen monks moved into Kyoto, they took over the best part of town. Simply fantastic how this happened the beautiful hills that I was talking about this morning were occupied by the Brigands who later became the Japanese nobility. The great Daimyos, the toughest characters. And the Zen monks played a game of them. Which was that you know you possess all these lambs and you're powerful and so on but so what it's all falling apart then what will you do. Well they said that's too bad we don't know. And the Zen monk said. You know you haven't got the hang of the things. So, they found that they couldn't terrifies Zen monks. That they played all sorts of tricks but the Zen monks were better masters at it. Supposing you say to

somebody. Look I'm not afraid of you you can do anything like you can kill me or anything else to talk well if I go to kill the fellow who says this are never find out whether he was afraid or not. So, they out-faced these people and said you did you need we have a secret you see that you don't have and we'll teach your. Your servitors to be great warriors because they'll learn the secret too and they won't be afraid of anything and this is what they did and so they daimyos, the nobleman. Built a great monasteries for these and masters and monks on their best land the finest artists of Japan made gold leaf screens. For homicide every room in the place and although nobody owns anything individually the community owns it collectively with the protection of the daimyos, and they had a tremendous scene going.

Now to us that sounds extremely weird. Even immoral you don't expect religious people to do things like that. You know I know you don't care if the religious people are self-righteous and have no human. But these people didn't go around pretending that they were specially good. They didn't do themselves. Yes. They were people who understood what human nature is that in every one of us there is an element of irreducible rascality. In Jewish theology this is called the yetzer hara. Yezer hara. The element of irreducible rascality, which was created by God because God has one too. And that's why when you are really affectionate with somebody else. When for example, men I don't know what women do in their private lives between each other but men. As we all know say to someone they're very fond of why you all basket. You know. Just like that you know there's a certain way of saying to a person there's a certain glint of recognition. And so there's a Zen poem which says when to Zen masters meet each other on the road they need no introduction. When a thief meets a thief, they recognise each other instantly. And this goes back you see again into the heart of Chinese philosophy. That human nature is considered to be basically good. And even the rascally elements of it are good, they have a sort of salt in the human stew. There has to be this little thing that human passions and that the the natural contentiousness and green or whatever that we have is an essential element in our makeup. And that when people lose sight of that they go mad. Nothing for example, is more dangerous than a saint. That is to say, an unconscious saint who thinks that he is right. And. Who endeavors to live an absolutely pure life. And to eliminate all selfish thoughts. Somebody who undertakes that task is going to be a menace. To

all around. Because he loses his humor. He loses his real humility, which is knowing that after all since we are humans we have certain needs we are. We need to eat we need sex we need this that and the other, and this this sort of has a quality of humor to it. And so this is why in Zen Art, the sages are always drawn to look a little bit like bums. You know that put tie or Hotai as he's called what's called the laughing but of the fat but it with an immense belly. And carrying around an enormous bag of rubbish into which he indiscriminately puts anything he finds around and then gives it away to children. This is the sort of type which the Chinese call the old rogue. And the old rogue as a type of the poet, sage, monk and scholar you see is greatly admired he is the nonviolent Brigid. The Rolling Stone. The free man. Or in our words, the Joker. The Joker you see, is the card that can be played any role in the back. So then, Zen developed in China after Bodhidharma's time. And came to a sort of a golden age in the tongue and song dynasties. The Golden Age of Zen lies between seven hundred thirteen. A.D.. And approximately eleven hundred, twelve hundred. Eleven to twelve hundred. That's the great creative period. In which all the marvelous Masters emerged and during which zen exercised a profound influence on the development of Chinese. Poetry of painting calligraphy and scholarship.

Then, between eleven and twelve hundred, it shifted to Japan. And underwent a new development. Rather different in quality and in tone. And after it [had] done that for some curious reason which is very complicated historical question, it slowly faded away in China. So that as we find it today it is principally a Japanese phenomenon, and it is slowly fading in Japan. And slowly growing in the West. It's very funny thing. Now then, let me indicate what Zen training, what it's method is, how does it work. I said before, what is involved is a dialogue, an interchange between two people. One who has defined himself as a student. And has therefore defined the other as the teacher. There is no teacher until a student arrives. No problem until a question is raised. So students create teachers. It's very funny. We have a saying, anybody who goes to a psychiatrist thought to have his head examined. You can interpret that as you're an idiot to go to a psychiatrist because they're a bunch of charlatans. But the subtler meaning of it is, yes, if you can if you define yourself as being in need of help psychiatrically you need a psychiatry. They say exactly the same thing in Zen. If you ask a

question you get thirty blows with a stick. If you don't ask a question, you get that it blows with a stick. Because you simply, put yourself in satupa lari [sic]. You have defined yourself as having a problem. Now nobody really has a problem but the mire the game of life is to pretend that you knew. Going back to fundamental Hinduism the godhead of the self pretends it's all of us and so gets lost and so as a ball, dreams all this going on. So when you're on your way out from the dream it suddenly occurs to you that you have a problem. Life is suffering. You would like to get out of this, so one such student went to a Zen master and he said, we have to dress and eat every day. And how do we get out of all that. In other words, you might ask the question in this way we have to work to get up Monday morning go to the office do all this routine sell something and so on how do we get out of the rat race. So we have to dress and eat every day, and how do we get rid of all back. In the master said we dress, we eat. The student said, I don't understand how he replied if you don't understand put on your clothes and eat your food. I know there's this is the kind of dialogue so characteristic of plan. So the position is this. The master on being approached by a student about the problem of life. Says I have nothing to teach you. I'm a Zen master I have nothing to say Zen is not words. And furthermore, everything is perfectly clear. There was a Confucian scholar who went to a Zen master and said What is your secret teaching? And he replied, There is a saying in your own teacher Confucius which explains it all didn't remember when Confucius said to his disciples do you suppose that I'm concealing something from you I've held nothing back. And the scholar didn't get this. So a few days later, they were walking together in the mountains and they passed the wild laurel bush. And the Zen master said to the Confucian scholar do you smell it he said yes he said, You see, I'm holding nothing back. So the position of the Zen Master is, there is nothing to tell. There is no... because we're not offering you any panacea or any solution any doctrine any big big goodie. For the problem of life. Because the problem is an illusion. Well then the student under these circumstances thinks. Well this is some sort of a come on. He's testing my sincerity, and of course the nothing which he has the teachers that the mystery of the great void. Theory does not he doesn't take it as meaning just plain old ordinary nothing but the great void. And so, he persists, and the teacher makes him persist until he gets a way out on a limb. He has to persist so much that he practically dedicates his life saying just as a way to a car symbolically cut off his arm.

The students put in the position of dedicating his life to solving this thing and getting what that the chance. And of course there wasn't anything all along but he's been put in that position.

So then, once he's in start to put the Lhari. Once he becomes a student. He's put through all kinds of hoops. They make him learn to meditate to sit cross-legged practice doesn't and then they also add to the trouble by asking impossible questions which are called koan. And these questions are palpably absurd. What they're saying essentially, at least the elementary koans are all concerned with this requests for behavior on the part of the student that will be perfectly genuine. In other words, show me who you are. Now wait a minute I don't want to see any social definition of you. I don't want to know your name, your address, who your parents were. I want to see the absolutely authentic you it's like existentialist talk about authentic being. Or might be in the same way a contrast or father confession in a Christian sense would say, Now give me a really good confession. What is the thing bad bad thing you've really done? And you confessed to him and doubters and their son sacked religion blasphemies and cussing and so on and he says on come up those are only trivial sins. Come on now, what is there really awful thing you've done. And. This is the backwards way of doing exactly the same thing a Zen Master's doing. I think who you really. Are you anybody is anybody home. Have you got anything and they what they do things like. Making you shout see this word is very important word in Zen. Nothing moves out on the other side of the ball that's represented by the empty circle the word move in Japanese so they say now say it same move move you know the oil of your guts going into this and I don't know you you don't know how to say that come on that's feeble that's nothing that's really say it. They have every kind of trick like that. To show you that the more you make an effort to be genuine the more of a fool you become. And they tie you up in knots until you're desperate there was a server in Americans and student who was on a Fulbright and gave him a year to study Zen. And he started to panic because he'd only a month ago and he hadn't realized that. The only had to and he went to the said license the damage he said look I've got I'm going to get a month left the master said all right we'll have what we call a session or session as an intense meditation practice, where you only sleep three hours a night sort of thing and you meditate all the rest of the time let's go let's really do it! Do it! Do

it! And every day three times you come to me and present the answer to your zen problem your karma. And it got worse and it got worse and it got worse and he got more and more desperate that here was this for bright going to end and he wouldn't know what zen was all about. We're back to on the last day he suddenly saw there was nothing to singing. You know it's all right the way it is and this tremendous illumination this load off his head was of course what the Master was trying to make him do. And now in the ordinary way if you're not on a Fulbright and you learn. You can stay around church and the Master will then play a trick on you. And you say, well now that's wonderful. You've got your foot on the gate. You saw you realise there's nothing to realise you realise the void has nothing to cling to see the. No barriers, no blocks in any direction it's all transparent. But that is just the beginning. And many, many it's all a necessity now for you to discipline yourself much harder to make great efforts really to get through.

So, what are you going to do about that? The student may say well I don't know. I've had enough I think I realise what it's all about. And he goes away. Sometime later, he begins to worry, because you see the great emotional relief of this insight begins the where up. And life begins to look ordinary again. And then he said, well maybe I didn't miss something that was a very good master I went I better go back. So back he goes. And the teacher comes are very very tough. Answers you know you are no good you didn't stick with it why should I take you back oh master I'm so sorry I didn't realize I was young and inexperienced and I now I've come to my senses so the teacher finances all right all right all right you're on probation. Again, he starts another koan, and this one comes in from a completely different point of view. And he's got others that come from this way from this way and from this way from this way. And the point is always, so long as I can beguile you as a teacher into thinking that something you can get, you need to study with me. When I can no longer fool you into thinking that there's something to get out of life, you will know that your life you don't get something out of it you're it. But so long as. You could be fazed and you could be taken in by a teacher, you need a teacher. So in the end when the student no longer needs a teacher. And he sees that the old boy is fooled in the whole way through. He says at the same time, profound respect. And you wonderful rascal. There's a very strange thing in the I've poked around a good deal lately and down among Americans and students to find out

what's going on. And they tell me that the initial come on of a Zen master is very tough. And very authoritarian and paternalistic but as you move in, he turns into your older brother. And is the person you feel going right along with you beside you. Helping you in this thing full of friendship and compassion and everything. But occasionally, he will suddenly turn and bring on the authoritarian stuff. But they do in a very strange way. [There] was a Zen master who on a Saturday morning, when he should have been woken up at eight o'clock. Was woken up at seven. Or whatever the time was. No he shouldn't he should have been woken up at eight on Saturdays and seven on weekdays so this was a Saturday and his attendant Monk came and woke him up at eight he was immediately looked at the clock and absolutely furious it had been woken up an hour late because he didn't know it was Saturday so he's struck out at this monk in rage. And the monk said Master but it Saturday. He said all. Anger disappeared absolutely serene no apologies.

So you see the nature of this game is the zen game. And I seem to have given away the show to you told you, all the inside mechanics of it. But you would discover that if you tangle with the Zen master and you think you know from what I had told you what are the mechanics of it. And you stuck your neck out to put yourself in the position of being an inquiry. Everything I had told you would be useless. He would out with you completely. That's what consists in being a master he's not doing it because he wants to be superior and to put down other human beings he's doing it out of great compassion because he feels he knows something which...If you could find out, you would just be so happy. And would want to give it to everybody else but you can't give it away because everybody's got it but you've got to make them do is to see that they have it and that you don't give it to them. And that's the most difficult task.

Yesterday, I was giving you a general outline of the foundations of the Zen feeling for naturalness in art and life by describing the fundamental principles of the Taoist philosophy and then of the Zen discipline itself. And we saw that the roots of the idea of spontaneous living. Make this conception or rather doesn't accept such a conception as a doing something much more subtle than might ordinarily be imagined. A lot of people think that the spontaneous or completely natural life as it's understood by these Far Eastern philosophers is to act according to women. There was for

example a great Zen monk of lived shortly after 1000 A.D. who had a very peculiar way of painting he had long hair. And he would get very drunk on rice wine, and he had so his hair in ink and sloshing all over the paper. Then he would do a Rorschach test on it. And decide what kind of a landscape it actually was. And then put in the finishing touches. And suddenly, out of this apparent mess a great landscape would be evoked. For the whole art of the thing and then putting in the finishing touches. And also, that is a very curious thing. If a person who is untrained in painting makes a mess with the brush, it's liable to be just immense. Whereas if a person who has the feeling of painting in them for a long time and they make a mess with the brush or just do anything, it looks interesting. And that's why, if you try to copy the best. People in modern abstract, nonobjective painting you find it's very difficult thing to do. Because there is more to spontaneity than caprice and disorder. And I want to try and explain what that is. I mean wouldn't it be great if we could live absolutely on the spur of the moment. Not make any particular plans, not feel that...well, you might make plans because you can make plans spontaneously but. Not to worry about whether you had made the right decision whether your being good or bad selfish or unselfish, and not to hesitate in anything you see. In one of the great applications of Zen as I pointed out was to the art of fencing. And when you learn fencing...you see, you have to learn to be spontaneous because here of all places it is true that he who hesitates is lost. If you are engaged in combat you see, and you stop to think what sort of a defense or attack you ought to make of the enemies got you. So, the way they teach people spontaneity in fencing is very interesting.

When you first start into fencing school you of course live with the teacher he has a kind of. And a but you're given a janitorial job you clean up you wash dishes you put bedding away and things like that but while you're going about your daily business the master surprises you with a practice sawed which is made of four strips of bamboo, rather loosely tied together. And he hits you with this, surprisingly and suddenly, from nowhere. And you're expected to defend yourself with anything available with the bedding, with the broom, with the pots and pans the just anything to defend. But the student never knows when the attack is coming or where or what direction it's coming from and he begins to get tense. And he begins to go around everywhere on the sort of alert you see watching, watching, which

direction is coming from and if he goes down a certain passage feeling that the master's probably lurking around that corner and he's all set to go for him and that he gets that practice sword he suddenly gets hit from behind. So eventually. He gives up. There's absolutely no way of preparing for the attack and so he does wonders around feeling well if it is going to hit. And then he is ready to begin fencing because if you prepare for an attack from a space a specific direction and it comes from some other direction you have to withdraw from the direction in which you would expect it and send your energy in another direction and that takes time so what you do is you go around with a mind of no expectation that is called mushin, or monin. This is a very important Zen expression of motion it all means an empty mind. And this mu, know. The rub the in this. No Shin. You could also call it no heart, because the character shin means both heart and mind but it doesn't quite the same as our word heartless as we use it and it doesn't the same as the word mindless as we use it meaning stupid. To be in a state of mushin is to have a mind like a mirror. And all of this the taoist sage Chuang Tzu said the perfect man employs his mind as a mirror it grasps nothing it refuses nothing it receives but does not keep. And when anything comes in front of the mirror it reflects it instantly. The mirror doesn't wait to reflect it but they also say. When the moon rises. All bodies of water instantly reflect the moon I mean they they don't they don't bother with physics about the speed of light or anything like that is irrelevant. To say when you clap your hands the sound issues immediately it doesn't can stop to consider whether it will issue. And so sparks from the flint when it struck, they issue instantly. But to do this you can't try to be quick. So you have a Zen master corners you with a funny situation and he puts you in a quandary expecting spontaneous action from you, don't try to hurry. I know I watch the Zuki wait a whole minute before answering. But he doesn't hesitate. He's not entirely embarrassed by this wait. And he can answer with silence just as well as with a formal response. The point is, do something.

When two young Americans one of the studies then. They were taken by a Japanese monk to interview the master and act as interpreter. And one of them had had some practice and you know knew a bit about it and so after they had had tea together and just discussed formalities the master said in a very easy way well what do you gentlemen know about Zen. And one of these students threw his fan which he happened unfolded the families still

folded up he threw it straight at the Master's face. The master slightly moved to one side and the fan doing research and went right through the paper wall. And the master laughed like a child. That's the sort of game they get him. Once a master was going around through the forest with a group of students and he picked up a tree branch and noticed that one might pick up a tree branch and suddenly he turned to one of his students and said What is it? And he hesitated to hit it with a branch. And so another student was there and he told him which he said What is it he said give it to me I want to see it I'll tell you so the Master tossed the branch to him and he took it and put the money.

Now you may think dollars is kind of a rough stuff. But let me give you another story which is on a rather different level. And a certain then priest was having dinner at a big party and the party was being served by a geisha girl who was so elegant and so skilful in serving that he suspected she might have had some Zen training and so he decided to try her out. And he nodded to her and she immediately came to his place and sat down in front of his little low table. See everybody was would be seated probably in front of low tables all around the room and the geisha servants and people move up and down in the middle. And so she came down and sat down in front of him and bowed and he said I would like to give you a present. And she said I would be most honored. Now on the table there is there are. Which are little braces with charcoal and and you move the charcoal around with iron chopsticks he took a piece of charcoal out and I'm chopsticks an offered it to her. She had long long sleeves on acumen No I'm not she did was this she wound them all round our hands took the charcoal made it look up and went to the kitchen disposed of the charcoal changed her robe which had holes burned all the mobs all the way through the sleeves and came back. And she sat down in front of the master and bowed. And he said and she said to him I would like to give you a present he said, I would be most honored. And so she picked up the hunch up sticks and handed em the charcoal and he pulled out a cigarette and said that's just what I wanted, and lit the cigarette. Now here's a lesson. The master's spontaneity and being ready for that situation was the kind of quick thinking that a good comedian, who wouldn't completely unprepared way can make all sorts of jokes and turn any situation into a jest of some kind. That are of all sorts of people who do that. People who are experts and kind of like Dorothy

Parker. In that sort of repartee, but here it's been developed in a very fundamental way and to a very high degree.

Now the way in which it's developed you see requires a protected situation, because because if we all started to act on the spur of the moment without the slightest consideration or deliberation.[to cat] No. No, no c'mon kitty, shoe. If we all started to act on pure women everybody would think we were crazy. And that people would avoid us and call the police and things like that but what they do is this. They start you doing this in the context of a discipline situation where there are very rigid rules for most of the time but there are certain instance at which all those rules go hand. And you're in a community which understands the game. Because the point is this when you start acting spontaneously. You're not used to doing it and therefore your response is an unintelligent, and inappropriate. But when you become used to doing this and when it becomes second nature to you. To act in the state of motion. No mind or no deliberation, then your behavior has matured. And you find that you're accustomed to that respond quite appropriately as the Zen Master did in lighting his cigarette from the charcoal. So also, in learning the art of swordsmanship, when he has given up defending himself. When he...when he has given up defending himself and preparing his mind for attack then he has got a narrow mind. And this is also likened to a vessel of water like a wooden barrel. When you make a hole in the barrel the water instantly flows out of the hole because the water is always available to come out. It doesn't have to choose. And so you could also say that motion is what Krishnamurti calls choiceless ness. And because you see choice in this sense. Is not quite the same thing as decision choice means dithering. You know there are some people who before they start to write something down they they wiggle their pens a little. Pen delivers over the paper and then they start to write. And so in the same way, a lot of people in the constantly in the life situation they did that because that dithering is anxiety. To be are not to be that is the question Well there is no question about to be are not to be seen because to be are not to be go together as we saw there arise mutually.

And so, Kitty I don't think you're feeling very comfortable. Take care of it I don't want to get mixed up in the paper. So then in, the situation of the zen community. So. Safeguards are set up. In place within which. You can learn

how to act without deliberation which is you see in a sense going back to the State of the. Now it doesn't mean that you give up thinking. It doesn't mean that you become an anti-intellectual. You all can also learn and this is part of the later phases of Zen training. How to think spontaneously. How to deliberate spontaneously. The saying is you see stand or walk as you will but whatever you do don't wobble. So this is our difficulty because the human mind is a feedback system. Feedback as a peculiar susceptibility to nervousness. There was a young man who said though it seems that I know that I know what I would like to see is the I that knows me when I know that I know that I know. Say now, in this way we think about thinking. We worry about worrying. And then, when that really gets bad you worry because you worry about worrying. Now that is it analogous exactly to the kinds of vibration that are set up in certain mechanical systems. For example, if you...I did this trick on television once. I had the camera Man Turn the camera on the monitor. The monitor is the television set in the studio where you see what your doing. And so on this show I said Now I'm going to show you a picture of anxiety. Don't worry about your sets, this is not going to be anything wrong with the offset so don't turn it off now said Mr camera man would you please turn the camera on the monitor. He does that and what does he do? He's taking a picture of taking a picture. All in the same system. And as you do that the system starts going on young young man and an ad like that you see, it then makes a sense of kind of oscillation. And you see on the screen all these jagged lines dancing across. Now that's what's meant to see by hesitation, attachment, blocking all that kind of thing which the Zen discipline is designed to overcome. And because the human being is such a peculiarly beautifully organized nervous system and has this tremendously subtle cortex which is capable of all kinds of thinking about thinking. And you could turn yourself on in the most extraordinary ways by for example getting earphones which repeat what you say just a fraction of a second after you say it back to you they delay it and you can get an answer or scope tied up with your own heartbeats, and get feedback through in this way so that you suddenly begin to see yourself behaving. And it completely balls you up because you wait for yourself to go on but then he realizes you doing it but you can't wait on your heartbeat you can wait on what you say. And you'll get the sensation of going faster and faster and faster and faster until you just have to close the whole thing off. Or you'll go crazy.

So that's what we're doing, and our civilization and our social institutions reflect this in hundred of ways. And this would be true of any civilization because also relies ation is based on the development of consciousness and feedback that is to say, the property of self-control. Being self-conscious looking at what you have done. And then being able to criticize it and correct it. But who criticize it is the critic reliable when you criticize yourself. Who will criticize the critic. You see or to put it in the other way christus custodial ipsos custodes who will guard the guards themselves who will take care of the policeman. Who will govern the president? And that is the big problem. And when we get tied up in the problems the Chinese got tied up in it because they were simply of very high order of civilization so did the Japanese There has to be a break. Somebody has to start throwing things. Otherwise everybody will go insane. So,, Zen functions in that culture as a way of liberation. From the tangle of being too civilized now you see in Japanese culture, people are tremendously concerned with propriety with good manners. And with keeping up with the Joneses. One of the funniest things in the world is to watch Japanese people having a bowing contest. With a very frequent thing when friends meet or take leave they go. And they bow and they bow and they were behind the ticket back and forth, and see who gets the last one in because I'm more polite than you! And the worries about when somebody comes you know you would visit a family always bring a gift. And they start wearing is this gift suitable What is it anything as good as the gift they last gave us and is it right for the occasion have we thought about it enough is there some symbolism in this give that connects with this person the name of their birth they are something that that and think about the things ad terminum. And thus they cultivate in the ordinary culture. Has a great deal of social nervousness in it people giggle you often see girls who giggle and cover their mouths to try to say I'm not really giggling. All sorts of funny things happen because of this immense social awareness and nervousness.

Now as Zen breaks that up. Only it does it in a way that is as high artistry to it. So you see, in let's just take the aesthetic domain for the moment and you remember I was discussing yesterday one tivo. And you remember two. In the whole history of ceramics the Chinese developed some of the most elegant work imaginable. You are probably aware I don't see a specimen of the great work of the Sung and Korean Potters. Very often done in a jade

like green the most gorgeous texture. It looked practically as if it was carved out of Jade. Well that led on you see to the the Piat techniques of the Ming Dynasty with translucent porcelain, white clay. The most subtle design of all, and that style went also to Japan. And the very very rich people you read about here in say books like the tail of Genji, and you see a film of you must see it touche in Goa. This story of the forty seven Ronin. The lovely things they had around their houses were unbelievable. The lacquer, the boxes in pure gold. Oh, you know it was delicious stuff. About then, it was just like having too much. And ice cream and feeling mean young. Cooked archive am you know that French book who made everything look like an Oriental powers.

Now what happened? The people who practice Zen suddenly got an eye. For the beauty of the ordinary. There are two reasons for this. One was that they became fascinated with what happened spontaneously. What pattern a brush would make when handled roughly and the airlines were shown. They also because their practiced zazen, which is sitting quietly, not thinking of anything. Special but having a completely open mind. That puts you into a state where you get much better eyes and ears the new Ordinarily I have. And you start really seeing things. So you know that famous Haiku poem the old pond of frog jumps in, plop. And Japanese that plop is means the sound of the water. And there's a nother poem. Just like it in the dark forest a very drops. The sound of the water. But somebody suddenly realised you see, just the sound of the water it is marvelous. That's all. Or , they what we found that they were kept getting in very very cheap Korean rice bowls. The poorest cheapest kind of a presence to eat out of. And suddenly it struck one of the zen masters that that was an incomparably beautiful object. Nobody had seen this before. They also had the simplest wooden ladles. Bamboo and then a stick in it for use in the kitchen and one day somebody noticed that this ordinary everyday kitchen utensil was just lovely. And so in the same way, they found that it was quite a satisfactory, to listen to the kettle boiling as to listen to an elaborate concert. So what did they do. They started Throop. Typically a man called Senyo Rikyu to give part is. A very small get a few guests in shacks little or huts. In the garden made of. Very primitive materials such as a mud walls. And where they would go and sit and out of the simplest utensils, carefully chosen by a superb artist, they would simply sit and enjoy the uncomplicated life. And

so was born the tea ceremony. Now, look at that you see in the historical context that's terribly important it was they going back to the primitive. After people were sick of too much civilization. And yet, it was going on to the primitive rather than back. Because the people who selected all those things, they knew they knew the whole tradition of their civilization and their culture. They want barbarians. Once upon a time and then, you see when this became the rage. Rick you became. Attached to the court. The Shogun had tea with the Rikyu. Everybody started getting digging tea ceremony. And in due course, the whole thing became awful. Because what's happened today is this. Tea ceremony is essentially something to enjoy. And there are a few men left who know how to the ceremony. And it's an extremely congenial choir get together. For easy conversation simple and an ostentatious manners and really lovely things to look at.

I was present at a tea ceremony celebrated by is a Zen monk who happens to be an American. And he is a man who has done a lot of mountaineering. And he has therefore with him at all times the sort of equipment that you take on camping in the mountains because he does a lot of climbing in Japan. And I said to him one sure this afternoon with their nice to have a tea ceremony and you did it once before here and it was so pleasant would do so that again said Yes by on before he had served tea ceremony in the style that Zen monks do it which is rather simple and direct and much more comfortable than all these well educated ladies were on tittering about it and on tiptoe nervous I'm hoping they won't make a mistake and all that kind of thing is that dreadful. So he suddenly came in with a small Primus stove. Set that down then he had an old paint part. Which had inside it and aluminum Ugh he said that down. He then proceeded to take the aluminum market out pour water into the paint part and set that on the prime a stove but he ritually pumped up the primus stove he did everything in the style of tea ceremony but this was a dirty old Primus stove. And suddenly the thing began to flame like the god food Oh and. He mixed the tea in the traditional way with the whisk had all the perfect and lovely mammals handing us the aluminum cup. And we got into along with we it's a custom after the tea ceremony after drunk to pass all the utensils around for inspection and this is exactly what happened and we found that the aluminum Cup had the one nine hundred forty five stabbed on it which after it's. We got into a discussion about styles of aluminum copper speck the fact you thought you.

And it was the funniest thing but it was a complete make over of the tea ceremony into the modern idiom. Of course the tea drunk in tea ceremony is that powdered green tea. Which you don't steep like you may garden rooty you whisk it in mixed with a small amount of hot water into a froth and it's called Liquid Jade. And it's a bit of an acquired taste for most westerners. It tastes a little bit like a mixture of Matcha tea and Guinness. But when you get to know it it's very invigorating and very awakening and if you make up a strong mixture of it it's a good thing to use if you want to stay awake all night and do work. And so you see, the legend was that Zen monks started this interest in tea because they needed it to kids stay awake during the practice of meditation and it said that Bodhidharma, whom I drew for you yesterday and he's always drawn with eyes that are wide open why because he hasn't got any eyelids. Once, when he was meditating he fell asleep and he was furious and cut his eyelids off and as they dropped on the ground up came the first he plants that's why they have leaves shaped like eyelids and are all to be drunk ever thereafter staying awake so the plant of but isn't that teeny is the Buddhists drink just like wine is the Christian drink coffee is the Islamic drink and milk the Hindu drink. My religion as it's as it's drink. So then, around this kind of appreciation, born of stillness, and the delight in seeing how nature takes its course. Came the entire cult of Zen art with its special kind of activity. Its special ceramics its special calligraphic styles and its special gardens which are the controlled accident.

Now you see, as I showed you yesterday on that other tea bowl, this is a water jar. And. They leak they like to leave the bottom on glazed. You can really see that it's that way. But look you see how the Glazers been allowed to run. This that we would call not need at all. And you watch somebody make one of these. And I have watched a man just pick up the plate and as he applies the design of the glaze he just goes whoosh with the brush. And lets it drop on it. And it's done. There's another Man who blazes by wood smoke, and in his kiln you may put about eleven hundred pieces. And he wraps them in straw. And wherever the straw touches it leaves a splash of orange color against the purple background. Now you see, the straw arranges itself according to the nature of straw. It doesn't follow strict human direction. And the fascination is when they open up that kiln and bring the things out they look eagerly to see what is the straw down. So, this

principle of letting glaze run. To see what will happen is wu-wei, this is noninterference. This is mushin also no purpose or it can also be translated know a specific intent. And now of course you see, sometimes this doesn't work. And the master picks it up and says. That's not very interesting and rejected. What are the canons of taste which decide whether he will accept one of these accidents or reject it? Because here an additional principle of control enters say in the practice of calligraphy. A man may sit down with a huge pile of paper in front of him. And do a piece after piece after piece and if it isn't. Right he throws it away. So he eventually makes a selection comes out there's a famous story of a Zen master who was doing calligraphy and he had a very smart monk standing beside him who was his assistant and the monk said to each one as he did it you can do better than that oh now, oh come now you know much better than that this master got more and more furious but the monk had to go out to the bento to the toilet or mount and he thought quite what he's afraid. He did it and the Monk came back I looked and he said a masterpiece. I mean.

So there's this element of selection you see now what what determines that's. How do you know? Another example of this there was a tea caddy. Porcelain tea caddy not possible but clay. And when Senyo Rikyu was having tea ceremony he saw this tea caddy and made no comment on it and the owner. Was Dead disappointed that he smashed it. But one of his friends picked the broken pieces out of the trash can. And took them to a mender, and he said Look mend this with gold. And he put it there for gold cement and put this caddy back together and so it had all over its surface spidery lines of gold. And when Rikyu saw that he was just enchanted, and it became one of the most valuable caddies in the Japanese collections. Spidery lines of go following it just apparently a chance marks of a smash. There was a competition at the Art Institute in the University of Chicago in which there was a sculpture class and the competition was that each student was given a cubic foot of plaster of Paris. And they said now do something with it. Well the prize was won by a woman who looked at this cube and said it has no character. It doesn't want to be anything. So she flung it on the floor and smashed it all up. And she made dents in it and banged off the corners and but cracks a bit and things and she looked at again she said, Ah, now I know what it wants to be. And so she followed the grain in it as it were made by all these cracks and produced this marvelous piece of

sculpture. You have in this area a very ingenious sculptor but I am Donal Hord who is a master at following the grain in wood and actually making the grain the grain seems to suggest to him the muscles in the flow of the kind of body that he's making. Or that's the thing.

So, when a master decides whether the accident came off. What he wants is this. He wants the thing. To be the perfect harmony. Of Man and nature. Of order and randomness. Now this is a curious thing in the human mind. When we play games, we get most fascination out of those games which satisfactorily combine skill and chance. Games like bridge. Poker have a sort of admirable combination of these two elements, and we can go on playing those games again and again and again because you don't feel completely at the mercy of chance as you do with dice, unless you cheat. And you don't feel completely at the mercy of skill as you do with chess. Or specially with a game like three-dimensional chess. So there's a sort of up to the middle where order and randomness go together. Well that's what this man is looking for. He's looking for the optimal combination, you see, the things the artwork like a Persian miniatures or the jewelry of Cellini. And Chinese porcelain is too much skill. Too much order. It's like those houses you go into where you dare put an ash in the tray, because everything is so clean and everything is so tidy you don't touch it. One prefers a house you see that looks a little lived in it is more genial more comfortable somehow invites you to sit down and even put your feet on the table. Whereas on the other extreme, some kind of pad where everything is covered and filthy clothes are thrown in the corner and...you know, people are all paint all over them and so on. That's the that's the other extreme we don't want that. But that's that curious thing in the middle.

Now, the most difficult thing is to hold to the Middle. It's like walking a tightrope and that's why the path of Buddhism is called the razors edge. Because you see what happens. When this all this kind of work. In the course of history became fashionable. People began to affectation these styles. For example when Seshu The Great Master painter worked he would sometimes take a handful of straw. And paint with that instead of a brush in order to get the sort of rough effect that he wanted. But later on, there came people who could take an ordinary paint brush and so exactly ink that brush, that it would give precisely the messy effect that they had in mind.

They would also be able to ink a brush in such a way and this is terribly decadent they could dab grapes on the vine, and have dark ink where the shadow was supposed to be. And no into tall where the highlight was supposed to be as when they started getting mixed up with Western ideas about shadows and perspective. They didn't have that earlier. But they were so skilled in the handling of the ink, that they would do this sort of thing and they would imitate you see all the the so-called rough and natural effects of the greats and artists. And so, today in Japan a younger generation of artists has decided it's time to break all that up. If you imagine for example haiku parties, the writing of haiku poetry by show who is the great seventeenth century master of haiku said get a three foot child to write haiku. Because they're the sort of direct guileless things that children would say. But now that a magazine devoted to haiku poetry, wherein every issue there will be ten thousand haikus, written by people all over the country and they get so stilted and so affected that one which one had never heard of haiku. The same thing is starting over here. And you should see the entries we get in these haiku competitions that Japan Airlines and other people sponsor. But it all after a while becomes dated, stilted, and so somewhere again the new thing has to break out. Which is always coming up but there's no formula you see for fixing it so that you can do it again and again and again, because the moment you start doing it again and again and again it isn't it anymore that the the real thing has escaped. You remember, some time ago, there was a passion for having wrought iron fish does the outline of the fish some artist originate you know put this fish together and look great but then you suddenly found them in every gift shop and dime store and they look perfectly terrible. So this is the mysterious thing, where not only in the arts, but in life styles in everything. When you start saying what is the technique for getting this thing and people say well this is it. It's gone. Same in education. Same in music. The moment you start teaching something, what are you what question you are asking? How could we...is there some method whereby in our schools we could produce from the music department every graduation ceremony three music for musicians of the stature of Bach or Mozart? Now if we knew how to do that, that knowledge would prevent us from being surprised by the work of these people because we would know how it's done. And when you know how something is done it doesn't surprise you. That's why there's a Zen poem that says if you ask where the flowers come from even the god of spring

doesn't now. Suddenly the God of spring would be supposed to know where the flowers come from but the truth of the matter is it doesn't.

And so in the same way, if you ask the Lord God. How do you create the universe? He said I have no special method. And this, this is known in Zen as a very difficult this is the most difficult virtue to attain. So many of these things begin with mobile. Buji, it means nothing special. It means no business. No artificiality. In American, current, real cool. So buji is where something doesn't stand out like a sore thumb. But it is absolutely different. From being modest. A buji person may be immodest in the sense that if he knows he can do something where leader says he can. He doesn't go at all sorts of blushing violet techniques. Buji, you see is this mysterious quality of nothing special no special method. Because if there is that may repeat if we do know the method and we know it infallibly. It ceases to be interesting. There are no surprises left. And the moment the element of surprise is gone. The zest of life has gone. That you see is why it's very difficult to teach Zen to yourself. Because you can't easily surprise yourself. The essence you see of this kind of spontaneity is response to a surprise so the Master you don't know what he's going to do and he surprises you it's like trying to cure hiccups. Very difficult to kill yourself because when you patches on the back you know when you're going to do it so you're already for it but somebody else comes up and slams you on the back and that's a surprise and what you needed was a surprise. Or it's like jokes. What makes you laugh about a joke is the element of surprise in it. That's why jokes aren't funny after they've been explained. So in the same way, all these Zen stories. If explained, have no effect. They're intended to produce what I would call metaphysical laughter. But this has to be a surprise. And so, as to be surprised...well there's no way of. Premeditating it. So we'll see if you read for example there's a book out here called Zen by are you going to have a go who started archery many of you probably read this book by Herrigel. He had to learn to pull the bowstring in the manner of the Japanese Archer and let it go, but not on purpose. Is to have to let it go without thinking first I let it go. And then let go. He had to let it go. Not on purpose. Now that really bug Harreigel. How do you do something not on purpose Pashley If you're aiming at a target. Well the whole point is if you think before you shoot it too late. The targets moved. That's why we have a thing like beginner's luck. You see if you simply

point at something like that if your finger was a gun I would probably have hit the light switch. And so you get a person who is naive about a gun will pick a gun up and bang and the thing will be will drop did. I or never forget the first time I ever used a slingshot. Yes friend of mine was with me and he was aiming away and not missing and I did pick it up again and it hit and I couldn't do it again. You get a certain naturalness there.

So, there was a master by the name of Ikyu who was a great leg puller. And he had in front of his house a very now pine tree. One of those things contorted and I love this kind of thing and he put a notice up by said I Ikyu, will pay one hundred yen, which was a fair amount of money in those days, to anyone who can see this tree straight. Well soon there was a whole crowd of people around that tree line on the ground they twisting their necks and looking at every Also. There's absolutely no way of seeing the tree with a straight trunk. But if you had a friend who was a priest of another sect and a smart boy went over to see this friend and said what about this mistake use tree ower the output is perfectly simple he said You go and tell him the answer to seeing the tree straight is to look straight at it. So first found went over to Ikyu, and said I claim that it was he said he looked straight at it and if you looked in a funny way and said he was fucked out the Hundred Year and gave it to him I think you'll be talking to Rozin down the street.

Now in that way, just look straight at it. In otherwise, here's the bowstring let go of it don't. All this thimble-tambling, nimble-nambling, babbling jumble humble about. The right technique of letting go of it let go of it damn it. But that's very difficult. Because if as say to you now everybody let's be unselfconscious. And so finally, in desperation, you at last Learn to let go of the thing. Which was what you were supposed to do all the time. And then, one is as again as a child. This is original innocence. So, this is the meaning of the person who was asked what do you do here in the Zen institution, he said we eat when hungry and we sleep when tired. But he said that's been just like everybody else they all do that he said they do not. When they eat they don't eat. But they think of all sorts of extraneous matters and they tire they don't sleep they dream all kinds of dreams. So let's have an intermission, and then we can have a discussion.

Meditation

The art of meditation is a way of getting in touch with reality. And the reason for it is that most civilised people are out of touch with reality because they confuse the world as it is with the world as they think about it and talk about it and describe it. For on the one hand, there is the real world, and on the other a whole system of symbols about that world which we have in our minds. These are very, very useful symbols, all civilization depends on them, but like all good things, they have their disadvantages and the principal disadvantage of symbols is that we confuse them with reality. Just as we confuse money with actual wealth. And our names about ourselves our ideas of ourselves images of ourselves, with ourselves. Now of course reality from a philosopher's point of view, is a dangerous word. A philosopher will ask me what do I mean by reality? Am I talking about the physical world of nature, or am I talking about a spiritual world or what? And to that I have a very simple answer. When we talk about the material world, that is actually a philosophical concept. So in the same way, if I say that reality is spiritual/ That's also a philosophical concept, and reality itself is not the concept. Reality is [gong] and we won't give it a name.

Now it's amazing what doesn't exist in the real world. For example, in the real world there aren't any things, nor are there any events. That doesn't mean to say that the real world is a perfectly featureless blank. It means that it is a marvelous system of wiggles. In which we descry things and events in the same way as we would project images on a Rorschach blot. Or pick out particular groups of stars in the sky and constellations as if they were separate groups of stars. Well, they are groups of stars in the mind's eye in our system of concepts they are not. Out to them as constellations they're ready grouped in the sky. So, in the same way the difference between myself and earlier rest of the universe, is nothing more than an idea. It is not a real difference. And meditation is the way in which we come to feel our basic inseparability from the whole universe. And what that requires is that we shut up. That is to say, that we become interior silent. And cease from the interminable chatter that goes on inside our skulls because you see most of us think compulsively all the time. That is to say we talk to ourselves and I remember when I was a boy we had a common saying talking to yourself is the first sign of madness.

Now obviously, if I talk all the time, I don't hear what anyone else has to say. And so, in exactly the same way, if I think all the time, that is to say if I talk to myself all the time, I don't have anything to think about except thoughts. And therefore, I'm living entirely in the world of symbols, and am never in relationship with reality. Alright now that's the first basic reason for meditation, but there is another sense, and this is going to be a little bit more difficult to understand why we could say that meditation doesn't have a reason. Or doesn't have a purpose and in this respect it's unlike almost other things that we do except perhaps making music and dancing. Because when we make music, we don't do it in order to reach a certain point such as the end of the composition. If that were the purpose of music, to get to the end of the piece, then obviously the fastest players would be the best. And so likewise, when we are dancing, we are not aiming to arrive at a particular place on the floor. As we would be if we were taking a journey. When we dance, the journey itself is the point. When we play music, the playing itself is the point. And exactly the same thing is true in meditation.

Meditation is the discovery that the point of life is always arrived at in the immediate moment. And therefore if you meditate for an ulterior motive, that is to say, to improve your mind, to improve your character, to be more efficient in life you've got your eye on the future and you are not meditating. Because the future is a concept. It doesn't exist. As the proverb says, tomorrow never comes. There is no such thing as tomorrow there never will be, because time is always now. And that's one of the things we discover when we stop talking to ourselves and stop thinking. We find there is only a present, only an eternal now. So, it's funny then, isn't that one meditates for no reason at all, except we could say for the enjoyment of it. And here I would interpose the essential principle that meditation is supposed to be fun. It's not something you do as a grim duty. The trouble with religion as we know it is that it is so mixed up with grim duties we do it because it's good for you it's a kind of self punishment. Where meditation when corrected on has nothing to do with all that it's a kind of digging the present. It's a kind of grooving with the eternal now. And brings us into a state of peace. Where we can understand that the point of life the place where it's at, is simply here and now.

Well now, in the art of meditation there various props, supports. One thing that we are going to use as a means of stilling chatter in the mind is pure sound. And for that reason, it's useful to have a gong. This is a Japanese Buddhist gong made of bronze and shaped like a bowl. If you don't have one of these you can get the rounded end of an oxygen tank. Have a machinist saw it off roughly into the shape of a bowl and use that. Or you can use your own voice chanting. Another prop in meditation is the use of incense. And that is because the sense of smell is our repressed sense and because it's our repressed sense it has a very powerful influence on us and therefore we associate certain smells with certain states of mind. And so the smell of incense is associated with peace and contemplation and so it's advantageous to burn incense in meditation. The other prop is a string of beads. And these beads are used in meditation for an unconscious method of timing yourself. Instead of looking at a watch, you move a bead each time you breathe in and out, so that at a certain rate..You see, there are always one hundred eight beads on a rosary and when you get the slow breathing halfway around the rosary is about forty minutes, and that is the usual length of time for which one sits in meditation because otherwise you get uncomfortable and you get stiff legs and problems of that kind.

Now then, the other thing first of all that we have to go into is how. How does one sit in meditation? You can sit anywhere you want. You can sit in a chair or you can sit like I'm sitting which is the Japanese way of sitting, or you can sit in the lotus posture, which is more difficult, which is cross-legged with the feet on the thighs, soles upwards. And the younger you start that in life, the easier you'll find it to do. Or you can just sit cross-legged on a raised cushion above the floor or the point of this is that if you keep your back erect. I don't mean stiff like this, nor slumped like this, but just easily erect, you are centered and easily balanced and you have a feeling of being thoroughly rooted to the ground. And that sort of physical stability is very important for the avoidance of distraction and generally feeling settled. Here and Now, Je suis US does the French say, I'm here and I'm going to stay. Well now, the easiest way to get into the meditative state is to begin by listening. If you simply close your eyes, and allow yourself to hear all the sounds that are going on around you. Just listen to the general hum and buzz of the world. As if you were listening to music. Don't try to identify the sounds you are hearing, don't put names on them. Simply allow them to

play with your eardrums. And let them go. In other words, you could put it, let your ears hear whatever they want to hear. Don't judge the sounds. There are no as it were, proper sounds or improper sounds, and it doesn't matter of somebody coughs or sneezes or. Drop something. It's all just sound. And if I am talking to you right now and you are doing this, I want you to listen to the sound of my voice just as if it were noise. Don't try to make any sense out of what I'm saying, because your brain will take care of that automatically. You don't have to try to understand anything, just listen to the sound. As you pursue that experiment, you will very naturally find that you can't help, naming sounds identifying them, that you will go on thinking. That is to say, talking to yourself inside your head automatically. But it's important that you don't try to repress those thoughts by forcing them out of your mind. Because that will have precisely the same effect as if you were trying to smooth rough water with a flat iron. You're just going to disturb it all the more.

What you do is this: as you hear sounds coming up in your head thoughts you simply listen to them as part of the general noise going on just as you would be listening to the sound of my voice or just as you would be listening to cars going by or two birds chattering outside the window. So look at your own thoughts as just noises. And soon you will find that the so-called outside world and the so-called inside world come together. They are a happening. Your thoughts are happening, just like the sounds going on outside and everything is simply a happening and all you're doing is watching it.

Now, in this process, another thing that is happening that is very important is that you're breathing. And as you start meditation. You allow your breath to run just as it wills. In other words, don't do at first any breathing exercise, but just watch your breath breathing the way it wants to breathe. And the notice a curious thing about this. You say in the ordinary way, I breathe. Because you feel that breathing is something that you are doing voluntarily just in the same way as you might be walking or talking. But you will also notice that when you are not thinking about breathing, your breathing goes on just the same. So, the curious thing about breath is that it can be looked at both as a voluntary and an involuntary action. You can feel on the one hand I am doing it, and on the other hand, it is happening to me.

And that is why breathing is a most important part of meditation, because it is going to show you as you become aware of your breath, that the hard and fast division that we make between what we do on the one hand and what happens to us on the other is arbitrary. So that as you watch your breathing you will become aware that both the voluntary and the involuntary aspects of your experience are all one happening.

Now that may at first seem a little scary, because you may think well, am I just the puppet of a happening the mere passive witness of something that's going on completely beyond my control. Or on the other hand, am I really doing everything that's going along? Well if I were I should be God and that would be very embarrassing because I would be in charge of everything that would be a terribly irresponsible position. The truth of the matter as you will see it, is that both things are true. You concede that everything is happening to you, and on the other hand you're doing everything for example it's your eyes that are turning the sun into light it's the nerve ends in your skin that are turning electric vibrations in the air into heat and temperature. It's your ear drums that are turning vibrations in the air into sound and in that way, you are creating the world. But, when we're not talking about it, when we're not philosophizing about it, then there is just this happening this. And we won't give it a name.

Now then, when you breathe for a while, just letting it happen and not forcing it in any way, you will discover a curious thing. That without making any effort, you can breathe more and more deeply. In other words, supposing you simply breathing out and breathing out is important because it's the breath of relaxation, as when we say, whew, and heave a sigh of relief. So when you are breathing out, you get the sensation that your breath is falling out. Dropping, dropping, dropping out with the same sort of feeling you have as if you were settling down into an extremely comfortable bed. And you just get as heavy as possible and let yourself go. And you let your breath go out in just that way. And when it suddenly comfortably out and it feels like coming back again, you don't pull it back in, you let it fall back in. Letting your lungs expand, expand, expand, until they feel very comfortably full. And you wait a moment to let it stay there. And then once again, you let it fall out. And so in this way, you will discover that your breath gets quite naturally easier and easier, and slower

and slower, and more and more powerful, so that with these various aids, listening to sounds, listening to your own interior feelings and thoughts, just as if they were something going on not something you were doing but just happenings. And watching your breath as a happening that is neither voluntary nor involuntary, you are simply aware of these basic sensations, then you'll begin to be in the state of meditation. But don't hurry anything, don't worry about the future, don't worry about what progress you're making, just be entirely content to be aware of what is. Don't be terribly selective, particular, say I should think of this and not of that, just watch whatever is happening.

Now then, to make this somewhat easier. To have the mind free from discursive verbal thinking, sound, or chanted sound is extremely useful. If you for example simply listen to the gong. And let that sound be the whole of your experience. It's quite simple, it requires no effort. And then along with that, especially if you don't have a gong. We can use what are called in the Sanskrit language mantra. Mantra are chanted sounds which I use not so much for their meaning as for the simple tone. And they go along with that easy kind of slow breath. One of the basic mantras is of course the sound ohm. That sound is used because if you spell it out a-u-m, it runs from the back of your throat to your lips and therefore it contains the whole range of the voice. And for that reason, it represents the total energy of the universe this what is called the pranava, the name for the ultimate reality for the which then which there is no whicher. And so, in this way if we chant it... OHMMMMMM, and it's varied like this. AUMMMM [variation]. HUNNNNGGGG. And you can keep that up for quite a long time, and eventually you will find as you go on chanting that the words of the chant will simply have become pure sound. And you won't be thinking about it, you won't have any images about the sound going on in your mind, you will simply become completely absorbed in sound, and therefore you will find yourself living in an eternal now in which there is no past, and there is no future, and there is no thing called difference between what you are as knower and what you are as the known. Between yourself and the world of nature outside you, it all becomes one doing, one happening.

Now, in addition to those slow moving chants, you may find it according to your temperament easier to do a fast moving one. These have a sort of

rhythm to them that is absorbing say a chant that many of you have heard that goes. Krishna conditional Krishna. Hare Krishna Krishna. Hare Hare, Krishna Hare Krishna. Rama Hare, Hare.. And it doesn't matter what it means. Actually Krishna, Rama the names of Hindu divinity is but that's not the point. The point is just to get with that thing that is running, running, running. Any Krishna Krishna Krishna. Any and so on, and if you are a Christian or a Jew and you feel more inclined to use a meditation word that is more congenial to you, you can use say Hallelujah. Or if you're a Mohammed, you can use the the name of God. They have a way of doing it you know which gets very exciting goes, Allah, Allah, Allah, Allah...and it gets faster and faster you can keep it up for forty minutes. And you'll be out of your mind. But you see, to go out of your mind at least once a day is tremendously important, because by going out of your mind you come to your senses. And if you stay in your mind all the time, you are over rational. In other words, you're like a very rigid bridge which because it has got no give, no craziness in it, is going to be blown down in the first hurricane.

Zenrin Poems

Water not disturbed by waves settles down of itself. A mirror not covered with dust is clear and bright. The mind should be like this. When one big clouds it passes away its brightness appears. Happiness must not be so awful. When what disturbs passes away happened next comes of itself.

'At the sound of the bell now in the silent night. I wake from my dream in this dream world of ours. Gazing at the reflection of the moon in a clear pool. I see beyond my form. My real form. The song of birds. The voices of insects, are all means of conveying truth to the mind. In flowers and grasses, we see messages of the Tao. Of the Way of Nature. The scholar, pure and clear of mind, serene and open of heart, should find in everything what nourishes him. Men know how to read printed books. They do not know how to read the unprinted ones. They can play on a stringed harp, but not on a stringless one. Applying themselves to the superficial instead of the profound. How should they understand music or poetry? If you know the insignificance of things, the misty moon of the five lakes is all within you.

If you understand the activity of human phenomena, the heroism and nobility of the great man of all ages is in your grasp.

Walking alone, leaning on a staff in a valley of pine trees, clouds rise around my monkish robes. Sleeping with a book as my pillow by the window beneath the bamboos, I wake. When the moonlight steps on the floor clocks. A solitary cloud comes out of the mountain cave. It stays or departs without reference to anything else. The bright mirror of the moon hangs in the sky. It is aloof from both quietness and clamor.

The Zen says, when you are hungry, eat. When you are weary, sleep. Poetry aims at the description in common language of beautiful scenery. The Sublime is contained in the ordinary, the hardest in the easiest. What is self-conscious and ulterior is far from the truth. What is mindless is near.

The body is like a boat adrift floating along, or motionless in a deep pool. The mind is like a piece of burnt wood. What matters if it is that feeling of vanished with scented lacquer?

Reading the Book of Changes at the morning window. I rub a vermilion stick of ink in the dew that drips from the pine trees. Discussing the sutras with a visitor, the sound of the wooden copper is borne away on the wind from the bamboos. An ancient worthy says, 'The shadow of the bamboo sweeps over the stairs, but the dust does not know. The disc of the moon passes through the water of the lake leaving no trace.' One of our Confucians says, 'The stream rushes down swiftly but all is silent around. The flowers fall incessantly. But we feel quiet.' If you have grasped the meaning of this in all your relationships with things, you are free in mind and body.

If your heart is without stormy waves, everywhere are blue mountains and green trees. If our real nature is creative like nature itself, wherever we may be, we see that all things are free, like sporting fishes and circling kites.

When in the mood, I take off my shoes and walk barefooted through the sweet-smelling grasses of the fields, wild birds without fear accompanying me. My heart at one with nature, I loosen my shirt as I sit absorbed beneath

the falling petals, while the clouds silently unfold me as if wishing to keep me there.

Just as a whirlwind roaring down a valley leaves nothing behind it, so the ear is to have nothing to do with right and wrong. Just as the moon only reflects its light in a pool, so the mind, empty and unattached does not know itself from the outside world as two things.

When waves reach the sky, those in the boat are aware of the danger, but onlookers are trembling with fear. A drunken diner is swearing and cussing at the others but they are piled on and on and whereas those outside the biting that tongues and apprehension of a quarrel. Thus, with the superior man his body may be immersed in affairs, but his mind is above and beyond them.

Though my tea is not the very best, the pot is never dry. My wine is not exquisite but the barrel is not empty. My plane loot, though stringless is always into. My short flute, though a form of this one, suits me well. Following Buddhas, adapting ourselves to circumstances and our confusion acting in accord with one's position these two phrases are the life boy for us to pass over the sea of life. The paths of life our illimitable. If we desire perfection, all kinds of obstacles arise. But if we obey our destiny, we are free everywhere.

The following are verses from a book called Zenrin Kushu. Verses which are collected from ancient Chinese and Japanese classics, and which are used by a Zen monks to understand the spiritual discipline of the koan. That is to say, their understanding of the ancient dialogues between Zen masters and they're disciples. The translation of these verses is by Ruth Saki. From her book Zen dust. Published by Harcourt Brace and World.

'That cold kills you with cold. But heat kills you with heat. And there isn't a piece of tile to cover his head well there isn't an inch of US for him to stand on.

When the mind wants to speak about it Words fail. When the mind seeks affinity with it, thought vanishes. Sun and moon cannot eliminate it completely, heaven and earth cannot cover it entirely. Though we are born

of the same lineage, we don't die at the same lineage. When we are reviling one another, you may give me tit for tat. When we are spitting at one another, you may spew me with slobber. The Deer Hunter doesn't see the mountains. The miser doesn't see man.

Last year's poverty was not real poverty. But this year's poverty is poverty indeed. The Angels find no parts on which to strew flowers. The heretics secretly spying, find nothing to see. Last year's plum and this year's willow. Their color and fragrance, ours of old. At the limits of heaven, the sun rises and the moon sets. Beyond the balustrade the mountains deepen, and the waters become chilled.

He sees only the winding of the stream and the twisting of the path. He does not know that already he is in the land of the immortals.

He who would understand the meaning of Buddha nature. Must wash with the season. And the causal relations. Every Voice is the voice. Every form is the beautiful. The wild goose has no intention of leaving traces. The water has no thought of engulfing reflections.

The instant you speak about a thing, you miss the mark. How can the Mountain Finch know the wild swans aspiring. The eight-cornered mortar rushes across the sky. The Badger and the White Bull emit a glorious radiance. With no birds singing, the mountain is yet more still. In the spring beyond time the withered tree flowers. When the snowy Heron stands in the snow, the colors are not the same.

A pair of monkeys are reaching for the moon in the water. When pure gold enters the fire, its color becomes still brighter. Entering fire, he is not burned. Entering water, he has not drowned. A fish that can swallow a boat, doesn't swim around in a Valley Stream. I do not emulate the sages, I do not esteem my own spirit.

From the top of the solitary peak, I gaze at the clouds. Close by, the old ferry landing, I am splashed with mire. The fishermen, singing on the misty shore, all extol good fortune and honor. The woodcutters, chanting among the lofty trees, together rejoice in the air of peace. On the top of the solitary peak, he whistles at the moon and sleeps in the clouds. Within the vast

ocean, he overturns the waves and rouses the breakers. Not to take what heaven gives is, is to incur Heaven's calamity. Not to act when the moment comes, is to enter heavens misfortune. Enwrapped in billows of white clouds, I do not see the white clouds. Absorbed in the sound of flowing water, I do not hear the flowing water.

I take blindness as vision, deafness as hearing. I take danger as safety. And prosperity as misfortune. When I see smoke beyond the mountain, I know there's a fire. When I see horns beyond the fence, I know there's an ox.

When an ordinary man attains knowledge, he is a sage. When a sage attains understanding, he is an ordinary man. Though a cockatoo can talk, it is still just a bird. Though an orangutan can speak, it is still just a beast. But for the rule and the compass, the square and the circle could not be determined. But for the plum line, the straight and the bent could not be rectified.

The dragon hum in the dead tree. The eyeball in the dry skull. When you are really master of the myriad forms throughout the four seasons there's no weathering, no decay. A light breeze stirs the lonely pine. The sound is more pleasant from close-by. And now that I've shed my skin. Completely one true reality unknown exist.

Art of Meditation

A person who thinks all the time has nothing to think about except thoughts. So, he loses touch with reality, and lives in a world of illusions. By thoughts, I mean specifically, chatter in the skull. Perpetual and compulsive repetition of words, of reckoning and calculating. I'm not saying that thinking is bad. Like everything else, it's useful in moderation. A good servant but a bad monster. And all so-called civilized peoples have increasingly become crazy and self-destructive because, through excessive thinking they have lost touch with reality. That's to say, we confuse signs, words, numbers, symbols and ideas with the real world. Most of us would have rather money than tangible wealth. And a great occasion is somehow spoiled for us unless photographed. And to read about it the next day in the newspaper is oddly more fun for us than the original event. This is a disaster, for as a result of confusing the real world of nature with mere

signs, such as bank balances and contracts, we are destroying nature. We are so tied up in our minds, that we've lost our senses and don't realize that the air stinks, water tastes of chlorine, the the human landscape looks like a trash heap, and much of our food tastes like plastic. Time to wake up. What is reality? Obviously, no one can say, because it isn't words. It isn't material, that's just an idea. It isn't spiritual. That's also an idea a simple. Reality is this [gong]. You see. We all know what reality is, but we can't describe it. Just as we all know how to beat our hearts and shape our bones, but cannot say how it is done. To get in touch with reality there is an art of meditation, of what is called yoga in India, Chan in China and Zen in Japan. It is the art of temporarily silencing the mind. Of stopping the chatter in the skull. Of course, you can't force your mind to be silent. That will be like trying to smooth ripples in water over the flat iron. Water becomes clear and calm only when left alone.

So, will you try an experiment with me? Simply close your eyes, and allow your ears to hear all sounds around you. Don't try to name or identify the sounds, just hear them as you would listen to music. As when you hear a flute or a guitar. Without asking what it means.

And as and when I talk, just hear the sound of my voice. Don't bother about what it means. Your brain will take care of that by itself. Just let your eardrums respond as they will, to all vibrations now in the air. Don't let yourself, or your ears, be offended by improper or unscheduled sounds. If for example, the record is scratchy, OK. You wouldn't object if you were listening to it sitting by a fire of crackling logs.

[phone rings] Let em ring. It's just a noise. And keep your tongue relaxed floating easily in the lower jaw. Also stopped frowning. Allow the space between your eyes to feel easy and open. And just let the vibrations in the air play with your ears.

You must understand that in meditation we are concerned only with what is, with reality, nothing else. The past is a memory. The future an expectation. Neither past nor future actually exist. There is simply eternal now. So don't seek or expect a result from what you're doing. That wouldn't be true meditation. There's no hurry. Just now, you're not going anywhere, simply be here. Live in the world of sound. Let it play. That's all. In the world of

pure sound, can you actually hear anyone who is listening? Can you hear any difference between all these sounds on the one hand, and yourself on the other? Naturally, we use techniques and gimmicks to help the thinking mind to become silent, and one of them is the gong. It is a sound at once pleasing and compelling, it absorbs attention but watch what happens when it fades out. [gong noise] The one sound becomes the many. The single tone is transformed easily and gently into all other noises. And that's how the universe comes into being, out of the one energy underlying all events.

So if you don't have a gong, you can use your own voice, by chanting what Hindus and Buddhists call a Mantra. That is, a syllable or phrase sung for its sound rather than its meaning. Chief of these is the syllable ohm, or auhm, called the pranava, or the sound of God. Because it involves the whole range of the voice, from the back of the throat to the lips. Take the tone from the gong, and hum it with me.

Now, you can hear all sounds as ohm. There all at some point in the total range of sound, from the back of the throat to the lips, making a spectrum of sound as all colors are originally one white light. But, don't ask what the sound is, or what it means. Just hear it and dig it I'm with me again. Hum it again. [gong] Ohm.

Let me explain again what we're doing. We are going behind with names, numbers, beliefs and ideas, to get back to the naked experience of reality itself. And that this level of awareness, we find no difference between the listener the sound, the knower and the known, the subject and the object. Between the past, the present, and future. All that's just talk. What is really happening is. [gongs]

And you may wonder, how I can keep the sound going for so long in time. It depends on regulation of the breath, which is basic to the art of meditation, and I'm going to show you how to do this and why. To begin with, just as you have been letting vibrations in the air play with your ears, let your lungs breathe as they will. Don't as yet attempt any breathing exercise don't force anything simply breathing.

Now, is this breathing a voluntary or involuntary action? Or either? Just feel it without taking sides without words. And again, hear my voice as if it

wind in the trees of the sound of waves. Yes. Yes. Most of us are short of breath. We never really empty our lungs. But to make a long complete out breath you mustn't force it. Imagine there's a large ball of lead inside your neck. And allow it to fall slowly through your body to the floor. Pushing and easing the breath out as it drops, is the breath out just as you settle and sink down comfortably into a bed. And, when the ball reaches the floor, let it drop away as if to the center of the earth. Then, let the breath come back, back in as a reflex without pulling it. And then imagine another ball of lead in the neck. And again. Let it fall out, long and easy. And once again. You know how do you see what's happening. You are generating a great deal of energy without trying or forcing. Two things seem to be happening at once, first the outflow of breath is simply following, happening all by itself. Second, it's under perfect control.

So, from this practice, you learn to experience, to realize, that what happens to you, and what you do are one in the same process. There is no real separation between one thing called you, and another quite different thing called the Universe. When you stop talking and naming, they are quite obviously one. So again, let your breath fall easily out.

All the way. Let it come back on its own, and then out again. Whew. Let's put the sound on the next outflow. [gong] Ohm. And again, so that you have nothing in mind but [gong] ohm.

[afterword] Then, there is a very effective mantrum used by an important sect of Islamic mystics known as Sufis. Like all these different mantrums, they will be kept up for quite long periods say fifteen to twenty minutes or more, so what I'm giving you are only samples. You can easily do this one with me it goes like this. Allah, allah, all-Lah....

Why Not Now?

Before we begin our celebration, I want to talk to you for about half an hour and I apologize for this because I am for the elimination of sermons on Sunday mornings. But I need to explain both for you and for the radio audience what we're going to do. It has been announced as an Aquarian Age religious service. I did not invent that title. It has nothing so far as I

know to do with the Aquarian Age, If such a thing exists. And I don't like the word service. It's got all sorts of associations of sanctimoniousness. So I would rather call it a contemplative ritual. Period. Our purpose in doing this is to offer a suggestion to the churches. To the Christian Jewish and Islamic churches in particular, because for a long, long time, the kind of religious celebration which they have conducted has been impossibly loquacious. And didactic. Almost all our religious observances are nothing but talk. They tell God what to do, as if he didn't know. And they tell the people what to do, as if they were able to do it or even willing. And this throwing the book at people and telling them the Word.

I think we've had enough of it. Because the history of religion is almost equivalent to the history of the fair. Preaching. Since preaching is a kind of moral violence, which excites people sense of guilt, and there is no more uncreative sense than that. You cannot love and feel guilty at the same time. Any more than you can be afraid and angry at the same time. What seems to me to be lacking in our western religious observances is some sort of social ritual or liturgy, which gives an opportunity for spiritual experience. That is to say, for a transformation of the individual consciousness, so that in one way or another the individual is able to realize his oneness. With the eternal energy behind this universe which some people call God, and others prefer not to name or to conceive. The Western religions have from an official standpoint, being somewhat suspicious and leery of mystical experience. Because in the founder of Christianity, a mystical experience, led to the claim that he was God incarnate. Which was, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness. Because if you believe that God is a monarch. A beneficence tyrant in charge of the universe, anyone else claiming to be God is obviously committing an act of subversion. And would be suspected of introducing democracy into the kingdom of heaven. Which is supposed to be a monarchy and not a republic.

And I do not understand how we can be citizens of the United States, believing that a republic is the best form of government, but go on insisting that the universe is a monarchy. I feel rather the Jesus was a person who had this colossal mystical experience that we call cosmic consciousness, the experience that your real self is not that little superficial idea or image of yourself which we call 'I', but the total energy of the world flowing through

you and expressing itself in you. And that's the real you. And it was on that basis that he could say I am the Father are one. What the Christians did was to stop the Gospel cold by saying all right, Jesus was God but nobody else. And so for lack of the spiritual experience of Jesus, nobody has been able to live the religion of Jesus they have lived instead the religion about Jesus, which is a very different thing. Because he's been put up on a pedestal and worshiped at a distance and his example in life rendered ineffective, because you can't make the tail wag the dog, or the cart pull the horse. You cannot expect love in Action, unless there is what the Christians call grace underlying it and grace so far as anybody knows is a purely theoretical thing which you believe you have received but there is never been any indication of it, to speak of, except in exceptional individual lives that account rather occasionally.

So what I'm proposing instead of the ordinary kind of religious this is as I said a contemplative ritual. And the idea is not to have everybody shaken up and whooping around like Indians on the warpath. But to bring about a state of profound peace. So therefore I should say something in a preliminary way about meditation or contemplation as I prefer to call it. Usually when Western people hear that an Oriental practices meditation he asks What do you meditate on. And that question puzzles a Buddhist or Hindu. Because you don't meditate on anything anymore than you breathe on anything. You breathe, and in the same way you meditate. The verb is in a way intransitive. Meditation is the act of allowing one's thoughts to cease. As Patanjali puts it in the beginning of the yoga sutra, yoga meaning the art of meditation more strictly speaking, Yoga means union. The union of the individual in the universe. He says, after saying now yoga is explained he says she you know Gus pretty neat other which means yoga. Is stopping the agitation of thinking. Thinking is talking to yourself, or figuring to yourself. That's the way I use the word.

Now if I talk all the time I don't hear what anyone else has to say. Consequently if I talk to myself all the time I don't have anything to think about except thoughts. There is no Into go between thoughts. During which I can come into touch with reality, that is to say the world which thoughts represent as words represent events, or as money represents wealth. And so, if I'm never silent in my head I'm living in a world of total abstraction,

divorced from reality altogether. You may ask, what is reality? And people have various theories about what it is but you must remember that they're all theories those who believe that reality is material are projecting upon the real world, a philosophical theory about it and those who say that it is mental or spiritual are doing likewise. Reality itself is neither mental nor spiritual, nor any concept that we can have of it reality is simply [gongs] Nor anything else. Nonverbal and words are reality and so far as they are noises. But even that is saying too much.

Now therefore, to meditate you might think that we attempt to suppress thought. We do not do that. Because you cannot meditate. Let me put that in a more emphatic way you cannot meditate. You, your ego image, can only chatter. Because when it stops, it isn't there. When you are not thinking, you have no ego because your ego is a concept. The thinking behind the thoughts the feeling, behind the feelings and the think about Heine the thoughts is only a thought an idea of some reference point to which all our experiences happen. And that of course cuts us off from what we experience it makes a great gap or gulf between the knower and the known. And that creates the spirit of alienation to the world from which we suffer. Conflict. Hate. Domineering spirit arise from that basic division. So when you come to an end of thought, and you don't know how to meditate you don't know what to do with your mind nobody can tell you then thinking comes to an end naturally. And you just watch. You don't ask who watches, because that merely arises from the fact that in grammar every verb has to have a subject by rule. That is not a rule of nature, it is a rule of grammar. In nature, there can be watching without a separate watcher, just as there can be flashing without something called lightning that does it. The lightning is of course the flashing.

So when you realize that you come to your wits end, you can begin meditation. Or meditation happens and that is happening is the watching simply of what is, of all the information to conveyed by your exterior interior senses and of the thoughts that key. Chattering on about it all you don't try to stop those thoughts, you just let them run as if they were birds twittering outside. And they will eventually get tired of themselves and stop, but don't worry about it whether they do or don't just simply watch whatever it is that you are feeling, thinking, experiencing and that's it watch

it. And don't go out of your way to put any names on it. That's really what meditation is and you see you're not expecting any result. You are in meditation in an eternal present. You're not doing it to improve yourself, you found you can't do that your ego can't possibly improve you because it's what's in need of improvement. Your ego can't let go of itself, because it is a complex called clinging to oneself. That's what it is by definition. So it's just something that evaporates when it is understood that it is unable to achieve a transformation of consciousness mystical experience the vivid sense of union of individual and cosmos.

So one of the easiest ways to enter into the state of meditation is therefore listening to what is using the sense of sound. Sound is curiously enough a sense that bores us less easily than sight. And when you listen to sound, you listen to it, just the random sounds you know, that are going on in the room and the street. Is if you were listening to music. Without trying to identify its source or name it. All put any label on it at all just enjoy whatever sound may be going on whether it's in this hall or whether it's in the area where you're listening to the radio. That's what we shall do the proper part of the ritual, just listen. Now we can go on from that listening to making sound ourselves and also listening to it and instead of making sound we learn the knack of letting it happen through us. Once a great choirmaster in England Sir Walter Davies, was rehearsing a choir in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Who was then William Temple a great theologian. And this was a raw choir, he didn't really know much about singing. And he gave them a hymn to sing that they knew very well. And to impress the archbishop they sang it with gusto and it sounded forced and terrible. Then he had with him a professional choir and he asked them to sing a little known hymn. And sing it several times until everybody got the hang of the tune now he's says, 'I want you to sing this tune about there's one very important thing and that is that you don't try to sing it you mustn't try you must think of the melody and let it sing itself.' And they sang it very well, and he turned to the Archbishop and said Your Grace That's good theology isn't it. And it obviously was because William Temple told me the story.

So then, we get to what is in India called the use of mantra. And that is, that the chant words sounds chanted not for their meaning but for their sound. And thus everything that will occur. In the following celebration will not be

in the English language. It is not intended to be understood in a discuss of an intellectual sense you are asked only to dig the sound. And I use the word dig advisedly because it means something a little more than appreciate it means enter in to penetrate get right to the bottom off because when you are listening to sound and when you are letting sound hum through you, this is one of the most obvious manifestations of the energy of the universe. Shaba as it's called in Sanskrit is Brahman. Commonly said sound as Brahma, sound is God That's the real meaning of in the beginning was the word doesn't mean in the beginning was the chatter. In the beginning was the commandment, the orders, it means the vibration of the word and that's. So we concentrate therefore purely on the sound and you will find that although we have a chorus that has been made familiar with these Mantras. Some of them are so simple that you will all be able to join in with them. And please do so quite freely. It's a pity you see that the Roman Catholic Church which used to have a mantric service, the mass is dropping it and putting mass into the vernacular. And not very good vernacular that so far as the English translation is concerned. So that it sounds it's become terribly intellectual and often the somebody is standing by the altar at a microphone to explain what's going on. And therefore as Clare Boothe Luce put it the other day, it is no longer possible to practice contemplative prayer at Mass because you are being hammered out with information with exhortation with edification all the time. And the Catholic Church should realize that in giving up Latin it has lost its magic. Religion is not supposed to be understood. Religion is that which is past understanding. Understanding may lead up to it as a pedagogue but to express religion intellectually is using the intellect with something it can't do it is comparable to taking up the automatic telephone and dialing W H A T I S G O D, and expecting to get information as an answer. Although the telephone is very useful otherwise. You cannot find out the mystery of the universe through talk. Only through awareness.

And for that reason, we offer this as an example, and it's offered in this way. It is a ritual. And it has a certain order to it. But it's very easy to get together it doesn't require an enormous amount of dramatic rehearsal. And it's something that any group can do anywhere on the Do It Yourself basis any time. And I suggest that churches get rid of their pews, where everybody has heard it in like cattle to look at the backs of each other's

necks. And that they spread their floor with rugs and cushions. And that they have something in which people can approach. A, an ineffable, that means beyond words, a spiritual experience. And not be towed and forced into a particular pattern of thinking or mentation. So you see, for that reason I've only given the slightest suggestion of how one uses these mantras. All the silence for meditation you all have your own way of doing things like that do it your own way. All this is, is a vehicle, a support for contemplation. So now there will be an intermission in which I suggest you simply sit quietly and get settled. And then we will proceed to the contemplative ritual.

Intro to Contemplative Ritual

Before we begin our celebration, I want to talk to you for about half an hour and I apologize for this because I am for the elimination of sermons on Sunday mornings. But I need to explain both for you and for the radio audience what we're going to do. It has been announced as an Aquarian Age religious service. I did not invent that title. It has nothing so far as I know to do with the Aquarian Age, if such a thing exists. And I don't like the word service. It's got all sorts of associations of sanctimoniousness. So I would rather call it a contemplative ritual. Period. Our purpose in doing this is to offer a suggestion to the churches. To the Christian Jewish and Islamic churches in particular, because for a long, long time, the kind of religious celebration which they have conducted has been impossibly loquacious. And didactic. Almost all our religious observances are nothing but talk. They tell God what to do, as if he didn't know. And they tell the people what to do, as if they were able to do it or even willing. And this throwing the book at people and telling them the Word.

I think we've had enough of it. Because the history of religion is almost equivalent to the history of the fair. Preaching. Since preaching is a kind of moral violence, which excites people's sense of guilt, and there is no more uncreative sense than that. You cannot love and feel guilty at the same time. Any more than you can be afraid and angry at the same time. What seems to me to be lacking in our western religious observances is some sort of social ritual or liturgy, which gives an opportunity for spiritual experience. That is to say, for a transformation of the individual consciousness, so that in one way or another the individual is able to realize his oneness. With the

eternal energy behind this universe which some people call God, and others prefer not to name or to conceive. The Western religions have from an official standpoint, being somewhat suspicious and leery of mystical experience. Because in the founder of Christianity, a mystical experience, led to the claim that he was God incarnate. Which was, to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness. Because if you believe that God is a monarch. A beneficence tyrant in charge of the universe, anyone else claiming to be God is obviously committing an act of subversion. And would be suspected of introducing democracy into the kingdom of heaven. Which is supposed to be a monarchy and not a republic.

And I do not understand how we can be citizens of the United States, believing that a republic is the best form of government, but go on insisting that the universe is a monarchy. I feel rather the Jesus was a person who had this colossal mystical experience that we call cosmic consciousness, the experience that your real self is not that little superficial idea or image of yourself which we call 'I', but the total energy of the world flowing through you and expressing itself in you. And that's the real you. And it was on that basis that he could say I am the Father are one. What the Christians did was to stop the Gospel cold by saying all right, Jesus was God but nobody else. And so for lack of the spiritual experience of Jesus, nobody has been able to live the religion of Jesus they have lived instead the religion about Jesus, which is a very different thing. Because he's been put up on a pedestal and worshiped at a distance and his example in life rendered ineffective, because you can't make the tail wag the dog, or the cart pull the horse. You cannot expect love in Action, unless there is what the Christians call grace underlying it and grace so far as anybody knows is a purely theoretical thing which you believe you have received but there is never been any indication of it, to speak of, except in exceptional individual lives that account rather occasionally.

So what I'm proposing instead of the ordinary kind of religious this is as I said a contemplative ritual. And the idea is not to have everybody shaken up and whooping around like Indians on the warpath. But to bring about a state of profound peace. So therefore I should say something in a preliminary way about meditation or contemplation as I prefer to call it. Usually when Western people hear that an Oriental practices meditation he

asks What do you meditate on. And that question puzzles a Buddhist or Hindu. Because you don't meditate on anything anymore than you breathe on anything. You breathe, and in the same way you meditate. The verb is in a way intransitive. Meditation is the act of allowing one's thoughts to cease. As Patanjali puts it in the beginning of the yoga sutra, yoga meaning the art of meditation more strictly speaking, Yoga means union. The union of the individual in the universe. He says, after saying now yoga is explained he says she you know Gus pretty neat other which means yoga. Is stopping the agitation of thinking. Thinking is talking to yourself, or figuring to yourself. That's the way I use the word.

Now if I talk all the time I don't hear what anyone else has to say. Consequently if I talk to myself all the time I don't have anything to think about except thoughts. There is no Into go between thoughts. During which I can come into touch with reality, that is to say the world which thoughts represent as words represent events, or as money represents wealth. And so, if I'm never silent in my head I'm living in a world of total abstraction, divorced from reality altogether. You may ask, what is reality? And people have various theories about what it is but you must remember that they're all theories those who believe that reality is material are projecting upon the real world, a philosophical theory about it and those who say that it is mental or spiritual are doing likewise. Reality itself is neither mental nor spiritual, nor any concept that we can have of it reality is simply [gongs] Nor anything else. Nonverbal and words are reality and so far as they are noises. But even that is saying too much.

Now therefore, to meditate you might think that we attempt to suppress thought. We do not do that. Because you cannot meditate. Let me put that in a more emphatic way you cannot meditate. You, your ego image, can only chatter. Because when it stops, it isn't there. When you are not thinking, you have no ego because your ego is a concept. The thinking behind the thoughts the feeling, behind the feelings and the think about Heine the thoughts is only a thought an idea of some reference point to which all our experiences happen. And that of course cuts us off from what we experience it makes a great gap or gulf between the knower and the known. And that creates the spirit of alienation to the world from which we suffer. Conflict. Hate. Domineering spirit arise from that basic division. So when

you come to an end of thought, and you don't know how to meditate you don't know what to do with your mind nobody can tell you then thinking comes to an end naturally. And you just watch. You don't ask who watches, because that merely arises from the fact that in grammar every verb has to have a subject by rule. That is not a rule of nature, it is a rule of grammar. In nature, there can be watching without a separate watcher, just as there can be flashing without something called lightning that does it. The lightning is of course the flashing.

So when you realize that you come to your wits end, you can begin meditation. Or meditation happens and that is happening is the watching simply of what is, of all the information to conveyed by your exterior interior senses and of the thoughts that key. Chattering on about it all you don't try to stop those thoughts, you just let them run as if they were birds twittering outside. And they will eventually get tired of themselves and stop, but don't worry about it whether they do or don't just simply watch whatever it is that you are feeling, thinking, experiencing and that's it watch it. And don't go out of your way to put any names on it. That's really what meditation is and you see you're not expecting any result. You are in meditation in an eternal present. You're not doing it to improve yourself, you found you can't do that your ego can't possibly improve you because it's what's in need of improvement. Your ego can't let go of itself, because it is a complex called clinging to oneself. That's what it is by definition. So it's just something that evaporates when it is understood that it is unable to achieve a transformation of consciousness mystical experience the vivid sense of union of individual and cosmos.

So one of the easiest ways to enter into the state of meditation is therefore listening to what is using the sense of sound. Sound is curiously enough a sense that bores us less easily than sight. And when you listen to sound, you listen to it, just the random sounds you know, that are going on in the room and the street. Is if you were listening to music. Without trying to identify it source or name it. All put any label on it at all just enjoy whatever sound may be going on whether it's in this hall or whether it's in the area where you're listening to the radio. That's what we shall do the proper part of the ritual, just listen. Now we can go on from that listening to making sound ourselves and also listening to it and instead of making sound we learn the

knack of letting it happen through us. Once a great choirmaster in England Sir Walter Davies, was rehearsing a choir in the presence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Who was then William Temple a great theologian. And this was a raw choir, he didn't really know much about singing. And he gave them a hymn to sing that they knew very well. And to impress the archbishop they sang it with gusto and it sounded forced and terrible. Then he had with him a professional choir and he asked them to sing a little known hymn. And sing it several times until everybody got the hang of the tune now he's says, 'I want you to sing this tune about there's one very important thing and that is that you don't try to sing it you mustn't try you must think of the melody and let it sing itself.' And they sang it very well, and he turned to the Archbishop and said Your Grace That's good theology isn't it. And it obviously was because William Temple told me the story.

So then, we get to what is in India called the use of mantra. And that is, that the chant words sounds chanted not for their meaning but for their sound. And thus everything that will occur. In the following celebration will not be in the English language. It is not intended to be understood in a discuss of an intellectual sense you are asked only to dig the sound. And I use the word dig advisedly because it means something a little more than appreciate it means enter in to penetrate get right to the bottom off because when you are listening to sound and when you are letting sound hum through you, this is one of the most obvious manifestations of the energy of the universe. Shaba as it's called in Sanskrit is Brahman. Commonly said sound as Brahma, sound is God That's the real meaning of in the beginning was the word doesn't mean in the beginning was the chatter. In the beginning was the commandment, the orders, it means the vibration of the word and that's. So we concentrate therefore purely on the sound and you will find that although we have a chorus that has been made familiar with these Mantras. Some of them are so simple that you will all be able to join in with them. And please do so quite freely. It's a pity you see that the Roman Catholic Church which used to have a mantric service, the mass is dropping it and putting mass into the vernacular. And not very good vernacular that so far as the English translation is concerned. So that it sounds it's become terribly intellectual and often the somebody is standing by the altar at a microphone to explain what's going on. And therefore as Clare Boothe Luce put it the other day, it is no longer possible to practice contemplative prayer at Mass

because you are being hammered out with information with exhortation with edification all the time. And the Catholic Church should realize that in giving up Latin it has lost its magic. Religion is not supposed to be understood. Religion is that which is past understanding. Understanding may lead up to it as a pedagogue but to express religion intellectually is using the intellect with something it can't do it is comparable to taking up the automatic telephone and dialing W H A T I S G O D, and expecting to get information as an answer. Although the telephone is very useful otherwise. You cannot find out the mystery of the universe through talk. Only through awareness.

And for that reason, we offer this as an example, and it's offered in this way. It is a ritual. And it has a certain order to it. But it's very easy to get together it doesn't require an enormous amount of dramatic rehearsal. And it's something that any group can do anywhere on the Do It Yourself basis any time. And I suggest that churches get rid of their pews, where everybody has heard it in like cattle to look at the backs of each other's necks. And that they spread their floor with rugs and cushions. And that they have something in which people can approach. A, an ineffable, that means beyond words, a spiritual experience. And not be towed and forced into a particular pattern of thinking of mentation. So you see, for that reason I've only given the slightest suggestion of how one uses these mantra all the silence for meditation you all have your own way of doing things like that do it your own way. All this is, is a vehicle, a support for contemplation. So now there will be an intermission in which I suggest you simply sit quietly and get settled. And then we will proceed to the contemplative ritual.

Contemplative Ritual

[contemplative ritual, chanting sounds]

And that the song. Is. Don't give it a name. That's left. Your eyes. And go entirely into a world of sound. If I should say anything to you during this. Silence.

Just listen to the sound of my voice, and don't worry about the meaning of the words. Your brain will take care of that by itself. Which is playing with

your ears. Is also playing with your lungs. If you let your lungs breathe as they wish to, without helping. Watch what they do. When they feel like breathing out, let it go out but don't assist. When it feels like coming in. Let it come in but don't pull. Are you breathing or is it breathing you. Where the sounds come from. Judging with the areas. They seem to come out of silence out of nothing. What's the nothing? Can you feel it? Sense it without words without ideas. If you keep your tongue relaxed you won't talk to yourself so much.

Remember, there is no special state you are supposed to be. Simply let yourself be aware of whatever state you are in. Don't name it. Just feel. Now only is important. When there is no thinking. Where is yesterday? Where is tomorrow? Where is self? Where is other? Now would you gently allow. A sound to arise in your imagination, in the ear of the mind. The sound that is pleasing to you and which you would feel natural humming. Just your own sound. And letting your breath sort of fall out, easily and naturally. Hum the song out loud. Let it get louder...

The Self

The World as Self

The basis of all Indian philosophy—particularly the teaching of those books called the Upanishads, which are really the distilled essence of Hindu thought—the basis is called the Self. And this word, in Sanskrit, is *Ātman*, and that means ‘Self’ in the vastest possible sense, and the most inclusive sense of the word. It means ‘yourself,’ and it means also ‘self as such,’ ‘existence as such,’ the ‘totality of all being.’ And, of course, this is something that one cannot talk about in the sense of talking about it logically. You can’t talk about it. A poet can talk about anything, and the Upanishads are, very largely, poetry.

Of course, everything in the world—knives and forks, tables and chairs, trees and stones—are indescribable. Korzybski referred to the physical world as the ‘unspeakable world,’ which was really rather a funny name because it has two edges. It’s, of course, something you can’t say anything about—that is to say, it is ineffable—but it’s unspeakable also in the sense of the word meaning something taboo. And we shall see, as we go on, wherein that taboo consists.

But from the standpoint of logic we can’t say anything about everything, because in order to say something about something, and state it logically, you have to be able to put it in a class. Now, classes are intellectual boxes. When you play games like Animal, Vegetable, Mineral? you’ve got there three boxes. And when you come to think of it, you don’t know any one without another, because in order to have a box there must be what’s inside the box and what’s outside the box. And then, by this method of contrast, we can make a logical discussion about things. All words, therefore, are labels on intellectual pigeonholes.

But then, when you come to what fundamentally is, then you’re without a box and you can’t talk logically. Of course, you can distinguish ‘is’ from ‘is not,’ but only in a very limited way—as I can say, I have a pen in my left

hand. I do not have a pen in my right hand. And from this we abstract the idea of 'to be' and 'not to be,' 'is' and 'isn't.'

But when we consider Being—with a capital 'B'—this includes not only such 'is'es as celestial bodies, but also such 'isn't's as the space that encompasses them. And these two go together, as we shall see in more detail as the time goes on.

But now, a perfectly logical person would therefore say that the notion of the Self—the Ātman, as the fundamental reality in which everything else exists—is meaningless. And, of course, from a logical point of view it is. But at the same time, just because something cannot be put into a logical category does not indicate that it isn't real. The Self, you see, bears somewhat the same relationship to the world as the diaphragm of the speaker in this radio bears to the music you've just been hearing. None of the music was about the diaphragm and nobody said anything about there being a diaphragm. The diaphragm, as such, didn't come into the picture, and yet it was everything in the picture. All those different noises were vibrations of this thin film of metal. So, also, with your eardrum. So, also, with the apparatus of your eyes.

So one might ask, then—just as you say, Well, what is it on? What is the music on? Is it on tape, is it on a speaker, is it on a drum? Whatever the variations may be, we can ask the question, What are you all on? What is all this on? And the Hindus answer, It's on the Self—like we say, This one's on me. It isn't that there's only one Self in the sense that is taught in a philosophy called solipsism. Solipsism is the idea that you are the only person who exists and everybody else is your dream. Nobody can prove that this isn't so, except I'd like to see a congress of solipsists arguing as to which one of them is really there.

It isn't that; it's more complex than that. It's saying that the Self in each one of you is really, at root, one. Just in the same way that you have, all over your body, millions of nerve ends. Each one of those nerve ends is, as it were, a little eye—because all the senses are, fundamentally, one sense; they are various forms of touch. And the most delicate of the forms of touch is, of course, the human eye. Then the ear, and so on, down the list of the senses. Now imagine, then, every little nerve end is a little eye—and it gets

its impression of the world, but it sends it all back into the central brain. Well, in a somewhat similar way, every person, every animal, every—what the Hindus call—sentient being; and even rocks are regarded as sentient beings in a very, very primitive form, right down to the lowest.

So all those forms that we see may be looked upon as the eyes that look out of one central Self. Only, of course, in the body—in the human body—we can see the connections between the nerve ends and the brain. It's much more difficult to see the connection between one individual and another. If they're married that's a little bit closer. But just all us human beings rattling around, we're not even rooted to the ground—like trees—and therefore it's very easy for us to form the impression that I am only what is inside my bag of skin, and that my Self is a different Self from your Self. And we're all, therefore, fundamentally disconnected. And so your apparent disconnection—the fact that you are not tied to other people with umbilical cords, or some kind of wiring that gives you one mind—nevertheless, we do have one mind. In the sense that, for example, all of us turn out to be approximately the same shape. Two eyes, two nostrils, a mouth, two hands, two legs, and so on.

A haiku poem—Japanese haiku—says, A hundred gourds from the mind of one vine. And so it is with people, and so it is with everything in the world. That's just from a purely physical point of view. But going yet deeper, we find that it's somehow a necessity of thought that there be some sort of a something which is the common ground of all these universes, all these galaxies, and that ground is the Self—as Hindus understand it, the Ātman.

Now, that's quite [a] startling point of view, because what it's saying is, you see, that you are basically the works.

Now, the Hindus do say that the Self—the great Self—is consciousness. But of course, that does not mean consciousness in the sense of our ordinary everyday consciousness. Ordinary everyday consciousness is indeed a form of this kind of consciousness—shall we say, a manifestation of it?—but then there's also consciousness which doesn't notice, but nevertheless is highly responsive. The way your heart beats, the way you breathe, the way you grow your hair: you're doing it, but you don't know how it's done.

So therefore, just in the same way that conscious attention is not aware of all the other operations of the body, so in just that way we are not aware of our connection—indeed, our identity—with the fundamental Self. When the leaves die and fall off the trees, or the fruit drops—next year: more leaves, more fruit. So, in the same way, when you and I die: more babies later. If the whole human race dies, you bet your life there are all kinds of things that feel that they're human scattered throughout the multiplicity of galaxies. Because this universe is a peopling universe, just as an apple tree apples. But because we are unconscious of the intervals we are not aware of the Self with our conscious attention when conscious attention isn't operating. But still, just as you don't notice what your pineal gland, say, is doing at the moment, so in the same way you don't notice the connections which tie us all together—not only here and now, but forever and ever and ever and ever.

The difficulty, the basic reason why we don't notice the Self, is that the Self doesn't need to look at itself. A knife doesn't need to cut itself. Fire doesn't need to burn itself. Water doesn't need to quench itself, and a light doesn't need to shine on itself. So this is the fundamental problem of having some sort of awareness of the self. Nevertheless, it is the whole contention of Indian philosophy, especially what we call Vedānta, that it is possible—in a certain way—to become aware of oneself in this deepest sense; to know that you are the totality.

And this experience is the real substance of Indian philosophy as a whole, both Hindu and Buddhist. It is called mokṣa, which roughly means 'liberation.' Liberation from the hallucination that you are just poor little me. To wake up from that kind of hypnosis and discover that you are simply something—your organism, your physical body, your conscious attention (which is your ego)—that you are something being done by this vast, indescribable Self, which is out of time, which has no beginning, no end, it neither continues nor discontinues. It's beyond all categorization whatsoever, and so the Upanishads say, all we can say of it positively is the negative. Neti neti; 'it is not this, not that.' Anything, therefore, you can formulate—imagine, picture—will not be the Self.

So when you are trying to know the Self you have to get rid of every idea in your head. It doesn't mean, as some people seem to think, that you have to get rid of every sense-impression. It isn't as if you had to go into a catatonic state of total absorption. Of course that can be done, but the full mokṣa—the full liberation—is when you come back out of absorption and see this everyday world just as it looks now, but see as clearly as clearly can be that it is all the Self. You can become aware of this tremendous interconnectedness of everything, and that is what somebody who is mokṣa—who is liberated—sees. He sees, shall we say, that everything goes together.

And that is, in a way, what we mean by 'relativity.' Because relativity means 'relatedness,' just as fronts go with backs and tops with bottoms, insides with outsides, solids with spaces. So everything that there is goes together. And it makes no difference whether it lasts a long time or whether it lasts a short time. A galaxy goes together with all the universe just as much as a mosquito, which has a very short life. From the standpoint of the Self, time is completely relative. You can have, if you scale it down, as much time between two of those very rapid drumbeats as you can in eons and eons and eons, and it's all a question of point of view. Or—to use a scientific expression—level of magnification.

Change your magnification and you see molecules. And we know by other methods of observation that it can get smaller and smaller and smaller, and that the spaces between these minute units are so vast that they're comparable to the distances between the sun and the planets, in scale. So, also, with time. So, in this sense, there could be vast, vast universes full of empires, and battleships, and palaces, and brothels, and restaurants, and orchestras in the tip of your fingernail. And, on the other hand, we could be all going on in the tip of somebody else's fingernail.

It's very important to understand not only the relativity of size and of time, but also of what there is. Now, as you know, the human senses respond only to a very small band of the known spectrum of vibrations. We know, through instruments, of quite a vast spectrum, but we—as I say, with our senses—see only a little of it. If our senses were in some way altered we would see a rather different looking world. We can do this, of course—we

can put on special lenses to enable us to see heat, and then we see all the heat radiations coming out of people. And we say, Well, I never noticed that about you before! But so, in the same way, you see, there are infinitely many possibilities of vibration, and of organs sensitive to those vibrations, so that there could be world within worlds within worlds, spaces within spaces, just like the many, many wavelengths of radio and television going on forever and ever in all directions. The possibilities are infinite.

But having senses and noticing is a selective process. It picks out only certain ones, just as when you play the piano. You don't take both arms and slam down all keys at once, you select. And so perception is a kind of piano-playing; it is picking out certain things as significant—that is to say, as constituting patterns. And the whole universe seems to be a process of playing with different patterns. But whatever it does, whatever it plays, in whatever dimension, on whatever scale of time or space, it's all on the Self.

The Self is also known in Sanskrit as Brahman. This is a neuter word. Brahman is from the root brh, which means 'to expand,' 'to grow.' It isn't quite clear exactly why this word was chosen. Sometimes there's a still better word for the Self—which I like—is the word tat; almost like 'tit for tat.' Tat means 'that.' We get our word 'that' from the sanskrit tat. And so, when a baby comes into being first of all, the first thing it says is, Da! Da. The baby's pointing, Da, da, da! And it's saying, That! Look, isn't that marvelous? That, you see?

So that is the which in which there is no whicher, and so you get the formula in this Brihadaranyaka Upanishad: tat tvam asi, which means: tat: 'that;' tvam: 'that in,' you know, 'you;' asi: 'are.' 'You are that,' or 'that thou art;' 'that art thou.'

So in this sense, then, every self is modeled on—and is an expression of—the one Self, because you all feel, individually, that you're the center of the world. And everything else is seen in circles, circling out, sphering out from where you are. And that's, as it were—they called them 'microcosm,' the little cosmos. But then, in the same way, the macrocosm as a central self, although this is not central in the way we talk about centers in space. Do you see that? A center of a circle is in the middle of the circle and the circumference is away from it. But you could say—you could use a phrase

that the Christian theologians have used of God—that circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere.

You could speak of Brahman that way. It isn't in the middle of the universe, spacially speaking. You might ask the question, Where is the universe? Ever thought of that one? Where is it? Well, you can't say where because everywhere has to be in relation to something. There would have to be another universe to say where this one is. But then, since those two together would constitute 'the universe,' we wouldn't—still—be able to say where it was. It isn't anywhere.

And so, in that sense, the center isn't anywhere in space, locally—and furthermore, the kind of space we are dealing with is only one possible kind of space. It's the kind of space our physical organisms are attuned to. We are, you see, like the radio: we pick up what wavelengths we're on.

So, then, when inquirers used to come to that great modern Hindu saint Sri Ramana Maharshi, and they'd ask him all sorts of silly questions like, Who was I in my last incarnation? What will I be in my next one? he would always reply, Who is asking the question? Who are you? Find out, because that's the thing you need to know. As it were, dig down into the depths of your being and say, What is this that I call 'I'? That's one of the very fascinating questions. It's also—it teases us out of thought; to think about death in the sense of going to sleep and never waking up. Imagine that. And you find you can't—and yet, it's a thought that, although you can't get to grips with it, it remains fascinating.

Also, the question, How is it that suddenly you awakened into this world? Where were you before? In Zen Buddhism they have the meditation problem, the kōan. Before your father and mother conceived you, what is your original nature? And that's the same sort of weird question as what it would be like to go to sleep and never wake up. What was it like to wake up having not previously gone to sleep? It's very mysterious.

But as you go on and plumb this question you begin to develop the feeling that your existence is exceedingly odd. In many ways odd. Odd because it is here and it so easily might not have been. After all, if your father hadn't met your mother, would you be here? Of course, somebody would be here,

because he might have met somebody else. Would that be you? Of course it would. Don't you see? You can only be you by being someone. But every someone is you. Every someone is 'I.' That's your name. You say, It's me. I am here. And everybody feels that I in the same way. It's the same feeling, just like blue everywhere is the same color.

So I-ness being, as it were, the most fundamental thing in man is also fundamental to the universe. It, too, is 'I.' And our 'I' is a special case of it. Coming out from the "central eye," like so many tits from the belly of a sow, or so many spines from a sea urchin, so many legs from a spider. And that is, of course, why the images of the Hindu gods are shown with many arms or many faces: because it is saying that all arms are the arms of the divinity, all faces are its masks.

So, you see, there's really nothing to worry about because the important you is perfectly indestructible. It's what there is. Our comings and goings, our fortunes and misfortunes are a sort of mirage. The more we know about them, the more we know about the world, the more diaphanous it seems. And therefore everything in the world has the characteristics of smoke—you know, when you blow a cigarette, or pipe, or something, and a cloud of smoke, and you see it in a sunbeam and it's full of whorls and designs and all kinds of marvelous things going on, and then, slowly, it disappears. Well, everything's just like that.

Now, there are two attitudes you can take to that state of affairs. You can say sour grapes, it's all a lousy, wretched trap. And here I am, I'm given all these feelings of love and attachment and joy of life, and then I fall apart. My teeth drop out, my eyes become feeble, I get cancer or cirrhosis of the liver, or something, and then it all falls apart, and it's too bad! Therefore, therefore, don't become attached to things. Don't enjoy life. Treat it, holding it off—like that—just like a very, very firm person who's been jilted and says, Never again will I get mixed up with love, because love hurts.

But on the other hand, a weaving of smoke can be very beautiful, provided you don't lean on it. Provided you don't try to preserve it. Catch hold of it—then you destroy it. So, exactly the same way: there's nothing in the way

of form that you can lean on, that you can grasp. And if you see that, then the world of form is very beautiful. If you let it go.

To love people—you see, if you are husband and wife you must let each other go, otherwise the marriage is either going to break up or it's going to be hell. If you love a person you say to that person, Look, I love you—whatever that may be. I've seen quite a bit of it, and I know there's lots I haven't seen. But still, it's you, and I want you to be what you want to be. And I won't be happy if I've got you in a cage. You'd be a bird without song. And they're likely to go on loving each other. But if they wrap each other up with all sorts of ties and chains and documents and things, then they're not on a very safe basis. The very firm words of those documents belie the situation, because nobody curses, and swears, and kisses the Bible, and all sorts of things like that if he means 'yes.' If there's some doubt that he means yes, then he's asked to make all these rituals of cursing and swearing, signing on dotted lines, and see and some—indicates doubt right at once. It's just a fly in the ointment from the beginning.

So when the Hindu and Buddhist philosophers speak of detachment from all this apparent world of separate beings—detachment means 'going with' this whole thing and not resisting its change. And you can afford to go with it, you can afford to get mixed up in life, and to fall in love, and to get involved with all sorts of things. You can afford it if you know that it's an illusion. But this is not illusion in a bad sense of the word.

Here's this Hindu word—crucial—the world is called māyā. This word, māyā—yes, it means 'illusion,' it means 'magic,' it means 'art,' it means 'delineation,' or 'measurement'—and so from matr we get 'meter,' and we also get 'matter,' 'material.' Isn't it funny that the way we say 'material'—today, we mean something very real, but the root of the word is 'illusion.' So, you see—I mean, measurement is kind of an illusion. You don't find inches lying around; you can't pick up an inch. So, in the same way that hours and inches and pounds and dollars and so on are actually imaginary—they're elaborate systems of cosmic bookkeeping with their little scratches on paper, little hairlines on dials—so in exactly that way the distinction between things is māyā, is imaginary. But what an imagination! In a way, to say that the world is māyā is at the same time to say that what lies behind

māyā is immaterial. Look at the reversal of the word. Oh, it's immaterial, it doesn't matter. What matters is all this.

But that gets us to a deeper point yet. The Self—the real Self—doesn't matter, which is another way of saying it doesn't exist for any purpose. It doesn't need to exist for any purpose. What purpose would it exist for, when it's what there is! It won't find anything in the future, has nothing in the past that it has to go back and remember. It's now. An eternal now. And so, in that way it doesn't matter. But therefore, the most important thing in the universe is the one thing that doesn't matter. The one thing that's totally and completely useless, and that nobody can find anything for.

Once, a Zen master was asked, What is the most valuable thing in the world?

And he answered, The head of a dead cat.

Why?

Because no one can put a price on it.

So this Self, the Brahman, is like the head of a dead cat. But you see, if, then, you say, Mmm, I really ought to get that dead cat's head because... something spiritual about it and it'd be very good for me. After all, if I knew the Self I might be a better person. People might like me more. I'd be more constructive in society. I would do this, that, and the other. You see, that's putting the cart before the horse. That's trying to make the tail wag the dog.

The knowledge of Brahman, the Self, never does anybody any good if they're trying to make it do them some good. Only when they are not concerned with whether it does them any good or not does it do them any good. It's like when you relax and you go out and play. Americans, in particular, don't know how to do this because they always justify it. They always say, It's good for me. It's exercise. It's just a change from work, and that'll be able to make me work better. See? Everything they do is done for some serious reasons. It's the Protestant conscience. And so we never play,

except very exceptionally. Because play is that which is done just for itself—for fun.

So the Self—the Ātman, the Brahman—exists for fun. See, there is no reason to exist; it's completely useless. And it is—therefore, māyā is linked with the word līlā, and that means 'play.' Also, of course, the word 'illusion,' in English, is derived from the Latin ludere, 'to play.'

So the nature, you might say, of the Self is that it does no work, it only plays. Work is something serious, you now, that you do for a purpose because you believe that you've got to go on living; you work to survive, because you think you have to survive. That was one of the things they told you as a little child. You've got to go on, man!

You don't have to. This thing doesn't have to go on—that's why it does. I know that sounds paradoxical, but there's so many things in life that are like that. If I'm trying to impress people I usually don't. If you try too hard with anything you usually make a mess of it. And so this basic thing, then, is that the Self—the Brahman behind the world—is engaged in play. It is in this sense that the Hindu philosophers say, Brahman does not actually become the world. The meaning of that is: he's playing at being it—or it's playing at being it—as distinct from working at it.

And so, in certain Oriental countries, when one refers to noble people of high birth it is often said, Lord So-and-so has died. The Japanese would say he's played at dying. Or will he play at taking a journey to Tokyo? Also, remember this: although I have constantly used in this talk the word 'one' to apply to the Self—and 'central'—the Hindus don't use this word except speaking poetically and loosely. The Self is not one. The Self is called 'non-dual'—because, you see, the idea of one has an opposite. The opposite of one is many—or none. But the which then which there is no whicher has no opposite; there's nothing outside it, so you can't call it 'one.' Because 'one' is an exclusive idea, it excludes 'two.' So they call it, instead of 'one,' they call it 'non-dual,' which is advaita. This is from the word, you see—dva is the root meaning 'two;' the 'v' becomes 'u,' so we get 'dual;' and 'a' is the meaning—in Sanskrit, often—'non.' Non-dual, advaita.

And so it doesn't exclude anything. 'One' is an exclusive word. Advaita is meant to be a totally inclusive kind of unity. Now, of course, this word itself—when you look at it from a logical standpoint—is a dualistic word, just like 'one.' It's the opposite of dvaita. Dvaita and advaita. But the idea here, in Indian philosophy, is to use this word in a certain way. Now, you know that on a flat surface you can't draw three dimensions. Anything you draw will be in two dimensions. But why do we see three dimensions? Because of an artistic convention called one-point perspective, which will give you the illusion of a third dimension.

Now, in other words, a two-dimensional line is being used to imply a third dimension which can never be expressed on a flat surface. So, in exactly the same way, advaita is a word used specially to designate what lies beyond all logical categories.

Perhaps the simplest way in which one can express Advaita is this. Take a piece of paper, and it clearly has two different sides. Only by the elaborate joke of the mobius strip. In mathematical typology can you make a one sided piece of paper. But in all ordinary cases a piece of paper has two quite different sides. But these two different sides are inseparable. You don't have one without the other there is therefore shall we say a secret conspiracy between the two sides of the piece of paper always to be found together. Only what is this is when you get your boxes every inside has an outside and they go together. It's that going together that is non-duality. It expresses itself as duality but all duality is that we know go together and that is the non-duality that is the secret link between them.

This morning, I discussed the idea of the Self as the basis of the universe, and showed that this idea, which is fundamental to the central tradition of Hindu philosophy is not a logical idea. You could call it paralogical, metalogical or something like that, because logically, we can discuss only what could be classified and in logic only that which can be classified has meaning. Buddhist philosophy speaks of the four unknowns. Water to the fish, air out of the bird, enlightenment to the ignorant, and the mind to man. Because of what we are embedded in. What As I said we are on in the sense that something is on the radio, or on tape. Or on like a color transparency is on film what we are on is clean everything. It's like salt in the sea. And

therefore since it's in everything and in all directions. It never becomes an object. But that doesn't mean to say that there isn't some form of knowledge in which shall we say, its presence is apprehended rather than comprehended. So far Hinduism, and especially for its central philosophy called Vedanta. The of summation, the end of the Veda the the Veda being the traditional scriptures of Hinduism dating from perhaps about two thousand. B.C.. According to the Vedanta, realization of the Self is the goal of life. Moksha, liberation is when you know for sure. That you yourself is in a special case. Of the self. That, just as you are unaware of all your organic processes, just as the beam of a headlight doesn't shine on the wire that gives it power on the battery, but shines out in front so in the same way one is ordinarily ignorant. Or shall I say ignore-ant, of the root of one's own self as being the central self of all. Then I went on to discuss the production of a seemingly divided Universe of separate things out of the self, as Lila, a form of play. And this afternoon I want to develop that idea further.

So you must remember, of course, that the word 'play' and the word 'game' have many levels of meaning. We are accustomed to use the word 'play' in opposition to 'work' and to regard play as trivial and work as serious. Very largely, a game or a play is something associated in our minds with triviality. You're only playing with me, says a girl to a suitor, you're not serious. How serious do you have to be? When does one get serious in a flirtation? When do we say this is getting serious? When you're holding hands? Playing footsies under the table? Do you see? Petting? Sleeping together? Married and babies? Maybe that's serious.

But we also use the word 'play' in a non-trivial sense. I went to hear Heifetz play the violin. Was that a trivial matter? On the contrary—the very highest kind of artform. Still: 'play.' I say, too—when I do philosophy, like I'm doing with you—this is entertainment, but in the sense—perhaps, I hope—of your listening to someone play a musical classic. I'm not being serious, but I am being sincere.

The difference, you see, between seriousness and sincerity is that seriousness is someone speaking in the context of the possibility of tragedy; that there is a situation where things might go absolutely wrong, and then I put on the expression which is serious. That's why soldiers on parade are

always serious. They don't laugh. And when they salute the flag they put on a stern expression. That's why, in courts of law and in churches, people normally don't laugh—because all that we deal with here is very important, a matter of life and death.

But the fundamental question [that] must be brought forth: is God serious? And obviously the answer is no, because there's nothing to be serious about. I said, also, that the Self—as conceived, the supreme Self—was quite useless, that it was immaterial. Doesn't matter. Because it transcends all values of what is better or worse, what is upwards or downwards, what is good and bad. It so weaves the world that the good or the bad play together like the black and white pieces in the game of chess.

So play is—deeply—the sort of thing children like to do with deep absorption and fascination. To drop pebbles into the water and watch the concentric circles of waves. Or mathematicians. Mathematicians, you know—especially what we call higher mathematicians—are entirely lacking in seriousness. They couldn't give a hoot in hell as to whether what they're doing has any practical application. They are working entirely on interesting puzzles and working out what they call elegant and beautiful solutions to these puzzles. And they can go on and on like that in absorbed meditation, spend their whole lives doing it. Or consider the musician: practicing, working out interpretations; what is he doing? He's making series of interesting noises on instruments.

Now, what do people like to do when they don't have to do anything? Well, as far as I can make out as you look all over the world, they like to get together and do something rhythmic. They may dance, they may sing, they may even play games—because, say, in playing dice there's a certain wonderful rhythm to shaking the cup and rolling the dice out on the table. Or dealing cards: Tsu-tsu-tsu-tsu-tsu-tsu-tsu Wwrrrrrrtt! Crrrck! You know? All the things that people like to do and think about: these rhythms. Or some people like to knit, and this is a rhythmic thing, you see? Others just like to breathe. There are all sorts of ways in which we love to do this.

Now you see, our very existence is a rhythm of waking and sleeping, eating, and moving—and that's all we're doing. Just consider what we do every day. What's it all about? Does it really mean anything? Does it go

anywhere? It's just because we want to keep on doing this kind of a hoop-de-dah. So you can get a certain vision of life where everything is seen to be a complex pattern of rhythm. Dances. The human dance, the flower dance, the bee dance, the giraffe dance. And these are also comparable to various games: poker, bridge, backgammon, chess, checkers, et cetera, or to various musical forms: sonata, fugue, partita, concerto, symphony, or whatever.

And that's what this all is: it's jazz, you see? This is a big jazz, this world. And what it's trying to do is to see how jazzed up it can get, how far out this play of rhythm can go. Because that's what we all come down to, you see? We're going this di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-di-DI-di-di-di-di in every conceivable way. So then that is why, you see, this fundamental view that the world is play.

Now, let's examine the rules of this game.

The basic form of the cosmic game according to the Hindu view is the game of hide-and-peek—or you might call it the game of lost-and-found. Or, again, now you see it, now you don't. In examining the nature of vibration we find a very peculiar thing. If you represent vibration as a wave motion you will notice that there is no such manifestation as half a wave. We do not find in nature crests without troughs or troughs without crests. No sound is produced unless there is both. Both the beat, as it were, and the interval between.

Now, this wave phenomenon is happening on ever so many scales. There is the very, very fast wave of light, the slower wave of sound, then there are all sorts of other wave processes—the beat of the heart, the rhythm of the breath, waking and sleeping, the peak of human life from birth to maturity and down again to death. And the slower the wave goes the more difficult it is to see that the crest and the trough are inseparable, so that we become persuaded in the game of hide-and-peek that it is possible for the trough to go down and down and down for ever and never rise again into a crest; forgetting that trough implies crest just as crest implies trough. There is no such thing, you see, as pure sound. Sound is sound-silence. Light is light-darkness. Light is pulsation, and between every light pulse there's the dark

pulse. And so the Hindu image is that the Self eternally plays a game of hide-and-seek with itself.

Hindus calculate time in kalpa units, and the kalpa is 4,320,000 years. And so they say that for a period of a kalpa the worlds are manifested—or any particular universe, not all universes, but let's say any particular galaxy or whatever it may be; world order of some kind. Don't take this too literally; don't take these figures as being some sort of divine revelation as to making predictions and prophecies. They're symbolic figures. So for one kalpa the world is manifested, and that period is called in Sanskrit a Manvantara. And during that time the Brahman plays 'hide,' and he hides—it hides—in all of us, pretending that it's us. And then, at the end of the kalpa, there comes the period called Pralaya, and that is also a kalpa long. And in that period the Brahman, as it were, comes out of the act and returns to itself in peace and bliss.

This is a very logical idea. What would you do if you were God? Isn't the whole fun of things, as every child knows, to go on adventures? To make believe, to create illusions—that is to say, patterns. And so, for some ways of talking in Hindu thought, this world is the dream of the godhead. The godhead is, of course, represented as—in a way—two-faced. With one face he dreams and is absorbed in the dream world. With the other face he is liberated. In other words, what you have to understand correctly is that from the standpoint of the Self—the supreme Self—the Pralaya and the Manvantara are simultaneous.

But put into mythological form for human consumption they are represented as being in sequence, following each other. But they really happen at the same time, so that one doesn't realize union with the Self after death; later than a certain time. All references to the hereafter should correctly be understood as the herein, as a domain deeper than egocentric consciousness—that is to say, when you get down to the bottom of the egocentric consciousness you get to its limit, which is, figuratively, its death. Then you go on, inwards—the Self deeper than the conscious attention. And in that way you go inwards to eternity, you don't go onwards to eternity. To go onwards is to find only time, and time, and time, and more

time, and more time, in which things go round and round and round for ever. But to go in is to go to eternity.

But in the ordinary way, when we are talking about this graphically and vividly in imagistic terms, we can talk about the everlasting game of hide-and-seek, which the Self plays with itself. It forgets who it is and then creeps up behind itself and says, Boo! And that's a great thrill. It pretends that things are getting serious, just as a great actor on the stage—although the audience know that what they're seeing is only a play—the skill of the actor is to take the audience in and have them all sitting in anxiety on the edges of their seats, or to be weeping or laughing, or utterly involved in what they really know is only a play. So you would imagine that if there were a very great actor with absolutely superb technique he would take himself in. And he, you see, would feel that the play was real.

Well, that's their idea of what we're doing here and now. We are all the Brahman, acting our own parts, being human, playing the human game—so beautifully that he is enchanted. You see what enchanted means? Under the influence of a chant. Hypnotized. Spellbound. Fascinated. And that fascination is *māyā*.

Now then, this works on a little plan. Let us consider the breakdown of a single kalpa. It consists of four yugas. Yuga: that means an “epoch.” Number one is called krita, or sometimes satya. And these names are based on the Hindu game of dice. There are four throws in their game, and krita means the perfect throw; the throw of four. Number two is treta, the throw of three. Number three is dwapara, the throw of two, and number four is kali—that's the worst throw, the throw of value one.

You will see that these yugas divide up a period of 4,320,000 years. I never remember numbers too well. So the first yuga is 1,780,000 years long. The second is 1,296,000 years. The third—the dwapara—is 864,000, and the kali yuga is 432,000.

Now, you see what's happening here? When the manifestation starts it's as good as possible; everything is just glorious. Because you know well that if you were dreaming anything you wanted to dream you would start out by having the most luscious dreams imaginable. Now when we get, you see, to

the treta yuga, something is a little bit wrong. Krita is “four square”—everything’s perfect, like the symbol of the square is an ancient symbol of perfection. Treta is the triangle—something’s missing; there’s a little bit of uncertainty, and danger now enters. By the time we get to dwapara, the forces of light and darkness are equal—duality, the pair. But when we get to kali, the force of darkness overcomes.

But now, you see, what happens is: if you take one third of the treta yuga as being on the bad side, half of the dwapara yuga as being on the bad side, and all of the kali yuga, and you add those figures up, you will get the bad side occupying only one third of the total time. So what’s going on here? It is not quite a situation, you see—it is not a view of the cosmos in which good and evil are so evenly balanced that nothing happens. ‘Evil’ is just troublesome enough to give ‘good’ a run for its money. It’s as if the game that is being played here is playing order against chaos, but you gotta have some chaos in order to play the game of order against it. But if order wins there’s no further game. If chaos wins there’s no further game. If they’re equally balanced it’s a stalemate. So what happens is this: chaos is always losing, but is never defeated. It’s the good loser. And that is a game that is worth the candle.

Let’s take playing chess. If you get an opponent who can always defeat you, you stop playing with him. If you get an opponent whom you can always defeat, you stop playing with him. But so long as there is a certain uncertainty of outcome and you win some of the time, then it’s a good game. And this is simply a number symbolism—as I said, again, not to be taken literally—of the way this thing works.

So the mythology says that we are now in the kali yuga, which started a little before 3,000 B.C.—so we’ve got a long way to go to the end of it, if you’re going to take this literally. But of course, people have a way of always being in the kali yuga. We can go back to Egyptian inscriptions from 6,000 B.C., which say that the world is going hopelessly to the dogs. That’s always been the complaint. But according to this mythology there are—you have to realize the Lord, the Brahman, in three aspects. One is Brahma, the creative principle; two is Vishnu, the preserving principle; and three is Shiva, the destroying principle.

And Shiva is very important here. Shiva is always represented in Hindu imagery as a yogi. He is the destroyer in the sense of being the liberator, the cracker of shells so that chickens can come forth. The breaker-up of mothers so that their children can be un-smothered. The liberative destruction. The bonfire. That's why devotees of Shiva like to do their meditations along the banks of the Ganges where they burn dead bodies—because through destruction, life is constantly renewed.

Shiva has a paramour, and her name is Kālī, but that is a different word than this kali (yuga); you mustn't confuse the two. And Kālī is much worse than Shiva. She's black, and she has a long, long tongue, and her teeth are like fangs—but she's very beautiful... otherwise; has a lovely figure, but she's black. And in one hand—her right hand—she carries a scimitar, and in her left she carries a severed head hanging by the hair.

And Kālī, who is Shiva's—you see, Shiva is normally considered wedded; all the gods have their paramours, and they're all examples of the one central Self—she's called Pārvatī. But that's her bright aspect. But her dark aspect is Kālī. And Kālī is the awful awfuls. The thing about all that men most dread. Kālī is outer darkness, Kālī is the end. She may be represented as a blood-sucking octopus, as a spider-mother that eats its spouse. And Kālī is the principle of total night. And yet, there are those in India like Sri Ramakrishna, for whom Kālī is the supreme mother goddess. Because she is two-faced. She is playful and terrifying, loving and devouring, destroyer and savior. And the cult of Kālī has as its importance helping one to see the light principle in the very depth of darkness.

I have some suggestions for meditation on Kālī, which you can all practice very easily. You go to the aquarium and you find out there the monsters of the deep that make you feel most uncomfortable, and you study them. So in this way, Kālī is studied by her devotees. And if you meditate on those, this will be like putting manure on the soil. And out of all this apparently morbid and dismal thinking, bright things will begin to arise—because you will realize that what Kālī is is the most far-out act that the supreme Self can put on. The symbol of complete alienation from itself.

So what happens, you see, is this: in the process of the game of hide-and-seek the supreme Self tries to see how far out it can get. Just like children

like to sit around and have a competition as to who can make the most hideous face. And so this gets worse and worse as the time cycle goes on, until—at the end of the kali yuga—Shiva puts in an appearance, and he's all black and has ten arms, and he dances a dance called the Tāṇḍava. And in dancing the Tāṇḍava the whole universe is destroyed in fire. But, of course, as Shiva—having done this wreckage—turns around to leave the stage, you find that on the back of his head is the face of Brahma, the creator. And it starts again.

VIII

WESTERN DIFFICULTY WITH HINDU MYTHOLOGY

Well now, you see, this involves certain ideas that are quite alien to the West. One, the idea of the world as play. Our Lord God in the West tends to be over-serious, and no great Christian artist has ever painted a laughing Christ, or a smiling Christ. Nothing that I've seen of any of the great masters. Always, this figure is tragic and has that sort of look in the eye which says, One of these days you and I have got to get together for a very serious talk. So, you see, there is some difficulty about the notion of the world as a dramatic play; for us.

There's another difficult notion here, and that is cyclic time. See, most of us live in linear time. This originated with Saint Augustine and his interpretation of the Bible. Now, I don't know how true this really is, but it's certainly a big fashion in modern scholarship to say that it was Judaism that gave us the idea of history. Hindus have no interest in history whatsoever—or, not until recent times—to the total exasperation of historians. There is no way of finding textual evidence of the age of most of the Hindu scriptures—because they aren't interested in history as such, they are only interested in human events as archetypal occurrences, as repetitions of the great mythological themes, over and over again. So if a document started out that a certain adventure happened to king so-and-so—whom everybody knew at the time—in the next generation they had changed the name of that king to the current king, because the story was typical anyway. They just wanted to say a king that everybody knew. They altered things in that way, and so they know no kind of chronology. And if you ask even

quite intelligent Asians about this, they have difficulty in understanding what kind of a question you're asking. What is this history thing?

Whereas, on the other hand—according to our scholars—the Jews were historically minded, because they remembered the story of their descent from Adam and Abraham, the great event of the liberation from Egypt, and then the triumphant reign of King David, and then things go sliding downhill as other political forces become stronger and stronger. And so they get a fix on the idea that one day is going to be the day of the Lord, and the Messiah will come and put an end to history. And there will be the restoration of Paradise.

But this is linear. They don't think of the world having been created many, many times before, and come to an end many, many times before. It's one clear ascent from start to finish, from alpha to omega.

Well, when Saint Augustine was thinking about this, he thought, If time is cyclic, Jesus would have to be crucified for the salvation of the world once in every cycle. But for some reason he had it firmly fixed into his head that there was only one historical crucifixion in time—what they call the one, full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Once is enough.

Now, of course, he got his hierarchies confused. It's true—there is one sacrifice, but that's on the plane of eternity. On the plane of time, eternal things can be repeated again and again and again. But so, as a result of that, we are handed down not a Greek—the Greeks also had cyclic time, like the Hindus—but we have been handed down linear time, and therefore we're always thinking of a progression that will take us steadily, steadily, steadily, faster and faster to a more and more perfect world. And it will get better and better and better and better all the way along—if we keep our heads.

Now, this shows—I think—a rather naïve view of human nature. Human beings tend to smash what they create and say, Let's do it again! There is that in man which is also in the child. Rub it out—what fun! And so it isn't really too realistic to suppose that human beings will simply get better and better and better and better and better, because they'll soon get tired of it. They'll say, Let's be as awful as possible. See, there was that element in

Nazism: how awful can you get? How brutal can you be? How destructive? And that—it isn't just Germans, you know, who have that. See? We are converting all the living world around us into excrement and pretending it doesn't happen that way. And we are the most marvelous vortices in this stream of food which whirls around as us and then disappears into excrements, which again fertilize the soil—and we keep on at it.

So you see, there is that thing in us—which is represented by Shiva-Kālī—and it's always there. But the Hindu looks at the world with very, very hard-boiled realism in this way and sees terror and magnificence, love and fury; those two faces of the same thing. And you could say, Well, is there any peace possible? after you've looked at this picture for a long, long time, and you've conceived the endless, endless cycles because this thing goes on always and always and always. *Per omnia secula seculorum*: world without end.

And the Hindu sometimes feels, Oh, Brahma, don't you ever get tired of it? No. Because Brahma doesn't have to remember anything—and you only get tired of things you remember. That's why, from the standpoint of Brahma, there's no time—only an eternal now. So the secret of waking up from the drama, the endless cycles, is the realization that the only time that there is is the present. And when you become awake to that, boredom is at an end and you are delivered from the cycles. Not in the sense that they disappear; that you no longer go through them. You do go through them, but you know—you realize—that they're not going anywhere.

Now then, supposing you liken the rhythm of these cycles to music—why, surely, you don't hurry it up. You don't say, Let's get to the end faster. You know how to listen to music only when you slow down time, and sit back, and let that be. And so, in the same way, you can see every little detail of life in a new way. You say, Oh my! Look at that! And so one's eyes are opened in astonishment by being, living—totally—here and now. Up to this point, I have been discussing the theme of the world as the Self from three points of view and. Number one. Discussing what the self means in Hindu philosophy. The Self which you feel yourself to be is an expression. And is in fact at root the same as the self. That is to say, the being. Which is the root and ground of the universe. We went on from that.

To see. How according to Hinduism the self manifests itself in the cosmological way. In the beathing in and breathing out, raising out all the manifested universes and then breathing in withdrawing the manifestation over vast periods of time of space vast in length as also vast in brevity. The third step was to see, the social order, the human order as a microcosm of this huge macrocosmic game or Lila of hide and seek.

And so finally we come to the last consideration. Which is the question. In what way and by what means can an individual who is under the impression that he is a separate individual limited by and interest in his bag of skin. How can such a person effectively realise that he is deep down the universal self, the Brahman. This of course is a curious question, which reminds me of the famous story of an American tourist in England who wanted to find a certain obscure village and he stopped a native Yokel and asked the name to this place. And this Yokel scratched his head and said all, 'Sir I do not know where it is, but if I were you I wouldn't start from here.' In a sudden way the question how do I realize the Self is the wrong question. Why is it the wrong question. Because it proposes a journey to the place where you already are. Now it's true that you may not know that you are there. But you are and if you take a journey to the place where you are you will visit many other places. Than the place where you are and perhaps. When you find through some long experience that all the places you go to are not the place you wanted to find. You it may or. Kirti you that you were already there in the beginning. And that is the. Dharma or method as I translated that word, which all gurus teachers of spiritual development use fundamentalists. They are all of them tricksters. But in the most beneficence sense of the word trickster. Why trickster? Because I do know it's terribly difficult in fact it's impossible to surprise yourself on purpose. And yet, to be surprised is a great thing. But you can't plan a surprise for yourself. Somebody else can do it for you. And that is why so often a guru or teacher is necessary in this process. But let me say right from the start that a guru there are many kinds of groups. First of all among human gurus, there are square gurus. And there are beat gurus. There are gurus like...well let's say a great Zen Master today let's take odor Roshi at DI Tokaji who is a square guru. And a very good one. But you go through regular channels. Then there is a guru like Mr. Gurdjieff, who is a rascal guru. Who leads you in by means that are very very strange indeed. Gurus may be situations. Certain kind of problem

or encounter even a book can to some extent be a guru. A friend can be a guru. I have often thought of writing a story about a man who is some sort of guru seeker and potential yogi who goes one day into an automatic and sits down at a table where there is another fellow and he sort of thinks that this man looks wise. And he projects on to him the idea that he is a guru. And he says I am to you so he says I feel that something special about him. And the man says, 'Oh really?' Actually there's nothing special about me I happen to be an insurance salesman. And this other fellow says Isn't that fascinating how modest two years. And then I want to develop the story step by step they keep meeting each other because they both eat at the same automat regularly for lunch and although they are the fellow really is an insurance salesman and doesn't know a thing about these things it in the end results in the indictment of the person who project it is a major part. There's something like that in a New Yorker article which was then in the art of tennis. Which you may remember.

So there are as I say, many kinds of guru. But the problem of the guru is to show the Inquirer in some effective way that he already has what he is looking for. A story is told of a great Hindu King called Yagnidata who one day woke up in the morning and in order to arrange himself for the day picked up the mirror beside his bed and looked in it and found he had no head the reason was he had a hangover and he looked in the wrong side of the mirror one side of an ancient mirror you know this polished copper of brass or something, and the other is got some designs on. He looked on the wrong side and couldn't find his head said Good Lord I've lost my head and it was a great search he instituted to find his lost head. So we are all in that position. We're looking at the wrong side of the mirror. We're looking for our head. Have you ever thought about that? What if there were no... You would never know what your head looks like. And try to be aware of your head. What color is your head, so far as your eyes it means? You look around and you can't find it it isn't that the something black here that's like darkness. That I enjoy it is that behind your eyes do you feel there's a darkness there is there something black no as you turn around this thing just doesn't have any color at all it isn't black It isn't white it isn't nothing. And yet to have that thing there which has no color. No quality of any kind that you can see is the condition of being able to see everything. Actually what your head feels like inside is what you see out in front of you. Because as I

said all that you see out in front of you is a state of the brain. It is the way it feels inside your head and the things you hear they are all in the way the brain feels. The brain in other words is a marvelous contraption to the extent that it is not present to itself it is present to everything else. Now, if you get a tumor in the brain, the brain starts to become present to itself, and you get feelings inside your senses that are all weird and don't seem to be right with the external world. And that is because something has gone wrong inside your brain. So too, when you see spots in front of your eyes, you are seeing your eyes but you can only see your own eyes when they are defective. When they are working properly, they are completely invisible.

Now, in Hindu traditions, the realization of who you really are is called basically sadhana. And sadhana means the discipline. The way of life that is necessary to follow in order to escape from the illusion that you are merely a skin encapsulated ego. And solder now comprises yoga. From the root yoga. Which means to join. And so from that in Latin we get Ungere, to join. And in English junction. And also yoke. And. Junction is also the word union you see. All this derives from the Sanskrit root [with] 'u.' Yoke is also a discipline. When you yoke oxen that is a kind of a discipline. Now strictly speaking in the various strictest sense Yoga means the State of Union the state in which the individual self hat is called. The man. Jivatman is approximately translatable as ego gene that man. Finds that it is ultimately up man which equals Brahman. The Supreme Self. So yoga is the state the strictest meaning of yoga is the state of Union and a yogi means one who has realised that union. But, we find that the word is not. Normally used in that way in that strict sense. Yoga in the normal way of use means the practice of meditation, whereby one comes into the State of Union, and the yogi means one who is a traveler a seeker who is on the way to that point.

But again, strictly speaking, there is no metho to arrive at the place where you are. And no amount of searching will uncover the self. Because all searching implies the absence of the self. The big self the self with a capital S. So that to seek it is to thrust it away. And to practice a discipline to attain it is to postpone realizing. There is a famous Zen story told of a monk who was sitting in meditation, and a master came along and said What are you doing he said I'm meditating to become a buddha. Whereupon a master

picked up a brick that was lying nearby and started polishing it. Rubbing it and the monk said What are you doing he said I'm rubbing this brick to make it a mirror. He said by no amount of rubbing could you ever make a brick into a mirror the master replied by no amount of zazen will make you become a Buddha. Zazen means sitting meditation. They react very bad or to the story in modern day Japan. An anywhere. What is important to see quite quite radically here is that the moment you embark, supposing for just let me put it in this way supposing that I say to you. Each one of you is really the great self and I'm the brunt. And you say well if all you've said up to now makes me fairly sympathetic to this intellectually. But I don't really feel it. What must I do to feel it really? My answer to you is this. You ask me that question because you don't want to feel it really. You're frightened of it. And therefore what you're going to do is you're going to get a method of practice so that you can put it off. So that I can say well I can be a long time on the way to getting this thing. And then maybe I'll be worthy of it, after I have suffered enough. You see, because we are brought up in a social scheme whereby we have to deserve what we get and the price that one pays for all good things is suffering. And people love to boast about how much they've suffered I find it quite sickening the people who go over to Japan or India and come back and say or Tibet or somewhere oh these awful things that their masters did to us they made to sit for hours with. Crossed legs so that when we got up we couldn't stand and we were aching and we were hungry and cold and shivering and we were hit over the head with sticks and things and all these things we endured my God wasn't that tough of us and they do all this you see and say look at this cars I have look at the wounds I got in the battle look at all my medals, see, for my valiant spiritual endeavors. But all of that is precisely postponement. Is because one is afraid, here and now, to see it. If you had the nerve you know the real nerve you would see it right away. Only that would be there when one feels you should have been like that why that would be awful that would be that that wouldn't do at all because after all I'm supposed to be poor little me. And I'm not really much of a muchness. And I'm playing the role of being poor little me, and therefore in order to be something great like a Buddha or a Jivamokta One liberated in this life. I ought to suffer. So you can suffer for it there are all kinds of ways you know it's invented for you to do this. And you can discipline yourself and you can gain control of your mind and you can do all sorts of extraordinary things. I mean you can

drink water in through your rectum and do the most fantastic things. But that's just like being able to run one hundred yards in nine seconds. Or to push a peanut up Mt Tam applies with your nose or any other kind of accomplishment you want to engage in wraps a looter nothing to do with the realisation of the self. The realisation of the self is fundamentally the means of coming off it. You know the sort of when we say to people who put on some kind of an act with our Come off it. And some people can come off it they laugh and say they suddenly realise you know they are making fools of themselves and they laugh at themselves and they come off it so in exactly the same way. The guru, the teacher, is trying to make you come off it. As he finds he can't make you come up it is going to put you through all these exercises so the jewels at the last time when you've got enough discipline and enough suffering and enough frustration. You'll give it all up and realise you were there for the beginning and there was nothing to realise.

But the guru is very clever these it's all right if this is the way you have to go this is where you have to if you ask for it. You came to me I didn't invite you is either going to as those you came to me and said I want to learn yoga. Well he said, Yoga is union you are, tat tvam asi, you know. You know that but now you say I'm sorry I don't understand that because I only get it intellectually I don't feel it always says you're one of those. So I see, I've got to satisfy you the customer is always right now I got to give you all this work to do. Because you can see directly that this is. But he's looking at you in a funny way to see the year the guru is always saying to you. You know what do you do you do me what's your game. Imagine for example a father confessor. And you feel terribly guilty. That you committed murders and robberies and adulterers and fornications and all kinds of arson and injury to people and financial shenanigans and you go to this man and say I am a terrible sinner. Since really he says I have murdered somebody is how many times. And you think oh good lot this man doesn't realize how awful I am your aside all these things he's perfectly calm. And then you say to him Well you don't seem to be very shocked he said you haven't confessed any serious sense. He said What do you mean by a serious sin. Well I said What do you think. Well you know I, I just feel wrong. I just feel that something in the basis of me that feels that tells me that I am not what I ought to be. Could it be that I am spiritually proud. That I'm egocentric.

There's no that's an absence very usual this is quite ordinary isn't. But he says, 'You are guilty of something. Something really terrible.' And bluster that leave. Idea our sins come on a month to. Go deeper What is the real sin committed. You don't want me I little me could do something worse than murder them worse than spiritual pride. Just little me. I mean. I'm a reasonably well-intentioned person. What could that be. And he looks at you in a funny way that you know. You know that's a kind of a casket esque situation where you're accused of a crime that's not specified and yet, the judge the accuser says you jolly well know what you've done because we can't mention it. Because now it's like there's laws that are on the books in the state of California and several other states, where people are accused of the abominable crime against nature. And nobody knows what it I mean I can't imagine. It's too dreadful to be talked about. So this guy does the same thing but it's in a different dimension you have done it. What did you do seek the real crime is that you won't admit you're God. That's false modesty. You won't admit that your other self in disguise see as such and such a persona such as a person you know the word person means mask that persona, that through which the sound flows and the mask in the classical. Drama of Greek or Latin drama was shaped like a megaphone so that the sound would be projected in an open air theater Sepang So now that through which the sound flows as the mask and now we use the word person which means fake or mask to mean the real thing Harry Emerson Fosdick wrote a book How to be a Real Person. If you translate that back into the original meaning it means how to be a real fake.

So the guru challenges you see he challenges you if you raise the breast and he doesn't go out and preach in the streets. I say come on everybody ought to be converted he said stop under a tree. And waits. And people start coming around and they offer him propositions he answers back. And he challenges you. In any way that he thinks is appropriate to your situation. Now. If you've got a thin shell. And your mask is easily dispatched with. He simply uses what we might call an easy method. Listen Shiva, come off it. Don't pretend you're this guy here I know you are. And the guy sort of twinkles a bit and says. Well I guess you're right. But there are people out like that that have very thick shells. And so he has to invent ways of cracking them. So here's how it goes. You what to do to understand yoga, you need to get hold of a good translation of Patanjali. The yoga sutra. I

don't know which is the best translation there are so many albums. You know that Hindu friend of mine recognise recommends the one in the Harvard Oriental series by Woods. It says it starts out now yoga is explained. First. And the commentators say now has a special meaning because it follows from something else that you're supposed to know. Beforehand, that you're supposed to be in other words, a civilized human being before you start out on yoga. We don't eat yogurt a baboon. And so you're supposed to have been disciplined in as I told you this morning are the karma and dharma. In a political sense, the totality. And Dharma, justice. And then you can start your book. Then the next verse is your gas cheat the Briton it'll die which means yoga is the cessation of revolutions of the mind. In other words, that...you can interpret that a many levels. Chipped our meaning consciousness like a pull like water like a reflecting pool. If there are waves on that it doesn't reflect it breaks up all the reflections. So stop the waves on the mind and it will reflect reality clearly get a perfectly calm mind that's one meaning of it. On another meaning I would start thinking. Eliminate all contents from the mind all thoughts all feelings all sensations everything.

How will you do that? Well, he goes on to say you do it by certain steps. First of all, pranayama, which means the control of the breath. Pratyahara, which means preliminary concentration. Tarana, a more intense form of concentration. Jnana, which is the same John or the Sanskrit present. And that means profound union between subject and object and finally Samadhi, which is way out. Now what's happening? Control your mind, first of all by breathing. Breathing is a very strange thing because believing can leave you both as an involuntary and as a voluntary action. You can feel I breathe, and yet you can feel it breathes for me. And they have all sorts of fancy breathing ways in yoga. They're very amusing to practice because you get very high on. That one you know where you swing down into this way. So, you know, you're sitting in a lotus pastor and bending down and then you can bring it in through the left nostril. Breath out the right. In through the right. Out from the left. At the same time, imagine that as you take the current in it goes into you it goes right the way down your spine and goes by eyeing on the base of your spine and then catches hold of that snake that's supposed to be cold up there and as you breathe out pulls it up up up up up up. Up Up Up and out. The snake all the time, the Kundalini, the

serpent power that lies at the center of sexual activity but has to be dragged up and put in the brain. So, they set you up these tricks. And of course, if you are bright. You may begin to realize some things at that point. If you are not very bright then you'll have to draw on. And so next they really get to work on concentration. Concentrate the mind on one point.

Now this can be an absolutely fascinating undertaking. I suggest that you try it this way if you want to make experiments. Select a highlight on some bright, some polished surface, copper or glass or something. Where there's a little tiny reflection. Say of a candle or an electric light bulb. Look at it and put your eyes out of focus so that the right spot appears to be fuzzy. A fuzzy circle. Now look very carefully at the design in the sizes are all. And see if you can make it out. There is a definite pattern of blur. And you are going to have a wonderful time looking at that. Then, go back and get your eyes into focus and look at intense light. And you can go into it and into it and into it like you will know your falling down a fun. And at the end of that funnel is an intense light. And go down go N N N N N It's the most thrilling experience. Then suddenly the guru wakes you up and says What are you doing that for. And all well because I want realisation why? Because we live in a world of if we identify ourselves with the ego we get into trouble, we suffer, we are in a mess. He says, 'You're afraid of that?' 'Yes.' So then, all that you're doing to practice yoga is based on fear. You're just escaping you're running or. How do you think you can get realisation through fear. There's one to think about. So you think well now I've got to go on with my yoga practice my concentration is my exercises but not for a fearful motive. And you know that guru you know is watching you and he's a very very sensitive man and he knows when you're doing no always knows what you'll note it is.

So he puts you on to the ticks are getting a pure motive. And that means a very deep control of the emotions I mustn't have impure thoughts. Right so you go alarm and you manage to repress as many impure thoughts as possible and then one day asks you why are you repressing these thoughts? What's your motive for trying to have a pure mind. And you find out that you had an impure my. For trying to have a pure mind. If you did it for the same all reason you started out the thing in the beginning because you were afraid because you wanted to play and get one up on the universe. And so,

eventually, you find out, you see, that your mind is what is called in Sankrit Mudha, Mudha, which means crazy. Because it can only go in vicious circles. Everything it does to get out of a trap puts it more securely in the trap. Every step in the direction of liberation is a new tie up. So that you started you know with molasses in one hand and feathers in the other. That was the original situation of man. The guru made you put them together like that and said Now pick the feathers off. And then order them are of a mess the whole thing gets. So you get involved, involved, involved then involve others pose and in the meantime she. Has been telling you yes you made a little attainment today but it was only the stage and there are sixty four all together. And you got to get that sixty-fourth stage, and he knows how to spin it out and. Drag it all out because you are ever hopeful. That you will get that thing. Just as you might win a prize or what, win a special job or a great distinction and dream somebody. That's the motivation all along only it's very spiritual. It's not for worldly recognition. You want to be recognized by the gods in the Angels. But it's the same story on a higher level. So he keeps holding up these baits. And as long as the people falls for them he says he holds out more baits. Until after awhile, the pupil gets the realisation that what he's doing is running faster and faster in a squirrel cage. That he's making an enormous amount of progress and getting nowhere like in Alice Through the Looking Glass when the Queen says here, you have to have run faster and faster to stay where you are.

And so he impresses this upon you by these methods very subtle. And at last you find out, that you, as an ego as, what you ordinarily call your mind, are a mess. That you just can't do this thing. You can't do it by any of the means that have been held out to you. You can concentrate Yes you've acquired a considerable power of concentration by doing all this but you find you're doing it for the wrong reason. And there's no way of doing it for the right reason see Krishnamurti does this. He's a very very clever group. Krishnamurti says to people now look, there is nothing you can do to be liberated because all. All your efforts in the direction of liberation are phony. They are based on your desire to boost and continue your ego and that will never lead to liberation all you can do he says is to be aware of yourself as you are without judgment. See what is. But then, if you can do that, you have no further problem. But if you try to do it, you're in the same mess all over again. So we have Krishnamurti followers, who are so busy

being aware of themselves and not doing spiritual practices they can't read any books except mystery stories they mustn't read any philosophical books, any spiritual books, they mustn't do any meditation exercises or anything like that they just have to be aware of themselves all the time. Gurdjieff played the same game, in a different way. You said the most important thing is self-remembering. Always, at every moment be aware of what you're doing watch yourself constantly and never never be absent minded. So all day when you know you pick up the piece of paper you realize I'm picking up this piece of paper. And I'm opening it. And I know I'm doing it this way so I'm not asleep, ordinary people can't open up piece of paper. And in this way where. Rally thing out of his grave.

And so all these people are doing this you know, watching. Now, where do they land up? I've told this story millions of times really excuse me but it's very important when they teach you in Japanese Zen. How to use a sword. The first thing that the teacher says to the student is now. You if you're going to be a good soldier you've got to be alert constantly. Because you never know where the attacks are going to come from. And so all soldiers have taught us, watch. Christian us. Peace brother in be sober be vigilant if your adversary the Devils Daucus around as a roaring lion seeking only native our own resists steadfast in the face. Be on your watch Christian dust out heed them on this holy ground how the powers of darkness prowl and power around enemies on every side. Christians seek not yet repose I got an angel say now out in the midst of whirls watch and pray so the soldier other sentry everybody is on the watch on the alert. And you know what happens to you when you try to be on the alert? You think about being alert, and then you're a hopeless prey to the enemy. Because you're not you're not alert you're thinking about being alert.

So in the same way, the poor boy who is learning fencing and as a teacher and he's doing duties around the house the teacher attacks and utterly unexpectedly at any moment. And so long as he is alert, he's a sitting duck. Because he's alert in the sense of staring he says it might come from there it might come from there let's check out every Let's check out individually every place in which the attack might come check this check that check the other thing it might be this way it might be that way while he's doing that or to get him from in a direction he's not thinking about. To be alert, you must

not think about any special direction from which the attack might come. You must be simply, awake and relaxed. And then, all your nerve ends are working. And wherever the attack comes from you're ready. They liken this to a barrel of water. The water is just sitting there in the barrel, but the minute you make a hole in the barrel the water immediately is ready to come out of that hole.

So in the same way, the mind, when it is in the proper state is ready to respond in any direction from which the attack may come. So this man is no longer alert in the sense of taut and anxious which right you could see, just sitting there. Like a cat sits there. And the minute anything happens here now. It's right there because it didn't have to overcome any set in a direction opposite to that from which the attack comes. If you're set for the attack to come from there and it comes from here, you have to pull back from there and go there but that's too late. So you sit in the middle. And you don't expect the attack from any particular direction. So in the same way, all this applies to yoga. You can be watchful, you can be concentrated, you can be alert. But all that will ever teach you is what not to do. How not to use the mind. Because it will get you into deeper and deeper and deeper binds. You have to let it happen. Just like you have to let yourself go to sleep, you can't try to go to sleep. You have to let yourself to just your food you can try to digest it. And so in the same way, you have to let yourself wake up. Become liberated. And when you find out you see, that there isn't any way of forcing it that for most people is the only way of getting them to stop forcing it. Because they won't believe it when you tell them in the first instance you got to do this without forcing it. They'll say well that it won't work, it won't happen because I'm Darian evolved I'm just an ordinary human being I was poor little me and if I don't force it nothing like happened I people who think that if they. Don't struggle and strain they won't have a bowel movement. Or whatever it is they think they've got to do that work. In order to make it happen. In other words, all that is based on lack of faith, not trusting life. And to get people to trust life who don't trust it, you have to trick them. They won't jump into the water so you have to throw them in. And if they're on very unwilling to be thrown in, they're going to take diving lessons. You see in which they're going to go all through they're going to read books about diving they're going to all the preliminary exercises for diving and are going to stand on the edge of the

diving board and inquire whether there's a right posture till something comes up from inside and kicks them in the butt. And they're in the water. And it's also with this, it really is.

So now there's an amazing must instructor about this because it's important that you should know and the most amazing gamesmanship goes on in the whole domain of yoga and spiritual practice. You would be astounded. Somebody whom I won't mention, but for whom I have a fairly considerable respect came up to me a few days ago. He's a...I'll just say it, he's a psychotherapist. And he said. You should work with me. You know all last night. You were going around like a zombie. And this isn't good because if you if you would be clear with my work you would be an incomparable genius. I said. That's OK. I'm very fond of you I said you know what you're playing games with me I was getting around like a zombie last night because I had too much to drink. So I mean, one of the games in all this is to find a little flaw or something everybody has a place where they can be jiggled a bit. Something they're a bit ashamed of and so they think does this person really know my secret he's not saying anything with the polite but does he really see through me and know that somewhere or the awful awfuls, and that I'm a little bit upset of all. This is all part of a religious competition. If you'll go to the Roman Catholics and you started you've been psychoanalyzed, you see. They'll say well that's fine but don't cos it's not nearly enough I mean that's all very well so far as it goes but. Or if you're a Roman Catholic and you go to a Buddhist outfit that says missionary basis they'll say yes of course through your Catholicism you've learnt some of the basic virtues but of course, Catholicism doesn't go anywhere near the heart of things it is it doesn't have an elaborate system of meditation like we thought. And then you go over to the Hindu school and they say as the Buddhists go to a certain point. But they do it tain a very very high stage of realisation but there is nevertheless something higher than that which they don't quite get.

And you'll find that all around the world. Everybody claiming to have that little special extra essence just that others don't have. And why are they doing that? Are they all frauds? Are they all charlatans all out to get you into their society sometimes yes but sometimes they're trying to see whether you fall for this testing you are this is all by skillful method. And if

you become falling for that little extra special thing that's just supposed to be around the corner. You know. Then they've got you. Or rather you've got yourself in the mix. And you have to work at that and work at that and work at that until you find out. That you were being made a monkey of. That you were being made a monkey of because you could be made a monkey of. You hadn't really arrived where you are. You weren't. You didn't have the nerve to be you. That is to say to be the Self. And so you had always to feel that there was something beyond that, a stage higher. Than so that's why for example Masonry is such a success it has thirty-three degrees. And you know, you can go up that ladder and get higher and higher status the more degrees the merrier. There have been things that invented hundreds of degrees. And they're an immense success. Because you can postpone it longer and longer like Achilles overtaking the Tortoise. He doesn't overtake it in the problem because we keep dividing and dividing. The space between Achilles and the top of us as he approaches the top of us. What delay is getting is overtaking the top. This is not a killer is that our calculations about how he approaches it we make the calculations more and more complicated as he gets nearer and nearer to the tortoise. That only the calculations that put it off a kill is in fact runs right by.

So in the same way you can calculate yourself out of liberation. You can put it off indefinitely by inventing new degrees and new stages. But actually, when you get it, you don't get it. You will suddenly see. It happens instantly. And near where it happens instantly whether you put in thirty years practice or whether you put it in three minutes. It's the same. Suddenly, it dawns on you that that's the way things are the time I see. Medieval society in the West, comparable to Hindu society. Allowed people to check out of the game. It is revered and encouraged its monks and nuns. Are various types of discipline. And even a person who die and there's this difference is see for the west and India. You couldn't giant the Brahmana caste the priest caste from some other caste but in the European caste system. By becoming a priest. Or a cleric of any kind you see a cleric I mean simply a look. Person the word cleric is related to the word clever. It's simply means you're literate in only the clergy. A live word clever cleric clerk clergy are all the same. And they're also related to the word clear as it was originally spell C L E R E. Now you could join the clerical caste from any other caste, and the function of the clerical caste in the West is that it

was a cross as it were a kind of diagonal caste. You could familiarize with any other caste, once you're in that one. And so it was a wonderful way of rising in society. You could go from being a serf. Go to being a priest to being an archbishop and consort with the nobility. It was the only way open to cross castes you see and from then because they were the literate people it was through literacy and through universities founded by clerics that our caste system began to break. And we got the idea of choosing your own vocation and not simply following what your parents did. And I want to make an observation here about checking out of the game. This is not encouraged in contemporary society. Because the Catholic Church and these say the Episcopalian church are very powerful minorities they can still support monasteries and even hermits. But you can't be one on your own without great difficulty. Firstly, because you're a poor consumer. See around here there are we have a number of hermits there's a guy out there building that boat and he's essentially a non-joiner, poor consumer and the community they live a lot along here and they're mostly they're not working class people. They are people who dropped out of college because they saw it was stupid and that sort of people we would call them perhaps beatniks. But you see the city doesn't like it because. They aren't owning the right sort of cars and therefore the local car salesman isn't doing business through them. They don't have lawns, and so nobody can sell them lawn mowers. They hardly use dishwashers, appliances of that kind they don't need them. And also, they wear blue jeans and things like that and so the local dress shops feel a bit put out having these people around and they are very little very simply. Well that you would mustn't do that. You've got to live in a complicated way. You've got to have the kind of car you know that identifies you as a person of substance and status, and all that. So there's a great problem you know in our society now why is that this problem. There's always a very inconsiderable minority of these non joiners or people who check out of the game. But you will find that insecure societies are the most intolerant of those who are non-joiners. They are so unsure of the validity of their game rules, that they say everyone must play. Now that's a double-bind. You can't say to a person you must play because what you are saying is you are required to do something which will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily.

So everyone must play, is the rule in the United States and it's the rule in almost all Republican governments. I mean Republican in the sense of Democratic. Because they're very uneasy. Because everybody is responsible. You mean you may try not to be and avoid it and say oh let the senators take care of it or the president but theoretically, everyone's responsible now it's terrifying. It's all out when you know what's right there is an aristocracy there is the the clergy, and they know what should be done and they're used to really see but now you see it's in your hands you say well what are you what are we going to do. Well I think this way, and you think that way and he thinks the other way, and so we're all unsettled. And therefore we become more and more conformist individuals and rugged individualism always leads to conformism, because people get scared and so they herd together they were compounded with industrial society mass production etc. They all wear the same clothes. And they wear sensible clothes that don't show the dirt too much and. We get dollar drabber, with the exception of the Californian revolution. All the time you mean you go to New York and everybody looks as if they were about to attend a funeral Well part of the reason is the city is covered in filth murk descends, descends from the chimneys of Consolidated Edison it comes in at all the windows you can't shut it out so the girls wear black and pearls and even black underwear. Because it just doesn't show the diverse and all the men with sensible grey suits and black neckties and so on I mean the doesn't serve the dirt but it looks like a funeral or looks like an assembly of preachers. So, what, the reason for this is in a way that democracy as we have tried it, started out on the wrong foot. You see, in the scriptures of the Christian scriptures it says everybody is equal in the sight of God. Now, that's a mystical utterance. That means that from the standpoint of God all are divine. And are playing to function. And that is something that is true on a certain plane of consciousness. But to come down a step and try to apply the mystical insight in the practical affairs of everyday life and what do you get you get a parody of mysticism. You get the idea, not that everybody is equal in the sight of God but that all people are equally inferior. And that's why all bureaucracies are rude, why the police are rude, and why you are made to wait in lines and are obstreperous tax individuals and all that sort of person because everybody is a crook everybody is equally inferior so that becomes the parity of democracy and that kind of

society watch out for it it turns in a quick click into facets. And into, because of its terror of the outsider.

Now, a free and easy society loves outsiders. In fact, it's a little bad for the outsiders integrity because he becomes a Holy man see and people make salaams and give him food and all that they really take care of the outside, because they know that man is doing for us what we haven't got the guts to do. That outsider, who lives up there on the mountain is at the highest peak of human evolution his consciousness is one with the divine and great just there is someone like that around makes you feel a little better he has realized he knows what it's all about and so we need a number of those people. Even though they don't join our game they tell us you see what you're doing is only a game it's OK I'm not going to condemn you but it is only a game and we up on that mountaintop I watching you we love you we have compassion for you and but we excuse please we are going to join. So that gives the community great strength, because it tells the government in no uncertain terms that there's something more than government. That's why kings, wise Kings, kept not only priests but court fools. [A] court fool is much more effective than the priest. To remind the king. That after all is human. And you know, how in Richard the second where the fool is called the antics. The king says, 'Within the Hollow Crown that runs the model temples of the King keeps death his watch and there the antics it's scuffling it is stated grinning it is pumped allowing him a little time to monetise be feared and kill with looks that at last comes death. And with the pinballs through his castle wall and farewell King.' See, always this reminder of the priest or of the antics to the royalty to the government. You are going to die you are mortal. Don't give yourself and graces as if you were a god. As you are only a representative of God and there is a force, there are domains, way way beyond yours and way way higher. But it's very difficult for a Republican government to realize that. Because it's insecure. And therefore, in our present world. You cannot abandon nationality without the greatest difficulty. People who try to abandon nationality get constantly deported from one place to another. You must belong to this thing as Thoreau put it. However far into the forests you may go, men will pursue you and compel you to belong to their desperate company of oddfellows.

Play and Survival

So it is announced that the subject of the seminars play and survival. Are they in necessary contradiction? We're going to examine the subject in the context of Christian, Islamic, Buddhist, Jewish, Hindu, Taoist and scientific naturalism.

Living, it seems to me, is a spontaneous process.

The Chinese term for nature is one which means that which is so of itself.

That which happens very curious because because of our grammar that we speak in almost all standard average European languages.

We are unable to imagine a process which happens by itself because every verb must have a noun has its subject a director.

And we think nothing is in order unless someone or something orders it, unless there's somebody in charge. And so to us, the idea of a process of nature, which happens of itself by itself is frightening because there seems to be no authority. And therefore, in the United States, we are in a serious social and political conflict.

Because. We think that we ought to be living in a republic.

But the great majority of citizens believe that the universe is a monarchy. And you cannot be a loyal citizen of the United States unless you believe that a republic is the best form of government.

So we're always seeking for a monarch, for someone else upon whom to push the responsibility. I won't take it ourselves. We always complaining that where we are is the result of our past. My mother and father were neurotic, you know, and therefore they made me neurotic and their fathers and mothers were neurotic and made them neurotic. And so it goes back to Adam and Eve. And you remember what happened in the Garden of Eden.

God set a trap by saying there is that specific tree and you mustn't eat the fruit of it. If he had really not wanted them to eat the food, he wouldn't have said anything about it by drawing attention to it in this way. It was obvious they were going to eat it. So when he saw Adam looking guilty and he said,

Adam, hast thou Eden of the fruit of the tree where off? If I told the adoptions, not eat.

And he said, the woman you gave me. She tempted me and I did it. He looked very severely. He said, Eve, have you eaten of the fruit of the tree were off. I told you, thou shalt not eat. And she said, the serpent forgot passing about the same. And God looked at serpent.

This isn't written in the Bible, but they went to each other because they had planned long in advance.

The universe was not going to be a merely obedient arrangement. Well, I God say you shall do thus and so and you will automatically do it.

There would be no fun in that because of Venus prizes. So it is the Hebrew theology that God put into the heart of Adam at the creation, a thing called the yet Sahara, which means the wayward spirit.

Just the kind of little. Just like you. Well, when you make a stew, you put some salt in it. You don't want the whole stew to be salt, but just the touch thing.

So gone in creating Adam put just a touch of wickedness so that something surprising and different would happen, which God would not be able to. With MasterCard.

Now, this is very important.

You see, what we're going to talk about mainly is our sense of identity.

Our sense of alienation and the complications we put ourselves into by regarding survival as a duty.

These all connect together. You may not see the connection immediately.

But if you imagine yourself in the position of being God in the literal popular sense of God, the father almighty, it means you're a male chauvinist pig. And you're in charge of everything. You know, all pasts, you

know, all futures. You're completely in control of the cosmos. You have absolute power.

And you are bored to death.

So you say to yourself, man. Get lost. I want a surprise.

And here you are. Oh, you must admit it.

The whole mark of insanity is to know that your God.

That's absolute taboo, not only in the Christian religion, because Jesus got crucified for knowing that. And the Christians said, OK, OK, Jesus was God, but let it stop right there. Nobody else. But the gospel was the revelation to us all that the Hindus knew forever.

That's why Europe. And if Jesus had lived in India, they would have congratulated him for finding out instead of crucifying many people in India.

Who knew they would go out in disguise? Sri Ramakrishnan, Sri Rahman, the Maharishi Krishna himself, Buddha, everybody. They discovered it because it's not an exclusive claim. I alone am that you all are. As I look into your eyes, I see the universe looking back at.

So we're in a situation where it's a taboo.

We must admit that we know who we are.

So as to have the the thrill, that sort of self goosing effect of feeling lost, feeling strange, feeling alone of not belonging. And we say in popular speech that I came into this world. You did nothing of the kind. You came out of it just in the same way as the fruit comes out of the tree, the egg from the chicken, the baby from the womb. We are symptomatic of the universe. We are. It's nerve endings, just as in the retina. There are myriads of nerve endings. So all of us are nerve endings of the universe, and there are many of us. So that the universe is point of view of itself will not be prejudiced to be many sided.

And so fascinating things happen.

We want to find out what it is that's going on. And we do with telescopes to find the farthest out things. And with microscopes to find the farthest in things.

And the more powerful our instruments become, the more the world runs away from us. As our telescopes become more powerful, the universe expands as it's ourselves running away from ourselves. The more accurate our physics becomes and we investigate the nucleus. Some years ago, we thought we had it. We found a thing called the atom and that was that. Then groups than the electron turned up. Then bang, there was a proton. And then when we got those that came out, all kinds of things made songs anti matter. And it got worse and worse and worse because we got sharper.

And so we are a self observing system, which is like the snake, the rubber us that bites its own tail and endeavors to swallow itself to find out what it is. It's like the whole question of who am I? I would like to see me, but look at your head. Can you see? It's completely invisible and it isn't black. It isn't like that. There's a dark spot behind my eyes. It isn't even blurry. It's plain. No way. And thereby ending the tale. Most of us assume, as a matter of common sense, that space, this is nothing.

This is not important. It has no energy. But as a matter of fact, space is the basis of existence.

How could you have stars without space? Stars shine out of space. Something comes out of nothing.

And in just the same way, if you listen and then unprejudiced way with your ears to find out. You see, I've got the sense organs here and I'm going to trust them to find out what is going on. What really is a new.

And you hear all these sounds coming out of science. Silence is the origin of song. Just the space is the origin of stars. Just this woman as the origin of man. She is black.

Also, if you listen and pay real attention to what is.

You will discover that there is no past, no future and no one listening. You can't hear yourself listening.

So you live in the eternal now and you are that taught by Marcy.

That's really extremely simple. Isolated.

Now, then I started out by saying.

Survival going on living. Is a spontaneous process. Love is the same.

But the trouble is that when we our children. Our elders and betters told us that it was our duty to love. God said, thou shalt love the Lord, thy God with all our heart and with all my soul and with all my mind, my neighbor as thyself. And so our mothers said to us, you must have a bowel movement after breakfast.

Try to go to sleep. Take that look off your face. Stop pouting. Oh, you're blushing. Pull yourself together.

Pay attention.

And all these are commands. The basic rule is as follows You are required to do that, which will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily.

That's the formula. You must love me. And it's a double bind and everybody is completely mixed up because of this. So, you know, this stupid story I often tell the husband says the wife. Darling, do you really love me? And she says, Well, I'm trying my best to do so. And nobody wants that answer.

They want to be told, I love you so much. At that age, I can't help loving you. I'm your hopeless victim.

And so we are under the compulsion to go on living.

You must go on living. It's your duty. Get tired of living and scared of dying. You must go on. Why?

Well, I have dependents. I have children, and I have to go on working to support.

But all that does is to teach them the same attitude. So they will go dragging along to support their children, who will in turn learned from them to go dragging along and fighting this thing up.

And so I watch with total amazement the goings on of the world, see all these people commuting, driving cars like maniacs to get to an office where they are going to make money. For what? So that they can go on doing the same thing.

And very few of them enjoy it. Sensible people get paid for playing.

That's the art of life.

But the whole idea of struggling and beating your brains out in order to go on living is completely ridiculous. Comes at the beginning of his book, *The Myth of Sausages* made a very sensible statement. He said The only real deep philosophical question is whether or not to commit suicide.

Must you go on? Because it would be so simple to stop the problem.

Nobody around to regret that it wasn't going on in the longer run. What is it like? Death. Go to sleep and never wake up. Oh, that's terrible to be in the dark forever. It wouldn't be like that wouldn't be like being buried alive forever. It would be as if you never had existed. And not only that, you never had existed, but did nothing at all it ever existed. And that would be just the way it was before you were born. Which is another way of demonstrating how something comes out of nothing. Nothing is the essential prerequisite of something like that. But back in front of the same kind as the Chinese, say, the young and the intimate. So like you have an invisible head.

Your ultimate reality, the ground of your being.

Sun Yat is the Buddhist called the Void.

Which is space. Watch his consciousness. Which is that in which we live in movement about being.

The Great Void.

And fortunately, there's no way of knowing what it is.

Because if we could know what it is.

We would be bombarded.

A little function of interest is a mystery. There was a great Dutch philosopher by the name Vanderbilt who said the mystery of life is not a problem to be solved, but a reality to be experienced. And fortunately, we see we have in the middle of all consciousness a perpetual problem, a perpetual question that we don't know what it is that is.

Therefore, life remains interesting. We're always trying to find out.

But it won't yield the answer because reality when you say what is reality? The only way to answer the question, what is by classification? It is you is or is you ain't you male, is you female? Are you a Republican or Democrat? Are you animal, vegetable or mineral? Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor, rich man, poor man, beggar and thief. We put you in a class, but what it is that fundamentally is cannot be classified. So nobody knows what it is. And you can't really ask the question in a meaningful way. What is reality now? There are many theories, philosophical theories about what reality is. Some people say, well, reality is there material.

There's something called stuff. And philosophers with us, they're always lecturing in front of tables in the universe. You know, they always bang the table and say, now, does this table have reality or not? And they bang the table.

When Dr. Johnson heard about Bishop Berkeley's theory that everything is, in fact mental, he disproved it by kicking a stone. And said surely to every person of common sense. This stone is really material and physical.

Whereas on the other hand, more subtle thinkers say no. There is nothing material.

It's all a mental construction. The whole world is a phenomenon of consciousness.

When Bishop Berkeley's time, they didn't know much about neurology, now we know a great deal about neurology and we can state the same position in a much more sophisticated way that the structure of your nervous system.

Is what?

Determines the world that you see. In other words, in a world of no eyes, the sun would not be light. In a world of no tactile Nevins fire would not be hard. In a world of no muscles, rocks would not be heavy. In a world with no soft skin, the rocks wouldn't be hard. What's your relationship? So even there's the old question. When a tree falls in a forest and nobody is listening. Does it or doesn't it make a noise? The answer is perfect. Simple.

Noise is a relationship between vibrations in the air, in the air and the eardrums. Not if I hit a drum which has no skin on it. No matter how hard I hit, it wouldn't make a sound. So the air can go vibrating forever. But if there's no drum and no auditory nervous system, there's no noise because the noise is a relationship. So we, by virtue of our physical structure, evoke. The world from vibrations that would otherwise be void. So you're creating the world. But you're also in the world. Your body, your nervous system is something in the external world. You're in my external world. I'm in your external world.

So it's an egg and hen situation.

Passions fascinate, so we are from a very hard boiled neurological point of view, evoking the world in which we live.

And we are something that the world is doing. After all, what you are from the point of view of physics, the physicist will explain that you are buzzing

of electronic substances and processes just like anything else. It's all one jazz. But marvelous because it is aware of itself through you.

So.

Existence, however, has two aspects. You'll call one of them on the other off because all existence is a vibration.

If I am sitting next to a girl at the movies and I feel attracted to her and I put my hand on her knee and I leave it there, she will notice the first, but she will become unaware of it. If I don't move my hand. So instead of just leaving my hand, I start stroking that or patting I mean, saying.

Then I go on and off, on and off, on and off. And she realizes that I'm paying attention.

See, so everything that is happening to us is that young yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak. But this I'd take with that with the sense of sight, the vibration of light is so fast that the retina doesn't register the off.

It retains the impression of the arm. And so with our eyes, we see things as relatively stable.

But if we close our eyes and listen. We hear on and off.

Especially in the low registers of sound in the high register.

You can't hear the off, you hear the arm, but you get the low register.

You see here they are on and off the vibration. Actually, everything that is physically existing is a problem because it is positive and negative electricity.

Incidentally, read the article on electricity in the 14th edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Just the first two paragraphs learned scientific article with all kinds of formulas and stuff, but it starts out with pure metaphysics. Electricity, says the author, is an absolute.

We do not know anything else that is like it.

A fundamental, you know, since talking pure theology and.

So that this is it. You see the thing it does on and off.

Male and female. Yeah. Now you see now dump.

We've been brought up.

To think that with our 19th century background, to think that this energy which goes on and off is inherently stupid, that it is a mechanical thing. Freud called it libido and take will call it blind energy.

And so therefore, we feel that we as human beings.

Are flukes a million monkeys working on a million typewriters for a million years?

Might statistically tied the Bible.

The cost thereafter, as soon as they got to the end of it, they would dissolve again into nonsense. But we feel we've been brought up to feel and see that we are flukes. In that sense, we are simply accidents.

And that is Aryan Nations. That is the great problem. And it seems to me completely obvious that we are not accidents. When we say, you know, you're nothing but a little bacterium that crawls around on a bowl of rock that circles an unimportant star on the outer fringes of the minor galaxy. Why do people say things like that until you what they want to say? I'm tough. I look at the facts, the hard facts.

The idea that there's somebody up there who cares is a little old ladies weaklings.

And I think this universe is a bunch of shit. So I'm a real realistic guy. But that's the message you get from these people.

Always look in a person's philosophy.

As to what he or she is saying about himself. Cause your philosophy is your role. We gave you put on. Now, I admit, you see, my philosophy is my game I put on my big ass. Well, I think if I'm going to put on a big act at all, I'm going to put on the biggest one eye and say up there with all that nonsense.

I know very well that although I'm in permanent, which is just the way I want it, because I wouldn't like to be preeminent on a board, that would be.

But I am an impermanent manifestation of the which in which there is no future of the route and grounds. The universe, which is St. Thomas Aquinas would say, is what all men call God Ottoman Brahma.

And I think it's fun to know that.

Not merely as a theory, but as a positive sensation, which you can actually feel. And so therefore, my function in conducting the seminar with you. Is, if at all possible that you should share this feeling.

Not need anymore psychotherapy would not need any more gurus and not need anymore religion.

Just take off.

Except, I mean, there is something called religion for quick for kicks.

My favorite church is the Russian Orthodox Cathedral in Paris, where they really live it up to.

They have gold, incense, icons, masses of candles and gorgeous music and priests come out from the secret sanctuary we know behind the royal doors. The Equinox diocese divides the the main church from the inner sanctum and the doors open. Somebody comes out looking like God, the father, you know, beautiful robes.

And you see all those little ghost more useful roles for all the choir goers also voting for me.

And it goes on and on and on. And when you get bored, you go across the street to a vodka shop where they sell vodka and caviar, bleaney to village, keep it on ski and everything, you know, and everybody lives it up and they go back to church again. That kind of religion is like dancing. It's a it's a joyous expression and it's not telling God what to do because all this thing is an old church Slavonic, which nobody understands. And it's just making great. And Doris knows that this is essentially music.

So.

Now, what I would like to suggest is that we have a brief intermission that you can stretch for about five minutes, and then I would instead of monologue in that you would like to talk all of your reactions. Questions don't feel that. You just have to ask questions if you want to react in any way.

The whole point of the seminar, incidentally, is that it is a free for all. Instead of the big public lecture.

Well, this has to be restricted so I can give as much of my self dues as possible, so please help yourselves.

Now, since we are dealing with play, our next step is there are two steps now to follow. We've got some more theoretical matter to go through. And after that, we get into nonverbal practical matter. But I want to talk about music for a while. Do you realize that music could be defined as the greatest vice and addiction in the country?

It's a colossal industry. People are utterly dependent on it. Lots of people can't do without music at all.

Either billions of dollars go into the making of records and to the artistry of playing instruments and all this kind of thing. And it's completely and utterly useless from a practical point of view. Everybody gets excited about people being alcoholics, being heroin addicts, being marijuana smokers, being this, that and the other. But you could say there is a disease called contagious and the core database is addiction to melodious noise. That's absolutely fascinating because when people they go to these concerts, you

know, where a most elaborate productions are put on and then compulsively they have to come over and say that we did it.

And herein lies one of the great mysteries of being. Because. Music like survival doesn't really have to happen.

Now let's look you see, therefore take music as a model of the universe.

Music.

Is a fantasy with no destination. Dancing is the same thing only in motion. And when we dance, we are not going anywhere except round and round. And the universe, according to the Hindu theories, is going round and round. But according to St. Augustine of Hippo, the universe is going along on a straight line.

And this was one of the most disastrous ideas that was ever visited upon internalization since Augustine said if that if time is cyclic. Jesus Christ would have to be crucified again and again.

And there would not be, therefore, that one perfect and sufficient sacrifice, ablation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

And therefore, time had to be a straight line from the creation to the consummation to the last judgment, because then everybody stopped thinking as they didn't know what they were going to do when they got to heaven, they knew what they were going to do in hell.

And it's perfectly clear if you look at young Van Dyke's painting of the last judgment in the Metropolitan Museum, the superb work of art. Everybody in heaven is completely bored sitting there looking like the capital swallowed the canary. Rows and rows and rows of them. And the Lord God Almighty is presiding and looking equally bored.

But down below. There is a back winged start spreading out those ghastly wings, and they're all new bodies, writhing and being eaten by snakes and chewing each other. They're having an orgy. But all those stately people in heaven are in church forever, and that is the ultimate boredom. They also

observe Gustaf Duvets illustrations of Dante's demeanor comedian. He was a magnificent engraver. And while he's on the theme of the inferno is full of imagination in the Bogota trio, his imagination declines a little bit. And when he gets to the parody so it shot is all he has is ladies in White Knight is trailing in circles through the skies angels and he has no idea what an angel is. The only man who really understands angels is an Austrian artist.

What could be.

Yeah, who has fantastic imagination as to what an angel really looks like. So.

But they're very rare people. We'll have the Persian painters out a true vision of paradise.

Persian miniatures with their lovely gardens and jewel like trees and people sitting around smoking hookers and observing the birds. They. They really had it. But it is extraordinary that our idea of the paradise is weak. That's why I said earlier that students should write about their idea of heaven and to get the imagination going.

Well, anyway, the point is that we reach it and that's never been admitted. Is that heaven is the perfectly useless state.

What is God for what purpose is served by God? Obviously, none at all.

Imagine some use for God.

It's inconceivable.

Yes, but that again, you see, it returns to uselessness to say like every like everything else and like children when they're little.

And why is it a little let me give you a little a little about the community level, a little bit about it.

I know they love it. And adults say, stop that.

Behave yourself. It could be used for big purposes.

So but the universe is not. And here you see giraffes, hippopotamus, these ferns. Have you ever looked at high magnification of viruses?

They're insane. And of especially red radio. Lauria, which you'll find in the depths of the Indian Ocean, are the most magnificent pieces of jewelry that you could ever conceive. They have in the New York Museum of Natural History. Glass models of these blown up to be so big and you can't conceive anything so beautiful. There are tiaras.

There are spheres with spines coming out that look like, you know, the thing you always wanted and that you want to give your best girlfriend as a Christmas present. Gorgeous things. Why is it true that when human beings want to symbolize the ultimate, they will almost invariably pick a flower? Get the rose windows of the great medieval cathedrals. You get the Buddhist lotus is you get the mandolins. They are all flourish for Stella. Beings, we somehow look to the flower with more reverence than we look to the human face. That is odd. Because eyes are really, in my opinion, the world's most beautiful jewels.

You look in somebodies eyes. Really? Look, we always avoid eye contact in your own way because they're taboo. But if you really got some friend and you can sit in front of them and look deep, deep, deep into the eyes.

This is absolutely fascinating, but flowers all eyes. Iris?

And the circularity of the eye is the same principle as the circularity of the flower color. Beauty of the depth transparency my mother used to say showed me a morning glory. Doesn't it make you feel jazzy inside?

So. Find his them that the music.

Is life for its own sake?

Where we are living in an eternal now, when we listen to music, we're not listening to the past. We're not listening to the future. We are listening to an expanded present. Because to hear Melody is to hear the interval between tones. If you can't hear the interval, you're tone deaf.

So just as we have a field of vision which is so wide, so the present moment is not, as the talk indicates, a hairline that.

The present moment is a field of experience.

Which is not what we would call instantaneous. Much more than that, so that within the present moment we can hear intervals between tones and rhythms.

So we get the feel of a sequence going on.

So when I talk about the eternal now, please don't confuse it with a split second. It's not the same kind of thing. The eternal now is roomy, easy, lots in it. Rich. But frivolous. There's a wonderful tale that reminds me that there was a clergyman, Christ Church, Oxford. Who had terribly bad handwriting so bad he couldn't read it himself. He was preaching a sermon and he started out looking at his notes and said, oh, you who are frivolous.

Of course. Woo hoo, all frivolous, of course. Well, you. Followers of Christ.

But, but, but, but do you see the connection?

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. They know that there's been. Yet Solomon, in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. Do not be anxious for the morrow. You are frivolous, of course.

And the eyes told some one over lunch time, but G.K. Chesterton said angels fly because they take themselves lightly and say there is a divine frivolity, the love that moves the sun and other stars is frivolity.

And God, therefore, might be described as being sincere, but not serious. If I say there's some lady says to me, it's beautiful and attractive and she says, I love you. And I say to her. Are you serious or are you're just playing with me?

That's the wrong answer because I hope she's not serious and that she will play with me. So I should say to her, are you sincere or are you just toying with me?

So that playfulness is the very essence of the energy of the universe.

But I believe to be a level, a level, a level of activity. See, that's what's happening. It's music.

And bad music like written by Tchaikovsky has a meaning.

See, good music as written by Bach has no me. Bach is just making marvelous patterns of sound. Let's strike. Koski with the 1812 Overture is imitating the noises of the Napoleon retreat from Moscow and even what's his name, WC with this in gluttoned cathedral. This is tried to represent with music something other than the music itself. But the classical music, whether it be of the west, of the Hindus, of the Chinese, has no other meaning than its own sound. Now, words usually have meaning. Words are noises and they represent and point to something other than themselves in the same way as dollar bills represent wealth as maps represent territory. Words represent something else. Water. The sound water will not make you wet.

It's very important. You can't drink that noise.

Water, therefore, the word is symbolic and points to something other than itself. And so we say of words they have meaning. Now people get all fouled up because they want life to have meaning as if it were words. No gutter was hung up on those islands where Gaelic is nearing life.

All it is mortal is but a symbol.

See, confusing.

The reality with words. What does this mean?

What do you mean?

Huh? It's an insult to ask you what you mean, it's as if you had to have a meeting, as if you were a mere word, as if you were something that could be looked up at a dictionary.

You are mean. This is the point you say. That the meaning.

The good thing about life is exactly here and now we're not going anywhere.

Did you get this point of view? Go look out on the street and you will see people frantically thinking they're going somewhere, that they have important business and have a far look in their eyes and then there's a slick way out in front and they are going somewhere. They are on purpose.

They have something to achieve here. Now, sitting around here, we realize we don't have to go anywhere.

I mean, we are, in a way, a captive audience, but we don't have to go anywhere at all. With this group. And this is where it's at. That's why the Hindus call the true self of us all the ottoman. The man where it's at.

That's terrible.

It's horrible. Yes. It's I.

I'll tell you another one.

There is a being in Buddhist iconography called our local diaspora, who is also known as come on in Japanese and Indian and Chinese. Chen Raza in Tibet. And this is usually interpreted as the goddess of mercy that she is represented with 1000 arms.

Already dating because she is the cosmic millipede and the embodiment of compassion.

However, she is not completely a she. She is an aphrodisiac male, female, I have a low key dash for another low key test for a means, the watchful lord, one who is always caring.

And you can remember it because as the companies say, ever look at.

And that is good.

Take a look at it.

Have a look at. Language is simply fascinating. We could go into this and play all kinds of games with the with words and music and magic. But now here is the thing that we're getting at is that.

A culture which excludes frivolity. Hasn't lost the point of life, and this is where the Chinese communists are in extreme danger.

They are the most earnest, dedicated to survival. They were in an awful mess and it probably had to happen.

But the style of life in China and also in Russia is drab. Because they think that the point of life is to go on living.

And so long as you get by, no matter how horrible the food is, how drab your dress you're getting. And this is completely missing the point.

My spies informed me that I think they still have good food.

If your comments are now getting there, I think it's easy to wrap around.

All I have to go to do I have to go that and be persuaded.

But when I look at Mr. Mounts or don't.

Even Joe and Lai was obviously a fellow of enormous competence and brains. I wish there is more imagination.

We were talking about this just before it rolled out with this gentleman here, and I said I'd seen all the films I'd seen on communist China. The thing that impressed me the most was there was no humor.

That's the trouble that the mistake is on page two hundred and twenty four amounts of domes, red book realism. Now I tell you. Exactly. No, no, no.

I tell you the mistake where he says. It is essential to have a furrowed brow to think.

And that is the error I pointed out this morning to think that straining the muscles of the forehead has anything to do with clear thinking. That is

against louder. Who is the greatest of all the Chinese philosophers? The father of wisdom and so amounts, Adams says you must have a furrowed brow.

See, there's that little slip that.

I know my day, I don't want to pick and argue with an argument with you because you're beautiful, that you are so naturally without any effort. See how without a furrowed brow. See, nature does it.

I to think that was a great example of.

But it is really basic to psycho physical functioning.

You cannot make him make your mind, your nervous system efficient by straining. See, so he makes that mistake and that indicates an excess of seriousness. This is the point we're getting now. See that?

Life is not worth living if it is compulsive.

Why did so many people do that?

I mean, when you said at the beginning something about the big question is whether to commit suicide or not. The vast majority of people don't commit suicide. No. Why? Because.

Because well, the the answer to that question isn't simple. You have to answer within a in a in a kind of double way. The vast majority of people could be said not to commit suicide. A some of them enjoy going on. So, yes, some of them are terrified of committing suicide of death and feel therefore they must go on. That is it. It is an absolute necessity to go on as long as possible. While there is life, there is hope.

That's a terrible motto.

But some of us like to go on simply because we're enjoying the dance, even if we are not very rich and.

We live in a fairly simple way. Nevertheless, the companionship with other people, the sight of the sun, the stars, the grasses, the sound of water is its own explanation.

There's haiku poem says the long night. The sound of the water says what I. And therein we have this thing which I'm trying to describe as play play in Sanskrit is Leila.

Leila is our word lilt. And the universe is called Vishnu love the sport or play Vishnu, and we can go into that very deeply because when we talk about the play, we also talk about the theater.

And the theater is very curious phenomenon because it is defined by a stage in a proscenium arch. And behind the scenes is a green room is a green room. The actors dress up.

And they know who they are. In reality, before they assume their persona, the word pass sonar means a mask that through which sound passes their sonar. Because the masks worn in the open air theater of Greek or Roman drama had megaphone mouthpieces so that the sound would be projected in the out of doors.

So the person is the fake.

Your personality is your image of yourself, which is not you at all. Is your mask.

So the actors come on and they stratagem is that the actors want to convince the audience that it's real. What's happening on the stage? The audience knows by virtue of the proscenium arch and the kind of fencing off of the stage from the spectators, that what is going on on the stage is not really for real. The actors are going to act so well that they're going to have people weeping, laughing, crying, sitting on the edge of their seats and anxiety because they've almost persuaded that this show is for real.

Now imagine pushing this to a far extreme.

The very finest actors with the most appreciative audience.

And here we are. Yes.

See, we believe it through. And it's not.

And we take it seriously and therefore, because we take it seriously and we don't see through, we kill each other and I mean to each other and we exploit each other. No real reason whatsoever. If we understood we saw through that and we knew that this whole life was a joke. After all, what is the joker in the deck of cards? The wild card that can play any role.

The Joker is the symbol of God in the pack.

Now, fourth kings in ancient times would always have adjusted, of course. And what was suggested? The man was crazy. He was a schizophrenic who would make unpredictable remarks and everybody roared with laughter because he said things out of context.

Schizophrenics basically are in a way, liberated people because they don't give a damn.

You get a schizophrenic child and the schizophrenic child doesn't care whether it's knocked down by a car.

Whatever happens, happens. Liberals are positive that you're valuable. We must preserve you.

Charles and Co.

So they got these schizophrenics who are funny people. And they sat at least foot with the king's throne to remind the king.

Not to take himself seriously. You know, in Richard the second.

Within the hollow crown that rounds the model temples of the king keeps death his watch. And they're the antiques. It's the antique means the jester. They're the antiques. It's scoffing at his taste state and grinning at his pump, allowing him a little space to monetize. Be feared and kill with looks. And then at the last comes death. And with a little pin balls through his castle wall and farewell in.

Shakespeare is full of this kind of wisdom. The transience of life are rebels now are ended and these are actors, as I foretold, you were all spirits and are melted into into thin.

And like the baseless fabric of this vision, the crowd cloud cap towers, the solemn temples, the glorious palaces, the great earth itself, by all which inherit shall dissolve like this insubstantial pageant, faded leave, not a rack behind. We are such stuff as dreams are made on, and our little life is rounded. Obviously.

See the most fantastic things in poetry. Work on the theme of insubstantial, substantial reality of transience. It's all fading away. Everything we we are each one of us, not a substantial entity, but we are like a flame. And the flame is a stream of hot gas, like a whirlpool and a river. Every one of us is a flowing. Now, if you resist that.

You go crazy, you like somebody trying to grab water in your hands. And the harder you squeeze it, the faster it slips through your fingers. So the principle of the enjoyment of life is this is not a precept. This has nothing to do with my realisation. It has nothing to do with what you bought should, etc..

It is completely practical. Don't hang onto it. Let it go.

Birth, Death, and the Unborn

This seminar about birth, death and the unborn is going to be a discussion of the Buddhist philosophy of change.

And I'm going to start out by going into the very tricky and difficult question of the Buddhist view of birth and death and the doctrine which is ordinarily understood as reincarnation or rebirth, it's a curious thing. That many Westerners who become interested in Hinduism or Buddhism do so because of this idea of reincarnation.

They like it.

It gives a more satisfactory vision of individual. History and development. Then the two possibilities that would normally be open to Westerners to believe in.

On the one hand.

You've got the choice of the Christian view, which is that you live in this world once and in this fourscore years and ten, your eternal fate is settled. Or you've got the possibility of the materialistic view, which is that you only live once and when you're dead, you're dead. That's that. You're a flash of consciousness between two. Eternal darkness is. Intelligent people in the Western world have never felt very happy about either of these two prospects, and therefore there is a certain attractiveness about the idea, which seems to be the point of Buddhism and Hinduism, that you are a soul on a pilgrimage and that from some extremely obscure origin you began as some sort of animal kowl and worked your way up step by step through all sorts of forms of life. And finally, you have the privilege of appearing in human form. And once you've got there, you have an opportunity to develop to the highest spiritual position. You must remember that according to both Hindu and Buddhist doctrines, the human form is a very privileged position. For there are, according to both of them, because they share a common cosmology, six domains of beings.

And if you will visualize the wheel of life.

With its six divisions at the highest top division, there is the realm of the diva, diva is the word from which we get the word divine and equally the word devil diva means, though, originally a God or more correctly, an angel.

Angel is a better Western translation of diva than God. Immediately opposite the diva world at the bottom of the circle. There is the naka world of beings in torment of the absolute. This is the dimension of the world, which is the screaming meanies, which is experience in the form of horror. The diva world is the experience of being in the form of bliss.

And between these two poles, there are all kinds of ranges. There are, for example, the assures next to the divers going clockwise around the wheel

and the insurers are.

They are a wrathful beings, are sure is the incarnation of divine anger. They're next to the ashore, are going around are the animals or animals whatsoever. Then again, we get to the Naka at the bottom, the place of the purgatory, we'll call it then coming up again. Does the world of the proto who are frustrated beings and they're represented?

I cannot graphically as having very large bellies and very tiny mouths. That is to say, an immense appetite with very little means of satisfying it. There are sort of spiritual bottleneck. And then coming up between the predators and the devils is the world of the humans. And this is understood to represent a sort of middle position. You can be liberated from the human state because the dangers are too happy to be liberated. The assures too furious the animals to dumb, the narcos too tormented and the predators too frustrated. You need not take this as a literal. Account of various kinds of being in the universe. You can take them simply as a depiction of various states, of the human mind, of the moods you can go through. They're all really in your own head, as we shall see later on, about many other things. But these are the six worlds of Hindu and Buddhist cosmology, and the notion is that one reincarnate again and again through the six worlds. This is the popular idea. In other words, if you live this human life in a bad way and you become angry.

If you devote your life to fury, you'll be reincarnated as an insurer. If you devote your life to merely living for back and belly, you'll be reincarnated as an animal. If you are horribly cruel to people and so on, you'll be reincarnated as another cat. And so on all around. But on the other hand, if you do good things in the course of your karma, you will be reincarnated in the devil world or in better and better situations in the human world.

That's the popular understanding, and Westerners, many of them think, well, that's great. Cause this opens up vast vistas of future development. We can go on in future lives working out our destinies, and we can also love to think about who we were before. When you fall in love with somebody, did you meet before in some past life?

Is this the working out of a Columbine that is between you? And it's very interesting. But the funny thing is that Hindus and Buddhists who do believe in rebirth do so not because they like it, but because they feel they have to accept it as a hard fact. And the whole task of the work of sadhana or spiritual practice and discipline is to get out of it. So it always strikes me as very funny that Westerners take this up because they find it comforting. But Easterners are always trying to get away from being reborn. It was so funny once. Joseph Campbell told me a story that he was sitting with a Vedanta swami. One of these Vedanta societies, Swami. And the swami was saying, oh, dear me. He said, you know. Really? The idea of rebirth is so wonderful, said I, really. I think this is the most the most comforting notion. And Joe said to him, Swami, don't be a damn fool. What are you talking about? The idea of rebirth being so comforting. Don't you realize that that's what you're supposed to get away from? And the swami suddenly jumped, said. Oh, yes, of course.

It was like I once had a talk with a swami and he was arguing, you see that behind all the multiple forms of this world. There was only one single divine principle and he was going on about this. I said, Swami, you can't talk like that. You know very well that the Brahmin the ultimate reality isn't one, because one has an opposite, which is many, and Brahman has no opposite. Who should speak as Brahman as the non dual. And again, he said, did you talk just like a Hindu?

They are funny, you see, because these families have accepted an enormous amount of Western feeling and the British were responsible for that, for occupying India so long and perverting its traditions. Now, it is so curious to all of us because in Buddhism. That still prevails an idea of rebirth. Very strong among all Buddhist countries, and yet. Buddhism explicitly denies that there is any individual reincarnated soul.

You see.

In Buddhism, there is a doctrine which is called the three signs of being. And these three signs of of being, well, I should more correctly say the Sanskrit word is power B, HIV A, and that means becoming rather than being HAVA is from the basic root.

I think B H which is connected with the with growth. So Barber becoming the process of change has three signs. One is called Duca.

The U H K HK looker in Sanskrit means frustration.

Sometimes translated suffering. But I think frustration is a more general word, which is perhaps better.

It's Ducker is the opposite of Sucre. Sucre means sweet. Duka perhaps means sour. But in this in the way it's used, it means frustration as a basic characteristic of living beings.

Because for some reason or other that life is always eventually frustrating. You have what you desire more than you can ever get. You overreach the possibilities. And so to every being, death comes as a collapse.

And something unfortunate.

The next sign of being is called a ninja A and I T way in Sanskrit. Anita, which means impermanence. The opposite word being Nita.

Eternal. So Annika is everything is in flux.

And finally, I'm not on a an 18 million allotment, which means that nothing has its own, so.

Now, that's a. Sounds to a Christian. A terrible idea.

Because we use the word soulless or we say to a person, you have no soul, which means you have no finer feelings. You have no or you're not a human being. Because Christian theology did distinguish between humans and animals by saying that animals have no soul. Idiots have no soul. They've lost their soul. But you can see at once that there is a complete difference of the meaning. This is a to translate Ottoman as soul is ridiculous.

Apartment means basically that nothing exists.

Well, there's another word in Sanskrit. You have to nose fab, however, SGA, V.A., that means oneself or one's own.

Same as the Latin source because the V becomes the U so far. Viva, viva becoming again your own becoming. Or sometimes it's called your own nature or self nature. And so what it is saying is that you don't know that nothing has. Any real sub, however. Because no individual thing of any kind exists except in relation to all the other things. In other words, you are what you are. Only because of your relationships to everything else. And therefore, the whole universe is a system of interdependence. It's just as if, for example, you were to stand two sticks on the ground and lean them against each other and they will stand up and form an inverted V. Because they lean on each other. And this is an old thing that they teach children in Japan that these sticks leaning against each other form the Chinese character for man. And they say, therefore, man cannot exist unless we support each other. This is the basis, therefore, our brotherhood and of good social relationships.

But underneath that is the far more profound idea.

The universe. Cahiers. By everything, depending on everything else. And therefore, nothing. Exists alone. Nothing exists in its own right. And that's what that man means.

You do not have an indestructible, immortal soul, which is just plain you forever and ever and ever. And is independent of there being anything else at all.

Also, though, this does go along with the idea that there is not some kind of gaseous spook, some kind of etheric double astral body. What have you, which outlast the existence of the physical body and migrates to the next incarnation. So it has always been a puzzle for Buddhist philosophers to explain how they cannot once believe in reincarnation. And at the same time deny the existence of an individual spook, which is independent of the physical frame.

And the most subtle discussions in all Buddhist literature range around this puzzle. The most important text of early Buddhism is a book called The

Questions of King Melinda.

This is the Greek man under. He is a king in the succession of Alexander the Great, who ruled in Alexander's Eastern Empire and had long conversations with the Buddhist sage by the name of Magaziner. And Magaziner tries to explain to the king how there can be rebirth without anyone who is being reborn.

And so this is the problem to which we address ourselves. How can there be a continuing process without anything carried along by it? And you will recognize at once that the problem is very largely semantic.

Because it involves our whole idea of continuity. What, for example, do you mean by a wave?

When you see you throw a stone into the water and from the plop point where the stone goes in, a whole lot of rings emerge and they are waves and they go out. And you can, as it were. Look at one of them and follow it. And you say I am watching a wave. But what is a wave? You know very well that the water itself.

No. No volume of water, no specific volume of water is moving outwards from the place where you dropped the pebble.

If the water is staying quite still so far as lateral motion is concerned, but the water is moving up and down and these up and down movements create the illusion of a thing called a wave that goes along. Similar to the illusion, when you watch a barber's pole revolving, it seems to be a procession of something that keeps going up from the bottom of the pole to the top.

But actually, it's just going around.

Now that that appearance of something moving when there is actually the only thing that is going outwards is motion and motion is about as abstract as you can think. This is the whole route of the Indian idea of Maya of the world as Maya.

As a construct. Something which, shall we say, exists only in your mind.

Only we shall have to be very careful what we mean by that. And I'm going to come to that later on in the seminar.

So here. Here is here is the point. You are delivered from rebirth. This being the purpose of the spiritual disciplines of Hinduism and Buddhism. As soon as you are relieved of the illusion that something is going on. Continuity. This after this, after this, after this, all linking up together into a chain. In the famous Zen text call, the Platform Sutra attributed to Wayne on the Sixth Patriarch.

There is a passage that says if we allow our thoughts past, present and future to link up into a series, we put ourselves under restraint.

But on the other hand, if we just see that they are not. There is just this thought and then this thought and then this thought, you are liberated.

This is an idea which is taken up by T.S. Eliot in this poem, The Four Quartets. Where he could you come to the passage where he says that you are getting on a train.

And you settled down in the compartment with your newspaper and you're going on a journey. But the one who arrives at the destination will not be the same person who left the platform in the beginning. Because you sit here now. Are not the same as the people who came in at the door a little while ago.

Just in exactly the same way as the flame of a candle appears to be a constant flame, which we can identify as a thing, but as a matter of fact, it is a stream.

Hot energy. Which is.

Whatever particles, whatever gaseous molecules are here, are going like this the whole time, flowing upwards and disappearing the conflict, the flame is converting the candle wax into gas. And in exactly the same way as we can see that the flame has an identity. You say it is a flame. We have a noun for it. We're actually it is a process. It is flaming. And so in this in just

precisely that way, every human being is a process. Just as the flame is the conversion of wax into gas.

So you and I are the conversion of air and water and light and beefsteak and milk into. Shit, and which again converts into something else. You see, we are the flowing vibration through which all this goes. I'm not for one moment.

Are we the same?

So then the meaning of the Buddhist doctrine is that.

You who live today are never going to die.

Because the ones that are going to die will not be the, you know. And likewise, the one that's here now was never born.

It goes like this. It is explained by Dogan, who was the most fabulous Zen philosopher living around twelve hundred A.D.. When he said.

The spring. Does not become the summer and the summer does not become the autumn. No one would say that. Spring becomes the summer, there is spring and then there are summer.

He said in the same way, when you burn wood, there are ashes. But the wood does not become the ashes. There is wood and then there is ashes.

Each is, as it were, sufficient to itself. Their eyes were so steps. It's like vibrations wave crests. You see where.

The water doesn't move. You see what it doesn't move laterally.

So in this sense, by analogy, the spring does not become the summer. But by watching it, you in your mind impose motion on the up and down of the water. And so you say the spring becomes the summer. So likewise, you say the baby becomes the adolescent, becomes the man, becomes the crone, becomes the cops. And the Buddhists say no. These states follow in the same way as the apparent motion of a wave.

And so.

The the word to the wise is live the moment you're in. There is no other place to be. You will not die and you were never born. If you realize if you see through the illusion. Now, this may sound as if one were creating a theory of the universe, which is what you might call at a mystic. Discontinuous, it is saying the universe is nothing. But point instance.

And it all comes down to that. I see this as an extension of the Western philosophy of nominalism, nominalism as opposed to realism. The nominalists argue against the realists point of view, which is realists say there is such a thing as mankind.

Mankind is a reality, and every individual human is a special instance of a real universal substance called man.

The nominalists argue this is an abstraction and nonsense. There is no such thing as mankind. There are only individual people. And of course, this has become in the 20th century the ascendant point of view. There is not really such a thing as the United States of America. That is a political abstraction. There are just the people who live here.

But if you take nominalism to its logical conclusion, you'll get to the point where you don't exist at all a human being. There is no such thing as a human being. It's an abstraction. All there is is the molecules that are the cells which infest your bones.

And dissolve those further into the nuclear particles and you can say, well, that's all there is. You see there are just these things.

But then you suddenly begin to realize there is no end to that way of thinking because you can always give an imagination and given instruments of sufficient subtlety, subdivide any unit of existence, of motion of energy into further subdivisions.

Further units of measurement.

And say, well, that we get more real as we get smaller. You see that simply saying that the smaller things are, the more real things. Well, that's a ridiculous argument because you can play it exactly in the opposite direction. You can say, oh, no, no, no, no. Since all small things only exist relatively. That is to say, in relation to each other.

The only real thing is the big thing.

So all those small particles are relatively unreal. The only thing that is real is the whole universe.

And that's so big that nobody can conceive it.

So do you see all philosophical argument is a game playing with people, arguing with each other in words, playing up and down the scale of arguing as to which level of bits, collections of bits, all bits whatsoever.

Which one is real?

I've noticed a very funny thing in observing with my experiments with psychedelics that psychedelic conversations are absolutely perfect examples of what is going on and always has been going on in philosophy. People start talking with each other, having very animated conversations about nothing at all except the processes of grammar. In other words, let's imagine a conversation in which nothing specific is mentioned. No proper names are used. No proper nouns. Nothing is being referred to whatsoever.

But all the words that indicate more or less dimensions of quality, dimensions of quantity are all the operative words. Say words like to be.

To grow, to diminish.

To expand, to contract, all these are operant words which can be used with reference to all kinds of specifics, but they get into conversations where all specifics are dropped out and only operant words are used and they dance with each other. By using these kinds of words. And philosophers are doing exactly the same thing now. Philosophy is an intellectual dance of a game that we play just like it might be go.

It might be chess or checkers or poker where we take these abstractions, the set of cards 52 to the deck and we play numbers.

And orders against each other. See what philosophers do, just the same thing and all their arguments.

And you say, well, isn't that kind of silly? Well, maybe it isn't. Because life itself, biology is the same thing.

We have all these species that eat each other and come on in different shapes, in different forms and so on.

And there is a contest going on all the time to prove whether the cats are more powerful than the mice or the humans than the rats. And there's this constant thing is going on. But it is the same kind of bubbly, bubbly bubble only it takes instead of such a simple word as bubble, which is a vibration in the air.

It comes on as a mouse. And a mouse is a very complicated way of saying bubble.

So in all this, you see when when when you get it, when you get a game going of this kind, there comes the point of what you might call emotional investment. When you feel that the outcome of this particular feature in the game is urgent, this matters. And you do see that that's what we mean by matter. The words matter, meaning something substantial, something material also means important. It matters. And it's up to you what you think matters. We teach our children. What matters? What's important for them to learn? And we teach them basically that it's important to live.

You must go on. That's terribly important. When you get a schizophrenic child or a Mongolian, so-called Mongolian idiot, these children don't realize that it's important to go on and they don't give a damn. And they are very happy. But from our point of view, incompetent and adapted to society, useless because they don't understand why it's necessary to go on living. They're just going to have a ball where they are. And generally what we would say goof off.

And in a way, every being in this world is torn between going on and goofing off.

We feel that's that's the basis of our distinction between work and play. Play is everybody needs some time to goof off, but they must go back to work because you've got to farm and fish and manufacture and produce so that you can go on.

But when you see you have this terrifying urgency to go on. And field, you must. This is. This is important. This matters. We screen out of our consciousness the fact that this is our own volition and our own game. Because we are captivated by the illusion of the necessity and the importance of going on.

To keep other people going on, to keep children going on, to keep this thing up.

And the difficulty is that as we become disturbed and anxious about this.

It's more difficult to keep the game going.

In proportion, as we are frightfully concerned to survive, we start fighting other people. We start clobbering our neighbors were stealing our crops and whatever it is. All the old fights start. And it is these fights which more than anything else at the moment to see are endangering the entire human project. But all based fundamentally on the illusion that it's utterly important that we survive.

A little while before he died, Robert Oppenheimer said. It is perfectly obvious that the whole world is going to hell. It's going to blow up.

There is no way know that it can be stopped except that we don't try to stop it happening. Because you see the panic. What's going to happen if this bomb goes off? See, this more than anything else will make it go off. Because it's like a person who's looking down over a precipice. And starts to get unreasonable. He is terrified to fall over it and therefore suddenly all the strength goes out of his fingers and his legs get wobbly.

And he's ready to fall. Simply because of his fear of falling.

But you see in all this, what underlies is the illusion.

But that I am going on, that I constitute a real continuity. From this moment to the next moment to the next moment to the next moment. What are you afraid of losing when you die? Why all the capital you've acquired during your life, the experiences, the friends? The status. The skills. Everything that you remember. Would be destroyed. Ordinarily, when you die. And that's why, in other words, we are afraid of losing the past. Now, it's perfectly obvious to me that when you die. Yes. Everything that you've acquired as an individual and stored in your brain is dissolved and distributed.

But at the same time, it is equally obvious that you are not going to that when you die, there won't be following the moment of death.

Everlasting nothingness.

That would be as ridiculous as to suppose that you went immediately to heaven and joined the Saints and Angels.

The point is that when you die. You're always reborn. De novo, that is to say, just as you were before. When you came into this world. There gradually arose into being the sensation of I. And it stays there a while, it goes through a development and then it drops off.

But all the time, everywhere, there are other eyes starting up, see whether they be human, animal. Anything you like to be in other galaxies, etc. Always. They're starting up now. But we would say, is there? No, there is no connection between.

No. In the same way. There is no connection between the molecules in your hand. And yet you say it is a hand.

But if you look at it under a powerful enough microscope, the molecules in your hand are miles apart. And you would say there is no connection between what's the connection between this galaxy and other galaxies.

While we can't see any connection and yet there are gravitational swings whereby they respond with each other and move in a certain collective order. So in a very similar way, the constant appearance of beings who feel that they are I. Constitute a wave motion.

And they may be considered individually.

See what we're doing in this? I'm not sure. Is not setting down a doctrine, but it is doing an exercise in perception. You can see it either way. You can see yourself, in other words, as existing only now. That's the only you there is. The alternative to that. Logically is to see yourself as everything. Either it must be that you exist. Bingo like that, your point, instant bond.

You know, if you go and the Fillmore Auditorium and dance, they've turned on the strobes, copy light going very rapidly.

Brilliant light on and off, on and off, on and off, on enough. And it seems that everybody's all the time going in and out of existence.

Now, in a way, that's a kind of. Exemplify creation of the truth that we are vibrations and that everything does go on and off, on and off, on and off all the time.

So the only real thing is the moment of on where you are now. Got it busted. Got it lasted. Got it last. See, that's the only thing real. That's one poll. The other poll is the view that.

All these on and off. Just like the molecules in your hand constitute a continuous reality.

But if you follow that line, you've got to add up not to just what you are at this moment. You're going to add up to the whole universe. Through the entire span of its existence in space and time. Any middle position you take between these things is arbitrary.

Say, OK. I'm gonna be so much. I'm going to call myself this particular human being who lives for substance at a time.

OK. That's where you want to play the game as the rules you've been told. And if you wonder to get attached to that and hung up on that, you're going to say that matters. And so you feel material.

And the Buddhist idea is simply saying don't get hung up on a what is called in Sanskrit, Rushdie.

Rushdie means a view. A particular way of looking at things.

You say that's it. I looking at it from this point of view.

This is the way it seems to me to be. And I'm going to stick for that. I'm going to get hung up on that. That is the meaning of attachment. So in Sanskrit, the word psychiatry, she means the view of separateness. The view that this is the separation of a certain bundle of. Wiggles. Taken out of the total willingness of all that there is is me. And another bundler, Wiggles, is very definitely you and I get stuck on that, see, and therefore to start a fight about it. Therefore, to start crying and weeping and gnashing of teeth, all about this thing being the real thing.

That is what these people are trying all these Buddhist sages and Hindu sages to get people off that hang up.

And say, wake up, wake up, wake up.

Don't you understand the whole thing's an illusion. Not that this is a word to put it down and say that it's horrible or bad. If you could see that the whole thing is an illusion, you would be happy as a lark. And life would be lived much more joyously by everybody.

We would dance together and give things away and stop, stop fighting. See if we really saw it was an illusion. We'd all be happy in our big dream.

But we are constantly saying to ourselves and we are saying to our children, it's real. God dammit, it's real. And death is gonna be awful and sickness is gonna be horrible. You see, it's real. And you better watch out.

See, you can see people say to me, you can say as a philosopher that all this things and you could talk this way because you're sitting in a comfortable place. You've got plenty to eat, but you watch when the thing hits you, you'll laugh the other side of your face.

Well, I don't give a damn when it happens, it'll happen, but it's not happening now. And what I'll do when it does happen is these sufficient unto the day is the trouble. They're off. As if you let yourself be free to react as nature dictates when catastrophe falls.

You'll be OK.

But if you go through your whole life standing in a state of preparation for catastrophe and you know what's going to happen, you just torment yourself and get ulcers and rotting of the brain long before it's necessary for that to happen.

In this seminar on birth, death and the unborn, we've been discussing the Buddhist philosophy of change. Of life as a flowing, dynamic pattern process, which is essentially immaterial. Because it isn't anything you can grasp we use the word substance we use the word silent we use the word matter for something you can catch hold of or stand on or rely on or cling to. And the basis of the Buddhist philosophy of change is that there is nothing of the kind. There is nothing to hang onto nothing to rely on nothing to cling to. But, when we say you see something matters the word has a double meaning in that it means that it's substantial in that it's important. And so we are brought up from birth to play the game of life in a certain way that a sudden things we are told by adults who were told by their out so were told by their adults that these things matter. And that one of the fundamental things that matters is that you go on living. And so, everybody is tremendously concerned with the things that matter that they've been taught to value, and because these things actually don't matter that is to say because they're not substantial but they're all a flowing pattern as I illustrated. A flame seems to be a substantial object that's there to burn unit in and watch it for a long time. Actually it's a stream of hot gas. And so likewise, the human organism is a stream of energy never the same for two seconds. Only we've we've been taught to watch that thing, and to cherish it and value it and it matters damn it. And yet it's going to wear out and yet

it's going to get sick and yet it's going to die. So everybody is involved in playing the game of life in a way that goes beyond play and becomes deadly serious. And as a result, the whole of existence is lived in a state of constant frustration. Because you are trying all the time to hold together and to preserve something which in the long run can't be preserved at all.

And therefore, in response to this cry of pain which everybody puts up as a result of being in the situation of trying to hold on to things, the wisdom of the various ways of liberation be they Hindu, Buddhist or whatever, is saying to everybody love now, wake up, see what the scene is. This is the kind of thing that's going on and. You are not a captive in a trap. You're not just some mere little measly being that somehow or other was brought into an insane universe, but you are what the thing is. You are not the victim. You are the system. Only, you have identified yourself with one wave in it and have forgotten that you are one with the whole energy that's going on but what you're doing is you, you have got a particular way that is to say a particular accumulation of memory. Of associations, of skills of things that you've learned and you don't want to let go of them because you found in that accumulation of memories which you call yourself an identity so you know where you are or think you do. But actually, you don't need to be anywhere. Where is the universe? You know, think up an answer to that one. And so the question of where is the universe is really ultimately the same question as where are you? Said what this is saying is let go. It's all right to play the game be involved and. Work out the various intrigues problems, creative projects and so on that life involves that's fine. But if you get involved in it so that you're hung up, this deprives you of delight and joy in playing the game. So the point is to get people un-hung-up on the whole thing, which in the way we have been accustomed to translate Sanskrit Chinese with because we have been calling unattached but on hung up as much better it's a much clearer this colloquial phrase a hang-up is a much more direct and exact translation of what the Sanskrit word klesha means. Attachment or evil passion or something like that. [It] is hang-up. It is blocking, being fixed on a particular point of view. And I was trying to show this morning. That we can take ever so many different points of view towards what's going on no point of view is the right one. Infinitely many points of view are possible. But if you take a point of view and you insist that is the only point of view then you're hung up on it.

If for example you take the point of view that there are only two kinds of human beings men and women. And either you are a man or you are a woman that's a hang-up. Because actually we vary a great deal there are men who have much more feminine elements in them than others and women who have much more masculine elements in them than other women and so there is an enormous variation but so long as you insist that black is black and white is white and that there are Republicans and Democrats and capitalists and communists and good guys and bad guys it's a hang-up. So also between what is you and what is other than you. Well that's the general area of what we were discussing this morning. And now I want to go further in explaining what I started out to explain, which is the basic Buddhist idea of rebirth. Of our being reincarnated. I said that this was not in Buddhism the idea that one has a kind of spiritual spook or astral spook or soul which travels from one life to another. It is a much simpler idea than that. But it's so simple that it's difficult to explain. I would begin you see with the assumption, that every person, every sentient being whatsoever is I. I it is simply the universe aware of itself at a particular place and time. That's what the word 'I' means. William James once said the word. Is a noun of position, like this or here. And so, the feeling that we call eye is how everything feels on the inside. But it is always in a particular place at a particular time. And these particular places and particular times they keep going on and on and on and on and on. Myriads of them, all over. Not only on this globe but probably in well scattered throughout the phone calls plus the I feeling arises, and you feel that you are i just as much as I feel that I am I. And your I feeling and my I feeling are essentially the same. Only we're looking from different places but it's all one I. Only we don't see this because we are hung-up on the coming and going of I. On the particular circumstances in which every I appears. And so, just as the flame changes its physical identity every second every split second every microsecond so do you you're a stream.

And so, taking us all together supposing you watched the human race from a very different point of view you were watching us. You didn't know anything about human beings never seen them before and you were observing what's going on in this planet. From some other point of culture in space and time and you would say well this world is people in this planet peoples, just like a tree bears fruit. And year after year the apples that come

up an apple tree all up very very much the same. And you would say, yeah, the apples come and go but they're always the same apples coming back. It's only if you look very minutely at the apples and started the details of coloration and formation that you would say that one Apple was different from another. Now we are also used to each other and we know each other so well that we see and emphasize the differences between us but somebody who knew nothing about humanity would see the coming and going of human beings as a repetition of the same process. Just as the flame burning. We say it's a flame but it's a repetition of the same process, it keeps on flaming. Now, if you're going to count each cha as a distinct and separate event, then you cannot hear the rhythm.

So because of our myopia because our point of view is fascinated by the details and the differentiations between everything that's going on the differentiations between people the differentiations between generations. We are so preoccupied with that particular view of things that we're hung up on it, and we don't see that it's the same thing happening again and again and again and that every I that comes into this world is you. Now you don't have to have any inside information to understand that. [It] doesn't require any sort of is a esoteric knowledge and something that can be demonstrated is just looking at things the way they are standing right out in the open and facing. Or eyes I. Wherever some of them scattered because you see this is the place. At the put the point call here in our this universe knows itself on the inside look around you and you see everything as it were presenting and next year or two. Supposing I want to delve into another person how am I going to do that there are many ways I can talk to them I can get them to express their inmost thoughts and their feelings. I can make love to another person and exchange of very fundamental sort of electrochemical union. I can take a knife and like a surgeon go in and analyze but my relationship to the other is always seeing life on the outside. However much I get down to the tiniest cells that constitute your nervous system, I'm still looking at that cell from the outside. If I go down into the molecules, I go down into the atoms, I'm still regarding them from the outside The only point at which I know the thing on the inside is where I am. Then I have inside knowledge of what everywhere else appears to be outside. So if you want to know what it's what all this is, that's why mystics say you have to look within. That say so they talk about the inner life within yourself and so on as that's the point

at which. You know what it's like on the inside. And so, to realize inside there must of course at the same time the outside to realise self, there must be the counterbalance of other. Because this light black and white is like back in front they're inseparable.

So then, this is where we start from. That every being coming into this world is I. And they keep on coming. It doesn't matter how long the intervals are between their appearances those in this planet were completely wiped out by a cobalt bomb explosion. That would be the end of this race in just the same way as say a group of insects will eat their food supply up on a plant and the whole population will perish. [It] happens again and again. And so in all probability throughout this galaxy and throughout other galaxies there are human or comparable populations that arise and go arise and go just as we do individually. So don't get too worried about the thought that this whole human system on this planet may go away and disappear because if you get too worried about it it's going to happen faster than if you don't worry about it. Because of the attraction of a Vertigo. The feeling of wanting to throw yourself over the precipice even though you know it will destroy you.

But it seems perfectly reasonable to suppose in other words that there is a constant rhythm. Of what we call consciousness, being awake to life, going on and on. Just as stars go on and on. If the stars are going all over the place and galaxies are going on all over the place. It's equally reasonable to suppose that life is going on all over the place. And although the distances from our particular point of view between these islands of life may be vast, don't forget that the distances between the molecules in your own body are equally vast, on their scale. You could go down and blow up the inside of your own head so that the various elements would be hundreds of miles away from each other and yet somehow or other they hang together. Don't be deceived because distance, space, isn't just removal. Space isn't just nothing.

This is the grand delusion. That space is somehow a thing to be ignored. When Buddhists say that the root of frustration or Dukha is other. Avidya means ignore and it's ignoring not knowing and this is very clearly explainable in terms of the doubt theory of perception the get out theory of

perception is that we notice the figure and ignore the background. We notice what is a relatively small enclosed space and ignore the more dispersed we notice what moves against what is relatively still and what is relatively still is ignored so likewise when we get a constant stimulus of consciousness. We begin to ignore it. And not to notice that consciousness tends always to notice novel things, novel changes in the environment. So, everything that that the most unnoticed things in life are those which are the most constant and the most regular. And because you see you lose touch with the most constant, and the most regular things. You screen them out of your your general thought is insignificant, they don't matter, they're not there. And the most ignored thing is space. Because space is always the background. The solids other figures. And therefore we say simply the space is just not is there's nothing there maybe filled around this planet for a little distance with air, which is important, because we do this a while and you notice something so there's some which going on. But up there space to that's nothing and all we can do the Michelson-Morley experiment show that isn't even ether in it. And so we say that is nothing. But all that is saying is that that is the background to every figure, and as the figure cannot be there without the background the solid cannot be there without the space and so the space are the world is that one thing we've forgotten. And the one thing that is absolutely essential to there being anything at all. But because in every direction the stimulus of space is a constant, we don't notice it. Just in the same way you don't notice when you hear music on the phonograph. You don't consider the fact that all the music that you hear is a vibrating diaphragm. Whether it imitates drums, flutes, human voices it's still a vibrating diaphragm but that's it not we don't say that's not important but it is important because without the vibrating diaphragm there wouldn't be any music at all. Space then likewise, is everywhere. But, we ignore it, because it's common to everything. A constant stimulation stimulation of consciousness is forgotten.

So then, we must realize that this is what we call separate things, separate molecules, separate lives, separate planets separate star separate galaxies are joined by space. Space, in other words, is a relationship between solids you would not be able to think about space without a relationship between solids. And so the whole theory of rebirth in Buddhism is based on intervals. Not on a transmigrating soul but upon intervals between lives as

is the interval that's important just as in the same way when you listen to music, you hear melody simply because you hear the interval between the tones. If you couldn't hear that interval you would not hear a melody. Tone-deaf people cannot hear a melody they hear merely a succession of sounds. And they can't understand why other people enjoy this, because they haven't got the capacity to hear the interval between tones following each other in succession or the intervals between tones played simultaneously as in a chord. Isn't that magical when you come to think of it? That music is created by not so much the tones, as the distance. The musical or sonic space between them. But so goes for everything. It is how it is spaced that creates the significance and interest of any being whatsoever. You say, for example, the human body consists of about ninety-five cents worth of chemicals. But how it's arranged. Playing a violin by a Great Master is just scraping cats entrails with hot air. But how it's done.

So the order of the way things are distributed is the magic, and that requires the spacing how it is spaced. And so architects, they understand that space is real, because there always they talk about space using space. People, when they first listen to architects talking a very puzzled because they are an architect will use an expression like the function of a space. And the ordinary person says how can space of a function how can nothing do something when the physicist speaks of space being curved. How the devil can space be curved? How going to be properties of space, see? Does the average person simply brought up to ignore space as being a total non entity. So then it is bases between. What we'll call solids. Instants. Points. That makes it possible for the points to have some point and. Grow all of everything this point nobody would be able to make up. One point from another. So has to be interval.

So likewise then when it comes to considering relationships between lives. Your past life, or past incarnation, your future incarnation. Do you understand this problem I repeat you do not need any spookery. It is all perfectly obvious and I'm going to demonstrate to you. By playing a game with pebbles. Now, [I have] scattered these pebbles at random all over the floor. And let's consider for the sake of argument that each pebble is a human life, and you see that the slats of the floor going across this way. They may be taken to represent, each one a century in time talked on

calendar time. And so here are human lives, all of different sizes, lengths that is to say different breaths how much they travel and how much space they occupied scattered right across a period of time. And we are looking at them from a sort of celestial position. With a kind of eye of God and seeing history happening scattered all over the place. Now one of the first things that we do when we see a scattered arrangement of this kind. The first thing, maybe say oh it's just a mess. And the second thought, hmm, it seems to have some lines of continuity in it. Because especially you see as...you can make out. Very quickly you can pick out a line you know how you do this lying in bed in the morning and looking at a chintz curtains or lying in hospital and looking at patterns on the ceiling you start to pick out designs and themes. [Leonardo] Davinci used to look a dirty old walls weathers moisture and damp and mold and see in those walls all kinds of paintings that he could therefore bring out the glorious cave paintings. Which are found in the south of France by most prehistoric man they're done by what's called eidetic vision. Those people looked in the caves at the patterns on the wall and in them they saw cattle. People and they simply touch them up and therefore got the most vividly realistic impressions It's called eidetic vision so in just the same way in looking at the scatter of pebbles on the floor. You can with eidetic vision pick out certain continuity is.

So, if for example we...it's very easy to see as things are to spot this line. It's almost a straight line, and a straight line is an abstract concept which is useful to us. See, I notice those are all lined up like that. Now is there a line there or isn't there? How real is the line? There was no intention to make a line, these are just where the things fall, but they do so this particular set of pebbles happens to be pretty much in a straight line now the straight line is a concept. It isn't something in the actual pebbles, and yet at the same time I can see it that way.

So then, we might argue if each of the pebbles in that line is representing the lifetime of a human being. Because they are lined up in this way, you can say that is a continuity in other words. This one. Here. Reincarnates as this one, and then as this one because they continue each other and form the line they talk about a line of descent. A line of succession. That's what happens. And you see that continuity in their system just as you see the continuity of the wave moving across the water although actually nothing is

moving the water is just going up and down. So you would see the continuity of this. So in the same way as I explained this morning you consider that you sitting here are the same people who came in at the door although you're not, you've changed completely. So this in other words, if I insist upon seeing this continuity of lives, then I'm reincarnating. If I realize however that my seeing of the line here is purely a projection, I'm not reincarnating, I'm liberated. Or we could do it in some other way. You don't have to see a straight line to make the connections let's imagine that these are all pebbles in a stream. And what will make connections between them for a little fellow who is walking around you see, and he wants to get across the stream. And so he put his foot on a pebble here and what next one can reach in get that one. And then get that one. Wowee, have a little problem to go on from there. But maybe with a jump you can land on that. And then on that one and whoops with a jump you can hit that. It all depends on the stretch that one. Sees and because they they're each within a a stretch then that's another reason for setting up a line of continuity. Being able to see a significant connection between any of the members of the group.

So what you're doing here you see, you are making sense out of a whole multitude of human lives in just exactly the same way that you make sense out of anything else. The way you make sense out of a Rorschach blot. But after all the whole world is a Rorschach blot. Everything in it is what we're doing is we're making sense out of wiggly processes. There is, you see human... wherever you fly across the world in a plane. And the landscape suddenly begin. To look rectangular. Or straight lines. And clear triangles or clear circles you know human beings have been around. Where they haven't been around the outlines of everything we really like the courses of rivers the shapes of mountains and forests because human beings are always trying to straighten things out. But the... we ourselves are not straightened out. We are wiggles. And we're interminably wiggling, but we're trying to regulate our weakling by setting ourselves up in houses and going along streets with traffic lights and regulations and so on, but we are we're going we're trying to straighten out this wheedling but wiggling is basic. So the whole world especially us, is a rorschach blot. And science is the art of trying to make unanimous sense of this block what science does. Is it isn't that there are certain fixed laws of nature which things obey. It isn't as if the wiggly events of the world are running on tram lines and. They have to they

have to do that. They don't have to. The point is that in order to make sense out of what is going on. There's no way of making sense, because sense and order the same thing. Therefore, we invent orders, and describe the way things that. In other words, here is the scatter of stones but it just so happens that I scatter them over a regular lives spaced floor. Each of these divides in that plane. And so, I can classify every stone according by by numbering the board which it's on. And by doing that, I'll be able to identify them and I'll be able to talk about various regularities in the way you see I threw them all out like that and there were certain dynamic principles involved in these principles can be measured and discussed in terms of the intervals at which all the stones fell.

But in fact though I invented the order. That order of distances between the divides in the blogs is just as much a projection on the formation of the stones as considering for example that this group lie in a straight line. Something projected onto it. So in just this way there, we are projecting onto a wiggly universe an order. [It] is the only way to make sense out of it. And to a very set because after all wiggles, although they are very irregular, there is regularity in them. And you can only know that those regularity in Wiggles because there's also irregularity and vice versa. So through noticing the regularity is you begin to make out a consistency in the behavior of events and if you dig consistency and say Great that's that's do it again is our this is this was fun all that wiggle was beautiful once more please yeah see then then you dig irregularities and you don't want to be irregular because deep. I mean well I've no idea what was going to happen next no summit is going to be enough great sun to bang, the whole thing's going to vanish. And I don't what's going to happen band show that could be crazy be great you know. But well we don't really settle for that we like to think to go to bump,bump, bump, long as it doesn't get too monotonous and boring.

So therefore we're looking we're scanning all the time the field of experience for regularities. And thus build our hang ups. It's got to happen every day, the mail's got to be delivered every day. You know you've got to keep doing your work gotta eat regular meals all kind of Desi and so it keeps going because we're looking for this regularity thing. But once again you see the Buddhists say, do you know this thing actually is neither regular

not irregular. You can pick out I want you to do what you want with it here the chips; what value do you want to put on? What pattern you want to see in? Or do you always want to see them in this call they're suchness. See that's the point of the garden the sand at Rionji. You go there and you see in lovely great stretch of white sand five rocks on it. And that's so those Zen boys made up but I didn't get away with murder. They set up first rocks in the garden. And everybody comes around and looks at it and I think this must be some deep meaning in this. And so there's little guide books that explain what it's supposed to be. They say well it's supposed to be an ocean with islands in it other people say oh it's a beach with the rocks on it other people say oh well these rocks have a certain dynamic relationship and they represent kinds of Buddhist principles and there's a guy at Dyson in where they have another rock and sand garden a very funny cute Zen monk who gives a lecture in English. He doesn't speak English, but he's memorized a particular English lecture which explains the symbolism of all the various rocks and how they work out and how eventually you get to the ocean of liberation. All this is made up out of whole cloth because the whole point of the Zen garden is just that it doesn't mean any more than this means. Or any more than anything else means the the mountain over here the fact of water the fact coastline goes and such and such a way and here we all sitting around wiggling you know only because I'm talking, and you've attributed certain sense to my words and so on you think that I'm communicating something. But actually, everything that we're doing is like this. Now we are brought up to think oh that's too bad if that's all it is you see if it's just this option is if it's just an arrangement that fell out like that. What's the point? Life seems meaningless and empty and without purpose and so on but that's just because you're geared you have been conditioned so all your thinking to feel that things meaningful unless they're meaningful. Where you say well life doesn't have any meaning that's because you added drilled into you that it ought to have. So you make a meaning out of. And if on the other hand nobody ever told you that life. Ought to have a meaning and that ought to make some sense that it ought to be going somewhere and that you should survive then you wouldn't expect it. You just dig it as it happens.

So really what this is saying is, that isn't that things are meaningless it isn't that they're meaningful It's just that they are so happened to be spread this way. And so, there is no fixed way you should look at it. So what is called

as the first principle of the Buddha's eightfold path samyak thrishti. Means samyak perfect. View. Says OK once was giving a lecture about Buddhism you know. And he said. Force noble truth of Buddhism is called a noble rate full path. First step of the Noble Eightfold Path of course shock can mean the view or of Buddhism some up in the. Second step of noble path is.. second step you better look it up in the book.

But the right view doesn't mean right in the sense of the particular correct view one should take. It means the complete view which is having no fixed view. So in other words, when you say what is the correct position of the stars in the Great Dipper the Big Dipper. Depends where you're looking for. There is no such thing as the correct position of those stars. So in the same way, what is the what is the right interpretation of these pebbles? Depends how you want to look at it there was a Zen master call it Q In the front of his monastery he had a very very not crooked pine tree. And one day he pinned a notice on it that said I will pay one thousand yen to anybody who can see this tree straight. So all kinds of people came around the tree and started standing on their heads and the getting it in weird ways so somehow they could line up the branches to see them all straight. And there was one very smart man who came and looked at this for a while and then he went off to see another priest who was a friend of the cues. And he said look what is this thing accuse doing. How would you say how would you see that tree straight when he said you look straight at it. So he went back to E.Q. and said I claim that with one thousand yen all you have to do to see the street tree straight is to look straight at it. And he looked at him in a very funny when he forked out the thousand yen and said, You must have been talking to my friend the priest down the road.

So, what of it what are we doing you see you've got it you've got a universe which you're living in which is fundamentally wiggly like this. And you are in it and in this way go see. Only you're trying to straighten it up. You're trying to see order in it. And your doing this is itself a wake up. After all and you may say part of this. One of two things in here is straight. You know. And that's their nature to go that way to be orderly things to be straight things or whatever other quality you want to put on and we're like that. But we are something in this. Which has it in its nature to arrange it this and that way to want to see things straight. But actually, there really

isn't anything in the whole arrangement that is the right way of doing it. There isn't anything in life in your life that is supposed to happen. You're not supposed to live to be eighty, or to die when you're twenty three. It doesn't make the slightest difference you can be one of the others by the way in the scenery of spring there is nothing superior nothing inferior flowering branches grow naturally some short some long.

So liberation is the realization there is no way that things are supposed to be. You don't have to go on living. You are you know you're what there is it's up to you to decide is it there's no way it has to happen. But on the other hand if you want to feel that there is some way you would like to arrange this means we can stop pushing these things around you know but them in some kind of an order that's OK too. The point being, you will be miserable to the degree that you are hung up on the notion that things should last go a certain way. That is to say, to have a fixed view. If you have no fixed view, you remain elastic. And about this there is always something that can't quite be said. When we say I have no fixed view it sounds as if I were just a non-entity like a moron. Chinese proverb says as a hollow room echoes all sounds an empty mind is open to all suggestions but there's another sense of an empty mind and that not the moronic empty mind, but the lively empty mind. The empty mind that can either let it alone or project patterns onto it. And especially do both. So that instead of saying what do you really ought to do is to project no pattern on the world, and realize that it's all fundamentally senseless is to say always do both at the same time project the patterns that realize at the same time there is no fixed view that you should take. This is exactly the same thing as being able to realize that there are rights and wrongs and things that should be done and should not be done, but at the same time there's another point of view from which you can see that everything that happens is right the way it is and that human life never makes an aesthetic mistake just as the patterns of the clouds in the foam never make aesthetic mistakes.

World as Play

This seminar is going to be a fundamental course on cosmic gamesmanship.

We shall discuss, first of all, the yang and the yin.

Because what we are studying is the way whatever may be called the universal energy plays. And so the fundamental thing is Yang Indian, the positive and negative principles to use the Chinese words. Next, we shall discuss relativity.

Next, we shall discuss group theory. In and out. And finally, we shall discuss identity. Who are you? But in starting. The moment one talks about cosmic gamesmanship, it carries with it the assumption that the physical universe is a game.

And that doesn't seem to be taking it sufficiently seriously. Of course, according to Hindu philosophy, the physical universe is an illusion. They use the word Maya, but Maya has many meanings. And among these meanings, only one is illusion.

And the word illusion, of course, always carries a bad connotation to Western ears. We want something that's for real.

But it doesn't necessarily carry such a bad connotation to Hindu ears, because the word Maya also means magic, creative power, art and of all things, measurement. Because it comes from the Sanskrit root Motrin and may tr from which of course we get meta. Martha? And the Latin matter mother.

In other words, the world is looked upon or can be looked upon as a perfectly good illusion. Because all art, in a way, is a creation of illusion.

On a stage the actor plays and Hindus think of the world by analogy with drama. The whole thing is a big act.

And there is one actor behind the whole thing, which is you, not you, in the sense of your.

So-called empirical ego.

Not you, as you imagine yourself and as you ordinarily censor yourself to be. But what is really and truly you at a much deeper level.

But you see, when we use the word game or play in English. We usually tend to mean that it's something trivial. You see, we divide life very strictly into play and work. Other people's don't do this.

And that's one of those shattering the awful features of our culture.

This division of play and work so that most people are working at tasks which they hate so that they can make enough money to stop doing it and play. This is perfectly ridiculous. Nobody needs to do that.

Because what you get with work. Done in this way. Done heartlessly and without joy is money. And what can you do with it? Supposing you do earn time to spare and money to spend, what is there to buy with it? The answer is the other fake and joyless products made by other people who hate their work.

So there is a certain phoniness, a certain lack of essential quality in almost all the work that we perform, because the work is done not for the work, but for money.

And play is considered something separate from work. Work is serious, play is not serious. In fact, we have a strange incapacity to play at all because we always, especially in the United States, play with an ulterior motive. That is to say, play is good for you. And we do everything because it's good for us, because we judge the physical world with. Without our senses, we judge in theory.

We believe that the proof of the pudding is not in the eating, but in the chemical analysis.

It is often my fate to have to take lunch in college cafeterias and what must be happening to the intellectual life of the nation as a result.

Professors, graduate students and students eating this kind of stuff must be catastrophic because I go all over the United States to various colleges and everywhere. The fair is exactly the same. You'll get a so-called salad, which is a piece of that wretched iceberg lettuce with a dollop of cottage cheese and a wedge of and pineapple on top of it. Then you get slices of beef that

have been tormented for hours in an electronic purgatory. Sloshed over a rubber coated is the exact word with a gravy made a water library, paste and bouillon keys. Then there are very repeated carrots and corn which have been sterilized because that's important by boiling for hours. And finally, there is a pie which is a slab of beige goo crust that is reconstituted cardboard and topped with sweetened shaving cream squirted from an aerosol bong. And all this has been analyzed by dietitians and by the whole Department of Home Economics and is found to verifiably contain the right amount of calories, proteins, carbohydrates and vitamins. Now, actually, this is all a result of academic politics, because academic politics, you know, is mainly concerned with feuding between departments. And this is the way in which the Home Economics Department has won out by rotting the brains of historians, anthropologists, mathematicians and physicists. But this miserable affair. And this goes on all over. Things are judged to see because they are good for you. And if we inquire carefully as to what this good for us is, you know, you mustn't look into that. It's taboo. The whole culture would fall apart if we found out what it was, because what is the good that is good for you, as always, and necessarily something in the future. It never happens and there's never going to happen. All of these vitamins and carbohydrates and things can do for you is keep you in a state of reasonable survival and in which you never catch up with anything.

Because you see, time is strictly an illusion. There is no such thing as time any more than that is such a concrete thing as the equator. The measurement of time time is a measure of motion, just like lines of latitude and longitude are a measure of the geographic surface of the earth and nobody will ever tie up a roll rose with the equator.

There is, however, such a thing as timing, which is quite different from time. Timing is skillful rhythm. And but you cannot ever attain proper timing if you hurry, if you're in a hurry to get to the future because the future is never going to arrive. So if you hurry to get to the future, you always get a punishment for it. For example, instant coffee.

TV dinners.

The sort of food they serve on airplanes of all beef that is cooked in electronic ovens, where you push the switching on and a whole roast is

done. It isn't that heated through, it's not roasted. And all these things are awful because they are the result of the illusion of time that there is something that is good for us and that we're going to get to.

And so this is the result of an educational system which is completely geared to literary and mathematical pursuits, which trains everybody to be clerks, sales, insurance salesman and bureaucrats. And only with great reluctance does education offer any kind of instruction in material competence.

And then only for people who are considered too stupid to be intellectuals to go on to college.

So the basic arts of life in our culture, farming, cooking. Dressing, furnishing, lovemaking. Utterly neglected. There is no sophisticated training widely available in any of these things for the average person. And so that that's the reason why there is nothing on which to spend the time that we save and the money we earn. Except trash.

So fake cards, pasteboard houses, bread made of squishy Styrofoam, vitamin enriched and all that sort of thing.

See, because of the illusion that we've fallen for the illusion of time.

So only that what is absolutely necessary for a culture that means a society of cultivated people. Is the cultivation and devotion to the present, to the material world, rather than to the purely theoretical world.

You see, Maya in Sanskrit, I does indicate in one sense the physical world. Because in the positive sense of the physical world is actually a marvelous work of art. But Maya, in another sense, in the sense in which it means measurement refers to all the ways we have of numbering and naming and dividing up into categories, the physical world. So time is Maya. Latitude and longitude is Maya. The future is Maya. In the less exciting sense of illusion. So you see, because of this state of mind, we we don't think that play is important. We play in order to refresh ourselves, to go back to work. And that's not playing. Playing is a real absorption. In a in the delight. Of a dance, for example, you don't dance because it's good for you, dance

because you're happy. You see, we have a very odd in capacity for happiness because we are happier when we expect good things to happen rather than when they're happening.

And so we say of a thing that we consider bad. It has no future. Well, nothing has a future. There isn't a future.

There's always a present and one has to get this is a kind of a basic approach so that one can also therefore use the word play or game in a sense that is not trivial.

We don't think, for example, that when we hear a performance. Of a Bach cantata. Or better a purely non symbolic thing like a feud. We don't think that that's trivial.

We don't think it's trivial to play the organ in church.

We do not think that the plays of Shakespeare are trivial. Their plays.

Play, you see, in the sense that I'm using, it is a musical thing. It is a dance. It is an expression of delight in the sense of Blake saying that energy is a tunnel delight. And for example, the art of Islam, the arabesque, which aren't pictures of anything. They're just fantastically intricate, beautifully colorful designs. They are play. And according to this thesis, the universe is just like that. It is a very, very elaborate play system. And the fundamental elements of this play.

The Chinese call the yang and the yin.

Yang means the positive and yin the negative yang refers to the south side of a mountain which is in the sun and into the north side, which is in the shade. Yang refers to the north bank of a river, which is in the sun and in the south bank of the river, which is in the shade. Yang is symbolically or proto typically male in is symbolically female. That's not to cast any reflections on women. But so you might say there's the reason they're called male and female is that Yang is aggressive and yin is yielding. Yang is calm. Vex Yin is concave.

Now, the secret about the opposites, which is as important as realizing that there is no such thing as time.

The secret about the opposite is this.

That they. Appear to be as different as different can be.

We say of opposites like black and white that they are the poles apart.

But in using that phrase, polls. You imply a connection between them. As there is a connection of the north to the South Pole of the earth, and as there is a connection between the north and south poles of a magnet.

There are two ends in the same stick. Two sides of the same coin.

Two opposite points on the same sphere. And that means that they go together in Chinese this is called a rising mutually.

As in the second chapter of Louder, where he says When all the world knows beauty to be beautiful, there is already ugliness. When all the world knows goodness to be good. There is already evil. For to be and not to be arise mutually.

What confuses people is that they don't see this. They think, for example, that the positive. It's something they're. Which truly exists. Whereas the negative has less reality. It doesn't exist. We think that, for example, the space in which this universe floats is a nonentity. And has no importance.

And we are thereby because we see energy manifested in the positive aspect of things and no energy manifested in the negative. We are afraid that energy. And it's delight is threatened by nothing's. That it's going to be swallowed up and that in the end, darkness will win. We feel that about ourselves and we feel it about the universe as a whole. Because energy is effort. And effort, after a while, you get tired and you can't keep it up. And so darkness must win.

According to Chinese philosophy, that is a hallucination.

Because.

Energy cannot be manifested without inertia. There must be something to push against for there to be any manifestation of energy. You cannot dance without a flaw. To use your energy against. You cannot when energy or any kind of motion is completely unobstructed.

There's a sort of squash, a fizzle and nothing happens. Because fundamentally, as we shall see next hour. Motion is only realized when there is stillness. Relatives. And so energy is only realized when there is inertia and.

The positive is only realized when there is the negative to bring it out.

These things work together.

But when you don't realize it, you are anxious, you are afraid that the dark side is going to win.

Now, the minute that happens, you become unable to play.

You start getting serious and the game degenerates into a fight. Because you feel it absolutely urgent, necessary under those circumstances that the positive must be made to win, accentuate the positive. You see, and that leads to all this beastly kind of religion where people go around with false smiles and hearty handshakes and accentuate the positive.

And the moment that a person does that, you know that it's a big fake to put on and then do something utterly unreal about it.

That's why you may have often experience the fact that certain kinds of virtuous people are offensively virtuous and they are very difficult to get on. They don't have any light touch. And of course, this is particularly prevalent in religions.

Because. Not all religions, but many religions. Our. States of terror. About the negative side. I was talking with a very enlightened none other day Catholic.

And she was open to all sorts of new ideas. I said, you know.

There's one thing wrong with your worship. And the way you sing your hymns and chant your chant and do all these rituals. You don't swim.

I mean, I don't mean by that, but it isn't syncopated. I mean by that that there is not an attitude of delight about it.

It's always you feel the service is being conducted in the presence of the chief inspector of morals.

The the original stuffed shirt, the appalling grandfather in whose presence you doubt.

Show any kind of spray cleaners, because after all, you know, when we are children and we are very exuberant and we leap around and bouncing all over the place, we make the adults tired.

Because the moment a child starts getting exuberant is they really tried to give him a guilty conscience. You have no business having so much fun. There are other people in the world who hurt. There are people who are starving. There are people who suffer.

And to you to go around leaping around as if the whole thing is gorgeous. It's a kind of irreverence. So be guilty. Shut up. So as a result of that, where we think that an occasion is of particular celebrity, where you're in charge or in court or standing in a row of Marines or something saluting the flag, everybody gets grim.

And so there is no delight in religion of that kind. Well, this nun agreed with me that they really ought to do something about that. And I said, well, maybe I'll come to your convent and teach you how to sing.

But you see, all of that is because of the fear.

That the. Nothing. Will win over the something.

Now, it's true in games there is a winner and there is a loser.

But in a fight, it is different. In a fight, the object. Of victory is to get rid of the defeated party.

Because he's bad and he ought not to be there at all. But in a game, it's quite different because. If there is to be a winner, there has to be a loser. So it's terribly important not to get rid of the opponent. You could have no chess unless you had the black side as well as the white. Impossible.

So in a game, what we admire a person we call a good loser.

That is to say, a good sport because he does not take the loss seriously. It's very instructive, for example, to play any game that you know well, whether it's chess or checkers or whatever, but with yourself. And each time you move over to the opposite side. Play it with your best skill. For example, you can play a very marvelous game. You take two cocktail olive toothpicks.

You know, the kind they make in the little plastic swords and you do a fencing match with yourself and actually try to stick one of your hands, on the other hand, really tries to defend itself. You'll find this is extremely interesting. It's a meditation exercise.

And then you realize, you see what is the nature of a game? Because if you are a good chess player, you may congratulate yourself. If your opponent wins, if you have given him a good contest.

Because then the game as such was interesting, and you come to realize that you and your opponent in a game of chess together constitute a single organism like your right hand on your left hand fencing with each other. Let not your left hand know what your right hand do, if that means. Have a conspiracy. To pretend that they don't belong to one organism and that they're different, like black and white, like space and solid. They must look as different as possible, but underneath in order that there be a game, in order that there be, in other words, a relationship of these two, there has to be a secret agreement.

They have to be tacitly one, but openly to.

X satirically too esoteric. One. Because you see on the stage, when you get the hero and the villain, they are really friends behind the scenes because they belong to the same company of actors. But this must not be admitted

on the stage because that would give the show away. Now, you see, it is true. We must not give the show away. That's why there are esoteric teachings. But on the other hand, there is another opposite extreme, which is not realizing that the show is a show that is as bad as giving the show away. So you have always, when you are in the theater, say you go to the movies. And you go to see some great horror movie, you know, awful thing. Well, why does one do it?

You want a thrill? And the whole of the universe once a thrill. That's what it's all about.

Otherwise, it would be boring.

But when you go to the movie, you know, in your heart of hearts that it's only a movie. And yet you contrive to some degree to forget this while you you're there and therefore get scared and feel real creeps. But that's great. Some people like to go and cry. They go and see some tragedy and just love to weep. Because it's a catharsis, it gets all the salt allergy or something on it.

And so you you do this thing and it is if we can say it's vicarious.

Yeah, but that is the spirit of showmanship, of play.

So one might say then that it is possible in this life to attain a sort of metaphysical courage.

In which.

You are, you know, really know deep within. That the most harrowing experiences that physical existence can offer. On our show.

Now, this is the what you might call ultimate nerve. And for example, when the samurai in Japan studied Zen. That's what they wanted to get from. They wanted to get ultimate nerve so that absolutely nothing would phase them. So there is a poem which says Under the sword lifted high, there is hell making you tremble. But go ahead and there is the land of bliss. Don't hesitate. Say don't. Don't be blocked. Don't be fazed, nonplused by the

illusion. Now, you would say, well, that's all very well, but I can't bring myself to that. I start to shake and I can't stop it. There's not to do with my will.

And no amount of gritting my teeth, clenching my muscles, exercising my willpower can get rid of the shakes. When I am really scared.

That's true, but you must remember that the secret to all this is not to be afraid of fear.

When you can really allow yourself to be afraid and you don't resist the experience of fear, you are truly beginning to master fear. But when you refuse to be afraid, you are resisting fear, and that simply sets up a vicious circle of being afraid of fear and being afraid of being afraid of fear and so on.

And that's what we call worry. Worry is simply a chronic condition, and people who worry are going to worry no matter what happens.

Because when one possible threat is exterminated, they will immediately discover another because worry is an infinitely skinned onion. And you can go on and on and on because the moment you see you reduce the size of the onion and you get your worried out too about this. Suddenly your whole sense of distance and size changes.

And because you're looking so intently at this little onion, it fills your whole field of vision and is once again a big onion. You start peeling that down. But as you get another one about this size, then it enlarges itself in your judgment and your sense of values. And once more, it's colossal.

Now that's always going on.

So if you are disposed to worry, there is always plenty to worry about.

You make plenty of money and you have no troubles about that and you start wondering if you're going to get a disease and the doctor says, no, it's all right. Nothing wrong with you. Then you wonder if you're going to get into an accident. And then you take precautions and then you wonder if

there's gonna be a political revolution, etc., whether your house is going to be robbed. There's always something.

So it is really this kind of worrying, is it completely useless pursuit? And yet we feel a little guilty if we don't do it because it somehow put into us that a proper amount of worrying is showing a good sense of responsibility.

Your concerned and Paul Tilley use this word concern in a special way. Quakers always use the word concern and all people, you might say, who are socially conscious are concerned. So when we say I'm concerned, it means I have a frown on my face. And I'm worried about you, about the nation, about the war, so concerned.

Nick said religion is ultimate concern.

I am concerned about the universe. And he used his wonderful decontaminated word for God, which he got from Eckhart to the ground of being to God, still has whiskers on it. But the ground of being doesn't, obviously. And so the ultimate concern is to be concerned about the ground of being. Well, now, I don't think you. Well, I'm not sure about to it.

I knew him. And he was a very wonderful man.

But what I call concern in the way I would want to interpret it instead of this sort of from.

Is something more like amazement. In other words, that existence.

Is extremely peculiar.

Minutes. I can't get my. I can't explain this feeling because I don't know quite. How to ask a question about existence so that I could be said to be wondering about it in some sort of clear thinking way. What what?

This is a very nice thing to consider to yourself that if you were going to have an interview with the Lord God. And you would have only five minutes and you might ask one question, what would you ask?

And you've got plenty of time to think this over in advance and you realize. Question after question is now.

That's not really the thing I want to get at.

It's not that like, do you exist because of God? Yes, there are. Am I having a hallucination?

No. Well, I'm not.

How can I be sure that this isn't a hallucination thing? Well, then you reject all that sort of question. And when you finally come down to it, you don't know what to ask. There is a sort of question in your mind.

Not so much a question as a questioning, a feeling of it's all unbelievable. It's amazing. I wonder at it. I marvel at it. It is a miracle. That there is anything.

But.

It's like a friend of mine who went to a Zen master. Got an interview after a deal of trouble. An interpreter. And he sat down and said, you know, now I'm here. I don't know what to ask. I just feel like laughing.

A Zen master said, Well, it's love. And they just broke up. So.

But that feeling you see of the.

The modern listeners.

Of being is what I call. I would want to mean by two x rays, ultimate concern.

It's also love is involved in it.

See, that's the part of the problem. An abstraction is culture such as ours.

As I indicated, we are not materialists. We are abstractions. A materialist is as a lover. And therefore, is somebody related to the present? Because you

see, you you can't love except in the present. When you have under your hands a piece of wood. And you say my hasn't got a gorgeous green. No. And you fondle it. If it moves.

You you you run over this and think he's not going to succeed. Well, yours, your loving it.

It may be that it's an apple in your hand and you say, I love you so much. I could eat you.

And you eat it. And he relished. That's loving in a special way.

So concern and love and there are many forms of love.

There's a whole spectrum of different kinds of love which runs from the red of libido to the violet of divine charity. But all of them are equally important because, as you know. You can't have the violet him without the red and. And vice versa. You wouldn't know what Violet was. Unless you had all the other colors. The colors create each other. So it isn't simply black and white. Between black and white is the spectrum.

And. Just as black and white arise mutually. So, you know, red in relation to yellow, in relation to green, in relation to blue and. But if they all come out of black and white. That's the secret. I think Mr. Lamb, who invented the camera. Made a rather spectacular demonstration of this. So. If then you try. To obliterate fear, the fear that black may win. You're working in the wrong way. To attack fears is to strengthen it. Because immediately you feel guilty if you don't succeed. Or you feel inadequate.

But fear is something that arises naturally and spontaneously under certain circumstances. Just as you will feel warm if you get near a fire.

And you can't go up to a fire without some sort of self hypnosis and then say, well, I refuse to be warm.

There's something a bit weird about that because I do often wonder if you're one and you get in a fight.

No, on the contrary, it is very natural to be afraid. And so if you don't try to knock it down, you don't try to make yourself over into some sort of preconceived idea of what you ought to be.

Then you are on the track.

Now, where do you think, for example, that I ought to change myself into something different? What is the agency which will affect this change?

Well, we could say two things. On the one hand, it's the same self that you want to change. So how can it change it?

Or on the other hand, you can say that the idea that there is a sort of separate ego in you which can go to work on the rest of you is a hallucination.

And that's why. Gurus and teachers said their students. Weird tasks. They may discover that the.

Dissociated ego is indeed a hallucination.

For example, one of the ones that has commonly used. Is to get yourself a pure mind, and that means you control your thoughts and emotions.

You mustn't have any violent or hateful emotions. You must not hate anybody. You mustn't have any sexy emotions or pure ideas. Cleanup.

You know what happens so many in the parent child relationship? Many parents can't stand their children. They are a nuisance. They are the result of bad rubber goods. And they didn't mean to have them any way. And they're expensive and noisy, and they disturbed the peace of the place and they protested. But you cannot admit in this culture that you detest your child.

That's the most awful thing. But you see what happens if you don't admit it. Is that whereas outwardly you go through the motions of being loving and beautiful. You don't smell right and the child gets it. The child knows

intuitively and inwardly that these have crossed up message here. It says love. But it act hate.

Vise versa. A lot of children hate their mothers, hate their fathers. That's supposed to be very bad.

And the whole pandemonium that's going on these days is. Largely due to that, that nobody can come out and be honest about it.

So now control your thoughts.

Watch that hate the moment it arises.

Dying, knock it down.

Well, now you know the guru who's teaching you all this. You've projected quite a bit on him.

The fact that you accepted a guru at all shows that you have endowed another person with much greater wisdom than yourself.

That's your opinion, incidentally.

And therefore, people will invariably attribute to gurus all kinds of astounding powers, especially that of a telepathic nature and indeed a good guru is a very sensitive fellow and can tell by a people's eyes and gestures and tone of voice, all sorts of things about them.

As can any experienced psychologist.

But you see, when you are trying to control your thoughts and you know you have some kind of wrong thought, you project upon the guru to recognize it instantly.

He reads you. He sees right through you.

And therefore, you know that he almost must look at you as a terrible worm because you can never quite succeed in doing it. See?

And the lesson of this is you see the whole point of this lesson is to discover that the alleged you, which is different from your thoughts and feelings, is a hallucination. There is a stream of thought and feeling going on, just like there is a stream of water going by, and that's you. It's an organized stream just in the same way that when you see a whirlpool in a river, it's organized, it's recognizable, it has a shape and it has an enduring shape, even though it is a constant flow. Or take a better illustration. Still a flame on a candle.

It is a stream of gas and no particle of this gas stays in the flame for a split second. But the flame keeps apparently there and is recognizable, I will say one, two, three flames this one that one for the one that's like us.

But that stream, which we are at is thought feeling what we call the body, everything like that, but the body is one of the most intangible things there is.

You seem to be able to grab hold of it, but it is nothing more than a vibrating pattern of energy. And on it flows.

So when you understand that.

You can see a little bit more why Hindus speak of the body as Maya as illusion, because one of the things they mean by illusion is transit of Venus as distinct from permanence. That is to say, everything in this world is disintegrating.

In fact, if it weren't, it wouldn't be now. Disintegration is life.

And it's as important to see that as it is to see that there is no time. And that black and white go together.

Because.

It to the extent that you see it is disintegrating and that there's no way of stopping this. You can get into a frame of mind where you get with it.

Where are you, as it were? Give up and fall apart along with everything else. Now, you might think you see again our in our general western frame

of mind. We would think, well, that's just giving up that spineless. That's cowardice. That's so. That's awful. And anybody who would just give up like that would be expected to become a slob. But the country is true. You see in all what you might call the dynamics of the spiritual life, there are what appear to be many paradoxes.

Courses of action, which in common sense would lead to one result, turn out in fact lead to an opposite result. So you would think that a child who admits to hatred of parents or vice versa would act out the hatred would do something violent. No, it is precisely the one who does not admit it. That will act out and who will do something fun.

Because like the monk of Siberia, who are fasting Ruwi here and weary of the violence, will at last bus from itself.

It can't be contained. And I found again and again and again.

Going around, especially in religious circles where so many people are trying to.

Not admit what they feel.

Especially Puritans prudes very frequently have a strong streak of cruelty.

And this, of course, can be a kind of a sexual substitute, a sadistic or masochistic thing, that is simply because they that they don't admit to having a negative side. And so the negative side will express itself in a violent way.

People who are always doing things for other people's good will be liable to bomb them for their benefit and utterly destroy them in the name of goodness.

And this is because such people are not ever going to be good soldiers.

I was talking a few days, a few weeks ago to the Air Force Weapons Research Lab.

At Kirtland, near Albuquerque, and I was somewhat surprised to be invited to this sinister institution, but that was full of extremely brilliant people, fantastic minds, and so naturally we got onto the subject of strategy.

Because military strategy is a very, very interesting thing. It contains all the basic life problems. And I said to them when I started out, I said, now you have asked me to tell you as a philosopher. What are my basic premises for moral behavior?

Well, I said they are total selfishness. I'm not going to beat around the bush with you people. I'm going to be sentimental or anything like that because you're dealing with military matters where you have to be tough and where you have to be so tough that you have no time for finer feelings. So let's begin that way. Now, I said you might imagine, therefore, that if I base my behavior on total selfishness, that I would go around being rude to people and aggressive and pushing through and so on. But I said I don't because I found that doesn't work. People put up resistance. They get obstreperous and I don't win them over. So my self-interest is better conserved by putting on a pretense of politeness and that I really are concerned about you all and so on. But I said I'm not. This just a big act.

Now, when I said the next thing that happens is this when I decide that I am going to base everything on total selfishness, I start wondering what I want. Well, so many things that I thought I want when I got there, when I found out I didn't.

So I have to go very deeply into the question, what do I really want? What sort of friends do I want? What sort of the house do I want? What sort of a life do I want? What sort of a job do I want to do? And you see, people don't think this through.

They get all sorts of ready made ideas of what they ought to want.

Because what education does to a soul to so large an extent, is to fit us into a set of prepared stereotypes. And we never stop to find out what we really want to do. Well, that's one thing.

But then something else very odd comes up when I say I'm purely selfish, which is what is me.

Then I come across this curious thing that I don't know who I am and this I know who you are.

If I would live without any other people, I don't think I would know I was there.

I see myself in terms of others. That is to say, by a social relationship. I am I because you are you. You are you because I am I.

But then there's something, something that's gone screwy here. Something funny about this. Which is, of course, that myself isn't at all what I thought it was.

Myself is.

But almost everything else as well as myself. Well, then I really don't know what to do because.

There's no point my thinking anymore that I can just go around attacking people and getting rid of them and so on and. Because all I'm doing is sort of is if I was hungry and I started chewing on my own toes. Because I have discovered that hurting others hurts me. Now, of course, you do have to cut your toenails and take care of your hair and things like that. And there's always some kind of violence is necessary in life, just like you have to kill a fish to eat it or you have to kill an apple when you chew it.

Well, it's sort of like cutting off the toenails and coming your hands or clipping things like that. And so like getting rid of dead skin and the general elimination process. But fundamentally, you see, when you think that there are.

Dreadfully wrong people.

Who ought to be obliterated, all that the world outside you is something that you are in a fight with. Well, that's just like.

A person. Who?

Is completely insensitive in the middle. So that he doesn't know that his legs. Leg and goes with the Top End. You know the worms, if a worm gets damaged, it develops a sort of callused area in it, and the worm, when it wiggles, the rhythm of the wiggle doesn't pass through the callused area. It has to wiggle separately on each end.

So the worm, instead of going we will, we will we go as we go bump, we go bump up quickly.

I think so. A lot of people are like that physically. This is one of the important things that will have right farmed out that people tend to have a state of tension in the diaphragm. As a result of which they can't sweep. You know, have you ever tried to teach anybody to dance the hula? Lots of people just cannot bring themselves to make that hit motion. They're too rigid. And they like the world with the callison.

Or then there's another myth about this. You know, there's a famous snake called a rubber us and he's always drawn chewing his own tail and eating it. Imagine what happens when the tail gets inside and he gets inside and outside.

When the whole thing is clutched up, you see and this worm is this snake is a symbol of what the Buddhists call samsara. That is to say, the round or rat race of life and death. And this goes on so long as the worm doesn't know that his tail is himself. When he discovers that he lets go of it and wiggles happily along like every good snake.

Of course there is some more to it than that. You might say, well, why in the first place did he not realize that his tail was his own? Well, because he wanted something else. See, there wasn't anything except the snake in the beginning. The snake is the symbol of God.

But in the opening shots, in the Isha opening shot first line, it said that in the beginning there was the one God, the father, and he said, I'm Loman. And so he made another, which was a woman. And he made love to her. As a result of which all gods were born. But the woman got guilty about this

because she felt it was incest. And so she turned herself into a cow. And he became a bull and he made love to her. And so came all cattle. And the same thing happened, she got guilty and turned herself into a sheep and he turned himself into a ram and so on. And by this means the universe was created.

So this is othering. It's called in Christian theology by the Greek word. Kenosis. Which means self emptying.

Where God others himself, in the sense of getting himself into a position where he forgets his God.

Aware he has abrogated omnipotence. Now in the theory of games.

It is absolutely important to abrogate omnipotence.

Because you realize that if you knew if your knowledge and power was without limit. There were no obstacle to it whatsoever. There would be no way of realizing it.

When we know for certain the outcome of a game, we don't play it, we call it off and we invent a new game in which we don't know the outcome.

So power, whether partial power or army power will always be in the state of abrogating itself.

So the fundamental game, therefore, the fundamental game form, which is manifested in the yang and the yin, the two opposites is of course the game of hide and seek.

Of remembering and forgetting.

You seem really to forget it is the opposite of remember only the word hasn't the same form.

We should but remember opposite dismember. Because to remember is to put back the members of something that has been dismembered.

So when the snake thinks that its tail isn't itself, it is dismembered.

When the snake finds that its tail is itself, its remembered.

So that's why the Catholics say the words of Jesus at the mass, do this in remembrance of me. So that you will discover that you are one body. Which is, of course, the only body there is.

So lesson number two is relativity. Lesson number one, having been the opposites in this course on.

Cosmological. Cosmic gamesmanship.

We were discussing the fact this morning that any manifestation of energy needs an opposition.

In other words, nothing happens. There is no motion. There is no possibility of energy unless there is something opposing it. There is no dancing except on a floor against which you can push and move.

And so I pointed out, therefore, the sense of self depends entirely on the sensation of there being something other, but that this is a kind of a Maya. In other words, the general feeling that one side is definitively split off from and separate from the other is an illusion.

But nevertheless. There is the opposition.

Between energy and inertia.

Motion and stillness. Is something that, as it were, is the bifurcation or two aspects of a single process. And you know, it's a single process because they can't do without each other.

If they could do without each other, then it would be a divided process. Radically divided, split down the middle. But as it is.

The interdependence of these two sides of things are two ways of looking at things shows that there is something in common between the two.

And to understand this is the essential key to living in a sane way, because if you're insane, you are split up an idiot. You know, the word Greek in your TS is means private. Purely private.

Isolated. Out of communication, out of relationship.

And so this is a way of saying that insanity is a lack of awareness of relativity because all existence is relationship. Now, if we can take a very fundamental illustration of this, I want you to imagine a universe.

In which all that exists is one ball. This ball will, of course, have to be floating in space because if there is no space outside the ball, nobody knows that it's a ball. There's no possibility of a ball which has no space beyond it, because then the ball itself, the solid material of the ball would be all that was and there would be nothing outside it.

So there would be no way of defining it as a ball. So there has to be our universe, one bowl in space and the space outside the bowl.

Furthermore, must be regarded as depending upon the existence of the ball, the ball and a space go together. Now, then, however, there is no way of telling what this ball is doing, whether it's moving or whether it is still. It could be roaring through the space at thousands of miles an hour and there'd be no way of proving it will be no air friction upon it. There would be nothing relatively stable with which its movement could be compared and against which it could be measured. So this ball has no energy.

It can't even be said to be still.

It can't be said to be in motion.

And of course, this is the situation of the universe as a whole in the beginning.

But one of the things that God said before the Bible started, the first thing, according to the Bible, was let there be light.

But actually there were several former pronouncements, one of which was you've got to draw the line somewhere and the other was have a ball. And this is why most objects of celestial existence are spherical. Don't you think it's very odd to be living on a spherical rock revolving around an enormous spherical fire with wake up, in fact, itself in that situation?

So he said, I have a ball. Now, this is the fundamental situation. The universe as a whole is presumably some kind of ball. It's curved space and there it is. And nothing can be said about the whole universe as to whether it is moving or whether it is still. It's neither. That's why the Hindus, in trying to make some indication of the ultimate reality, say it is not this.

It is not that. It is not one thing is not the other. It doesn't exist. It doesn't not exist. It doesn't both exist and not exist. It doesn't neither exist nor not exist.

So you can't say anything about it. Your tongue is tied up. That's why it is said in the moment, CON, which is a great Zen text, that when you attained enlightenment, you were like a dumb man who's had a marvelous dream. Everybody who's had a marvelous dream wants to tell everybody about it. But if you're dumb, you can't say a thing. So in the same way, the moment you realize that you are one with all that there is. Well, it's this fundamental ball and you can't say anything about it.

Cost isn't moving. It is not moving.

You can't think about it because and the reason you can't think about it is not because it exceeds you. It's because it is you. You can't get at it like you can't bite your own teeth. So then if we introduce two balls into our cosmos, then we can say something about motion because it is apparent that they can approach each other or get away from each other, but no one can say which one is doing it or whether both are doing it because there is no way of determining it.

One may be still on the other, moving to it or away from it. Both may be moving towards each other or away from each other, but there is no way of saying which one starts. And furthermore, they can only move with respect to each other in a straight line. They have no possibility of moving on the surface.

They have defined linear motion.

Now we will introduce three balls into our system and suddenly we find not only that they can move on the surface with respect to each other, but also

that there's going to be a little fight started because if two balls stay together at a constant space apart and one ball appears to approach them or to recede from them. Well, here is the problem. Are the two standing still and the one likes them or doesn't like them, so moves closer away? Or is the one standing still and the two moving towards it or away from. Well, there's only one way in this thing of deciding two balls that stay together constitute a majority.

And according to the majority vote, they will decide whether they are moving away from the other one or approaching it or whether it is standing still or whatever.

Now, then, the third ball, of course, can lick them by joining them. It can always stay if it wants to out a constant space from the other two unless they break up. And go off in different directions so long as they stay together. It can stay with them. And then we are back to the original situation because no one is moving at all. However much they move. Because the three constitute now one constellation, one triangle. All right. Introduce the fourth ball. Now we have the possibility of motion in three dimensions and you would say, well, now this is good because we've got an umpire, somebody who stands at the distance of objectivity and looks down upon those three ball and will decide which of them are moving and which of them are still very good. But the problem is, which one of them is the fourth? Who is the umpire? Everyone is in a position of a third dimension to the other three.

So everyone is both involved in the game of three. And could be the external observer who is the umpire of what the three are doing now.

That is exactly your situation as being sensing yourself as an external observer of the world. And this is a simple basic principle in terms of which all bodies in the cosmos may be understood. It's simply nothing but a multiplication of this situation. It's. It's complicated. Yes. So that you have to scratch your head to think about it.

But it all reduces down to this fundamental mutual motion of balls.

So you see from this, what is the meaning of relativity?

So none of the balls, incidentally, have such a thing as a true position.

Because the position of any one of the four is where it seems to be from the the different points of view of each member of the group.

The members of the group can get together and agree upon a theoretical. Positioning of the balls, but they can never directly see. All of the balls, including the one that's looking. In this theoretical position, just in the same way as you have a theoretical idea of the dimensions of a room which would correspond to an architect's ground plan and elevation, and you would say, you know, that that corner up there is a right angle, although you see it as an obtuse angle.

Now, this agreement as to what are the true positions of things.

Is very important.

Because upon such agreement depends. All possibilities of human communication.

We have to have a standard of what is north, south, east and west of what is a unit of measure. Of what languages and what words are, what noises are to mean, what experiences. And by constructing this conventional standard of measures. We are able to agree with each other. But one must see at the same time that this is a convention.

There is no reason for driving on the right side of the road rather than the left. Except that everybody must agree what side they're going to drive. One isn't really preferable to the other. The point is to agree. So when we agree about certain social conventions. Whether they be legal or moral or.

Description, all aesthetic, whatever they are.

They are a construct. They are an abstraction.

And nobody. Well, let's say they're an abstraction and it this abstraction.

Is never directly perceived.

Just as you cannot possibly go up to the ceiling.

To a position where you can see the whole floor as a linear pattern as it would be drawn in an architect's blueprint.

Your vision will always be distorted.

If by distortion, you mean departure from the blueprint. So then, except in terms of some sort of convention of this kind. There is no such thing as the true position of the four balls in space.

Because you must always ask when you ask about truth. Truth for whom? Or truth in relation to what standards?

Now, you see when we measure something by inches. Inch number one is the same length as the inch number two, three, four, etc.. When we measure things by the clock, the clock is a circle regularly divided into 360 or multiples thereof degrees. But I've often wondered whether it wouldn't be interesting to have elliptical clocks. Or Mae West shaped clocks so that certain times of the day would go faster than others. Slower than others.

And might be very convenient to have the evening to last longer.

Slow, slow time down for the evening, you see speeded up at some other time. Why not?

But you see.

We tried to fit everything into an ideal of regularity.

Now, the next point is that if relationship is existence.

We are going to discover from this that the existence of any identifiable thing or event in the whole cosmos.

Depends upon.

And in an opposite sense, is responsible for the existence of everything else but to do that. We've got to understand another image.

Which I will illustrate with the parable of a rainbow. Now, you know, there's an old philosophical conundrum. If a tree falls in a forest and there is nobody around to hear it, does it make a noise? This is a very simple problem, but it has been discussed in ways that make it very confusing. A noise. Is a neurological experience caused by a vibration of air interacting with an eardrum and an auditory nervous system? So therefore, obviously, when the tree falls, it will set up a vibration in the air. But if this vibration in the air does not pulsate upon an eardrum, there will be no noise. You can see it in a simpler way. What will happen if I hit a skinless drum?

There will be a hit, but no sound because the drum has no skin. So if there is no eardrum, the vibrations in the air will not make a noise. I don't need to introduce to prove this any spook worry about mind as distinct from matter or anything like that.

That's quite straightforward. But now let's take the somewhat more subtle case of seeing a rainbow. To perceive a rainbow. There must be three variables present. Three factors.

There must A be the sun B. There must be moisture in the atmosphere.

Then, funnily enough, C, there must be an observer.

At a certain angle relative to the angle of the sun and the moisture. The observer will, in other words, be standing. Shall we say, on a straight line between the sun and the body of moisture and what will then appear to be the center of the rainbow. That's why the sight of a rainbow is always off to one side. You never see this side of a rainbow directly in front of you. So the position of a rainbow differs for every observer. Just in the same way as that, the position of this table differs for each one of you in the room.

Depends where you're sitting. That's the way you see it. Now.

The trouble with this illustration is that a rainbow is a rather diaphanous thing and we tend to accord it a rather low reality status. And he added, fulfills all the requirements necessary for a genuine existence. Oh, it's true, you can't grab hold of it.

But neither can you grab hold of the moon. Least not yet.

Now it has these criteria. It isn't a hallucination. Because everybody standing around will curse and swear and they see that there and such and such a time and place, they veritable to see this rainbow.

It's not like a ghost or a hallucination, but.

Everybody sees it in a slightly different place. And you see, if there were no sun shining, there would be no rainbow. If there were no moisture in the atmosphere, there would be no rainbow. But let us suppose that the sun is shining and there is moisture in the atmosphere, but nobody is around. We only say with great reluctance that there would be no rainbow. Because that way of looking at things upholds that particular mythology of the world, the world is something independent of us. This is the great superstition of Western culture that the world is independent of you.

That you don't make any difference to it. Is there something into which you come and it's going along and allowing us to come in and look at you, look in the box and say, well, that's the way it is. And then they kick you out again. But now let's set up the situation in another way. Let's suppose the sun is shining out on the ocean somewhere and I'm on a ship and I could look over there and I say, my goodness, isn't this a nice day? If there was some moisture right over there, we would have a rainbow.

Then everybody says, well, there isn't one. It just does not truly exist that there is a rainbow.

All right. The sun is shining out on the ocean and there is some moisture. If there were a ship sailing near it so that there could be someone to sea, there would be a rainbow. Now, in these two situations, they are both exactly the same. There would be a rainbow if there was some moisture around, but there isn't, and equally there would be a rainbow if there was someone to see it and there isn't. Those are two completely equivalent situations because if this isn't, again, a question of spookily, it's a question that the existence of the phenomenon rainbow depends on the presence of three factors, like the existence of a human being depends on the existence of two factors a man and a woman. Everybody has to have a father and a mother or

have had. And the otherwise it with the exception of that relationship, you don't exist. One other case of the rainbow. It's exactly the same case as everything else.

It's just because a rainbow is rather diaphanous and intangible, although it sure hits you in the eye. And the eye, the ceiling is a form of touching. Seeing as touching at a distance when you find that the table is hard. That is a way of feeling with your fingers, the same thing as that, you cannot see through it with your eyes. So we we are funny about this, purely optical sensations are regarded as having a lesser grade of reality than tactile sensations. When you get hold of something and can grab it and you feel it solid, you feel you are sure of its existence. Then if you merely see it. But it's all the same thing.

Touch is a sensation, as if your finger hands were full of millions of little eyes.

Every nerve and an eye and they close around this and they find it is not transparent.

There is a limit. Here is something we don't go through.

But that's exactly the same as when you see with these eyes here. You don't see through something.

Southern.

The the physical world responding to the sense of touch. I mean, it's another way of saying that the table would not be hard and is not hard except when touched.

It is the touch that evokes the hardness in the table when it has not touched, it's not soft, it's not hard.

It has no quality at all.

Nothing, which is not in relation to us, has any existence or I will add in relation to some other kind of responsive creature.

Just in the same way that when light energy goes out of the sun into space, the energy will only be manifested as light.

If there is somebody outside the sun to reflect the light. Otherwise, the light does not in any way illuminate the darkness of space.

You must bring something into it. To.

Manifest the light in space.

So a Zen poem says the tree manifest, the bodily power of the wind, the water manifest, the spiritual nature of the moon.

Because you see, if the wind is blowing. That is to say an energy is moving along and there is nothing to stand in its way.

The energy is not there.

The energy in the situation is evoked only by something standing in its way.

Then it's manifest.

The water manifest, the spiritual power of the moon. Why? Because in the breaking waves, the moon can be shattered into thousands of fragments. And yet it always remains one. That's it. Spiritual power.

You wouldn't see that.

Miracle of the Moon. If it weren't for the waves.

They divided up like that. All right, you can say it's a distortion. That's not the way the moon is. The waves do not reflect the.

But that's only trying to say that things reflected in a smooth and still surface are reflected more real lives and things reflected in a vibrating surface. OK. If you want us construe it that way, it's your your privilege.

But you can have any kind of reflect that you want.

So in the same way it is with you. What you see therefore depends on the way your senses are constructed. You have certain kinds of sense organs and these sense organs evoke the kind of universe appropriate to them.

It's not necessarily the way things are because there is no way that things are. Apart from their impact or better relationship with some kind of perceiver or perceiving organs, because things are only in relation when there is nothing to which they can relate, nothing is happening.

And the so-called existence, which we perceive and that to which it is related, come into being together.

Now, is that to say that before any living organisms existed, there wasn't any universe, is that to say that all our knowledge of the prehistoric and geological past of the world and the cosmos before life came to it is nothing but an extrapolation? That is to say, all we are saying is that this is what would have been happening if it had been people around to see it.

But since there was no living organism around to witness this, nothing was going on. Now it's possible to make a very good case for that point of view.

But I would like to be a little more modest and not make it quite that radical. And I would say rather this.

That would never have been a universe.

Before living beings existed. Unless there was going to be a creature called man.

Man living in a future says implies. In the past, a certain state of affairs.

In other words, this planet had to come into being with an adequate amount of temperature, oxygen, gasses, everything else, food supplies for the organism called man to exist.

So let me say then, the existence of man implies a certain kind of environment meteorological, geological and astronomy.

But the other side of this proposition is that such an environment implies man.

Now where you get two sides of the situation where they imply each other mutually. You have, in fact, a truly relational and unitary system.

Well, then therefore, the answer to this problem is.

That prior to the existence of any form of life, the universe at that time is dependent upon the fact that those forms of life are going to emerge. Now, this is a thing that is very difficult for us to understand because we think of reality proceeding forward into the future. But dependent only upon the past. It's very difficult for us to see that the events that we call past are dependent upon events in the future. That a lot of things would never started unless certain results were going to happen. Again, this is another of those ideas, which is an affront to common sense.

But.

There are a number of ways of showing that it's quite a sensible idea.

Unless you were if you know you're flying an airplane.

You leave London. You arrive in New York.

You wouldn't have started out from London. Unless you had known in advance there was a place called New York where you could land.

So in a very similar way.

The energy system of the universe. Does not start out with certain, say, very primitive, immediate creatures. Until it knows that it can arrive.

I don't know where where it's going on beyond man, but at least it's got to get as far as man.

Because if it's not going to be able to do that, it won't even start. Now, you can put this in other terms, an electric current.

Electricity isn't like water. When you turn on the faucet, the water goes right down the hose and waits at the nozzle. So as soon as you turn on the nozzle, there's the water.

But an electric current isn't like that.

When you've got two wires. I mean, two terminals, positive and negative, and you've got the positive one hitched up and here's your wire and you leave the end of that wire just an inch away from the negative term. There is no electric electric current moving. It hasn't slowed down the wire from the positive terminal so that it waits to be ready to jump.

Trouble with is that is that electricity move so fast we don't see these things. And you can only see it if you do it on a colossal scale. Let's supposing that we had an electric wire that was. Oh, 300 million miles in length.

Now we connected at the positive end. Nothing at all happens. Connected at the negative end.

So that, too, can have a possibility. See, that's the other term and then immediately the circuit starts. But the circuit of electric current does not start until there is a place for it to drop to arrive.

See, that's the point.

So in exactly the same way it makes me, it makes no difference whether the wire be something that is 180 thousand miles and is traversed in one second. Or whether it's 60 billion miles. That will take a somewhat longer time. In either case, the current will not start until the receptor terminal, the minus terminal is secured.

So in this way, I would say just exactly the same way. Life will not stop. Up.

In a universe. To which it really doesn't belong.

In which it is can be regarded as nothing more than a stranger.

So if you follow that out, you see this, that is the whole existence of the universe depends on every individual.

It isn't a question of how long you last that the only universe will only last as long as you do. That's not the point. The universe is much bigger than you are and you are very small. But at this moment, it depends on you. The universe is much longer than you are and you are very short in time, but nevertheless it depends on you. The universe in the future, long after your dead, will still be depending on the fact that you once existed, the universe in the past existing long before you were ever thought of. Still depends on the fact that one day you would exist. And it depends on each person.

So in other words, there is in everything that happens. Every hold depends on every part because you see, in truth, there are no parts of the universe. Parts are an abstract creation. When we think of someone or something as a part, we are quite arbitrarily cutting him off and saying by convention we will agree that our skins are our boundary. And therefore, since our skins do not include the whole cosmos, we are only a part of it. But there are no parts. Just as in your own when you study your own organism. All of its continuous.

All the so-called parts flow into the others, like the motions of waves. You're not have detachable parts that you can unscrew inside you.

You see, unless you've got false teeth, I mean, not that, then take it out easy when the ordinary way. You can unscrew parts of the human being from another. They are continuous. Well, in exactly the same way you are continuous with this environment. And although we have been habituated to looking upon ourselves as separate things, we are no more separate from what's going on around us than each of these waves. Here are separate from the ocean. All that mount Tamil pies are separate from the planet Earth. We have great freedom of movement.

So do the waves of the gulls floating in the air. So do the trees waving in the wind. We have a larger degree of freedom than that because we are more volatile. But we are just as much waves in the total process. It depending upon us and we in turn depending upon it.

Now, I understand the meaning of there being no parts.

All parts are. Ideas. We have an idea of a part. We.

Chop things up and say one human being to human being, three human beings and so on, and so think of it as part.

But that's not the way it works.

You can see this from the most elementary neurology by understanding that it is the way you are as a living body that evokes the kind of universe that you see. It is your body which turns the sun into light, which turns it into heat, which turns water into wet and rocks into hard. And in turn, your body is one of the pulse sessions of nature, along with the sun, the rocks, the water, etc. so there's a mutual arrangement. It creates you or evokes you or does you whatever word you want to use. And at the same moment you do it and you do all of it.

So this is why. There was some kind of truth in astrology. I.

Say this, but at the same time, I suddenly don't consult astrologers and plot my life by the crude calculations of horror horoscopes. But because you if you do that, you get into endless tangles of self-deception because it isn't accurate.

But it has a principle. The astrologer was right when he drew a map of your soul. He drew a crude map of the universe. He drew the universe as it was at the time and place of your birth. The universe as it was, as seen from the point of view where you were born. And that was your soul.

So your soul, you see, is not in your body. Your body is in your soul because your soul is the entire network of relationships in terms of which you live.

Your soul is the whole universe.

But each one of us, as it were, is a different point in it. But all these points in it are the center. We can go way beyond Ptolemy and Copernicus now,

and if we think that space is curved, every point of space is the center of the universe, because any point on a ball is the center of the sphere of the surface. See, you could turn any point of a ball. And wherever you look at it, it's the center, isn't it? See, so in the same way, take a crystal ball in your hand. A crystal mirror.

And know what I mean, it's not a Crystal Miller, I mean a spiritual mirror. Look at it. And wherever you turn it, your face will be in the middle.

So in exactly the same way every place in the universe is the middle of the universe from a standpoint of curved space. So we go back to an entirely new Talmudic view of the world beyond Copernicus. Not that the earth is that. Yes, the earth is the center of the universe, but every other place is also the center of the universe. There is no absolute center.

So this is a an astronomical way of saying in Sanskrit. Talk to them, I see you're at. Everyone is rightly the center. You may think, oh, my mother used to say to me, you're not the only one. No, indeed. But in it but in a way, everyone is the central pebble and the feeling that you have of being the center, which turns out into selfishness and all this sort of conflict and scrapping is nevertheless based on something true. What we do is we misinterpreted. We don't realize that everybody else is the center to. In that sense, you are not the only pebble on the beach. You're not the only center of the universe, and yet there is only one center. And that's why. Who was it? I think it was an Bonaventure who first thought up the description or the definition of God as that circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere.

And.

This is a poem I seem to remember from Alfred Noyes.

Well, said the king. Oh, well, I have not found it here. Said the dwarf. And music echoed here. This infinite circle hath no line to bounded behold. Its strange deep center everywhere.

So this then you see, as I'm what I'm playing with here is what the Buddhists call the G.G. MLK.

That means a G means a thing event. Can you repeat it twice? That means between thing event and thing event more. There is no mutual obstruction.

This is called the doctrine of the mutual inter penetration of all things and events.

So it would be like those lovely drawings where you take a circle and you can play with this. It's a nice thing to play with. And you mark out 12 equal points around the circumference of the circle. Then you join every point to every other point. You get that beautiful star. And incidentally, this is the diagram of the notes of the twelve notes of the scale. BLOCK work this out.

And it's a lovely thing to see beautiful star.

So this is the diagram of the way it all fits together.

Now, if you study that. And by study, again, I mean not just think about it. But feel it out. You will find very strange thing happening.

That.

You will find that the present moment with all its particularity in which you live and are functioning now. Is exactly the same thing as anything you could possibly conceive of as eternity.

You will find that your limited life. And remember what I said about limits. You have to have something to push against your limited life with its frustrations and with its particular problems. At this instant is the same thing as omnipotence. And that your situation in space.

Which is appears to be in Sausalito, California, sitting on a boat which has a rickety old thing. Miles and miles away as China and Russia and England and Mars, Venus and everything.

But this particular point in space you will find in the same way by this law of relativity is the same thing as infinity.

Infinite space because it all goes together. It implies the infinite. The eternal.

All the energy of the universe is implied in any tiny hair on your skin, on your skin. It goes with it. Mutually implies this is the point. Just as the kind of cosmos and atmosphere in which we live. I my my existence implies that kind of an environment, so the environment implies me mutually.

And it all goes together. Now, the only reason for saying this. You see. This is really terribly obvious, but the only reason for saying it is that people don't know it.

And think instead that they don't belong, that this. You know, I'm just because of the parents put down, the children's little children should be seen and not heard. You don't belong here. Like I read the other day in some paper. Somebody was some young person was addressing a girl and saying.

He was trying to make love to you. He was trying to woo her.

And she said, you you won't be friends with me because you say, I don't like your personality. But you said you don't have to have a personality, a personality is something you had to put on because your mother didn't love you and you had to make up to her. Really? You don't need a personality because you're you. You're the essential things. And the personality is just a way of.

Performing to.

Ingratiate yourself. Well, we all do it because we put on personalities when we act like clowns and entertain the audience, put on masks, funny faces.

But really and truly.

The mask covers the oneself that we all have. And we all know it.

Only, just like black and white, we are pretending to be as different as possible while remaining the same.

I said that one of the aspects of cosmic gamesmanship that we were going to deal with was B group theory. And of course, I don't mean exactly by that sort of mathematical meaning, but the the relationship that's tremendously important and that is not sufficiently recognized between in

groups and out groups. You know how you've heard about little birds where they're cold and they're all huddling together.

The idea being to see who can get most inside and human beings are just like that. And so also is everything else.

Because, this is a an absolutely basic requirement of having an identity.

To have an identity is in some way or other to be in. I often try the experiment in giving a lecture and drawing a circle on the blackboard and asking the assembled multitudes what I have, what I have drawn, and people will almost invariably say that I have drawn a circle, a ring or a ball.

Only very rarely it some bright person suggest that I have drawn a wall with a hole in it.

Because the dished out theory of perception. It shows us that our attention is captured by enclosed areas as against open areas and by moving objects rather than still.

And so always, therefore, we tend to prefer the in the situation. That is something you see the the star is in THE SITUATION ROOM with respect to space, the space, the art situation. And so we feel that space is not important. It is nothing. It is just unimportant in a way. But the end situation is something. So then whenever human beings get into an out situation, like being a rejected minority, living on the wrong side of the tracks, they will find reasons for convincing themselves that their situation is the truly in one and that the people who claim to be in are really out.

So as I've sometimes said before, I hope this doesn't bore too many of you, but in Sausalito we have exactly that situation. We have the hillbillies with the old time people who regard themselves as in because they have the money and they live in the fancy houses up on the hill, and then we have the waterfront people whom they regard as out as a nefarious bunch of beatniks and bohemians and scallawag.

And so the people of the hill top fortify themselves at their cocktail parties with conversation about how awful the people are down on the waterfront

and at the cocktail parties down in the waterfront. People fortify themselves by discussing the squares on the hill.

And we believe down here that we have the true way of life, that we are not beating our heads out, making money to buy pseudo rocket ships. Although I do own a pseudo rocket ship, but it was wished on me because you see, I tried to be a bridge person.

That's what's called a pontificates one who between opposed classes points out the connections because the connection is that neither class would know who they were without the other. So it's tremendously necessary to have an outgroup in order to know that you're an in group.

In other words, if you belong to the church, which is the assembly of the elect of God, or if you belong to the synagogue, which is to be a member of the chosen people, an outsider, all those guys, then you know, you are in the sea.

But you must have the outsiders to know that you're in. There must, in other words, be beyond the pale of the village. The howling waste. Then you feel cozy. You feel protected. You feel you're there.

And so in that way, bodies have skins. Eggs have shells and so on. All through nature. Inside versus outside. About this versus must be understood as a form of symbiosis. And this is the crucial matter. This is absolutely of critical importance to anyone who wants to understand politics or military strategy or any of the real hard, tough games of life, that social conflict. Or conflict between the various biological species is a form of symbiosis.

Now, ordinarily, we consider the symbiotic relationship to be one of mutual support, as is obviously the case between bees and flowers. Which came the first be your flower. This is the same question as which came the first day. Go ahead. Because where there are no flowers, there can't be bees. And whether I know bees or other fertilizing insects, that cannot be flowers. So the truth of the matter is that bees and flowers, different as they are in appearance and separated as they may be in space, they constitute a single organism.

This is the real lesson of the bees and the flowers, and the same must be said truly of man and woman. There are no men without women. There are no women without men. Because it always takes a man and a woman to produce a human being. So we are our man woman arrangement, a woman man arrangement. Whichever way you want to look at it.

And so although you see, therefore, we move and look as if we are individuals. And separate from each other. This is not the case at all.

So now this is what I want to point out, is that the same sort of relationship exists between groups that would seem to be hostile to each other.

Now what are some of the bases of hostility? The real basis of hostility is that the biological order is a mutual eating society.

It's a very curious game indeed. And if you are philosophically inclined, it is one which might bother your conscience when you realize that you as an organism are a compound of murders. You are actually a bag of water because the human organism consists mostly of water.

And this water is held together and prevented from slobbering, prevented from slobbering all over the floor by a very complex arabesque of tubes and cells and films, the material of which was invariably belonging to some other being before you got it. You had to kill a chicken, a cow or a cabbage or an apple in order to get that tensile film of tube or whatever, to hold the water in you and as you.

And so we are, as human beings, a predatory creature. In fact, we are more predatory than anything else in nature. The sharks are supposed to be predatory, but they stay in the ocean. The piranha fish are supposed to be very predatory, but they stay in the Amazon.

The Eagles are predatory, but they stay in the air and on the land.

Only man ranges the whole range of elements earth, air and water and preys on things. And he eats like a swarm of locusts. Not only does he prey on the living beings he play preys on the minerals. And someone recently

described ARC our civilization as a lot of people sitting in the middle of a sewage dump shooting rockets at the moon.

Because if you you read get Playboy magazine for. September and read about the use of water or rather the misuse of water in our civilization. And it is absolutely horrifying. We've got to get that atomic power bringing this water from the ocean in nothing flat. Or we're going to be very thirsty. And you can see how we use water in the most amazingly uneconomical ways. So we are a predatory monster eating up the planet. And I have seen, say, a sorrow plant in the country covered with green fly one day. It is full of little green, succulent bodies having a ball a day or two later, stock with gray dust all over it. They've eaten up. They multiplied to the point of eating up the plant. And so they turn into great dust. Human beings could do just exactly the same thing.

And the reason why human beings are in danger of this is that they have refused membership in a mutual eating society.

They want to be top and only eater. And do not want to be eaten.

So that instead nowadays of returning what you aim to the earth.

We return our remains to the earth in an unassimilated form. Our remains include not only mummified formaldehyde in bodies, courtesy of the morticians encased in concrete so that no worms even get in, but also the fact that many things that we return to the earth are no longer in the organic cycle. For example, rust does not assimilate properly. All sorts of chemicals, all sorts of gases that we give off do not return into the organic cycle.

And we are ruining. We are we are actually abolishing animals. Wild animals have less and less of a prospect of living. Wild birds are being greatly reduced in numbers. Whales have almost are ceasing to exist because the whaling industry is getting rid of them.

And what is more, some of the animals we farm like chickens are no longer chickens. They are strictly non chickens which lay pseudo eggs because they are raised in enormous wire cellblocks and fed on chemicals under the

superstition that anything fed to a chicken will turn into chicken. And it won't. That is why you may have noticed that the chickens you buy don't taste like chickens could taste, especially those that have been allowed to run around in the sunlight and scratch, those can become real chickens. Because you see, the necessary thing about any species that you live on is that you must love it. I love you so much, I could eat you or I eat you so much, I could love you, but where you get things raised without love, you cannot love a whole cellblock of chickens.

You cannot love wheat when it is grown in vast wastelands or out of any trees and it is sheared off the earth and then winnowed and reduced to pancake makeup, and then chemicals are added to it and it is converted into the Styrofoam material called bread. Now, you know, like one converts milk into KAZIN so one converts wheat or rye into a plastic material, which is a kind of universal solvent, which is nothing at all and tastes of nothing at all. In fact, you know, when you feed babies that kind of nasty white pablum and you feed it and there was spit it back into the spoon. Well, our white bread reduces itself to that instantly on the contact with liquid and becomes a miserable paste. It's not bread at all. So if you are unwilling, you see to join the mutual eating society and you want to conquer everything and not be eaten by anything, the penalty you pay for this is the annihilation of your species and you eventually annihilate through eating things that taste like chalk and string.

That's what it will come to because you don't love what you eat. You have no respect for the raw materials.

So what we haven't understood then is that all groups need an enemy group, but that the enemy group which preys upon it is actually a kind of friend. Because the. Enemy group prunes your own group. It keeps your population at a reasonable level. And it keeps you on your toes. Because you have to defend yourself against it so you don't become flabby.

But you see in. We have lost the meaning of chivalry in all war situations and all conflict situations. Chivalry is indicated, for example, still in such customs as that the partners to a fight salute each other before beginning to fight and salute each other again at the end. You shake hands before boxing. You do these various things, you bow before judo contests and so on. And

that means that you recognize the opponent. As an honorable opponent. Somebody with whom a fight is a really important matter.

And that is really one of the most essential laws of survival to recognize that enemies, unless they are predatory locusts who have no respect, who do not, in other words, farm the species that they prey upon. That's the essence of the thing. You must cherish the species you prey upon. You must see like for example, in in lumbering, you must read. So you must plant a tree for every tree you take.

That is cherishing the species.

And few farm cows, you don't treat your cows, you often treat them better than you would your servants because the servants can go hang about, the cows are valuable, and so you nurture them because they're going to sell as beef and they're going to provide milk or whatever it is.

So the. The perception of the fact.

That is absolutely necessary to have an outgroup for your having an in group and that you cannot do without it is the beginning of sociability.

And so what you get then in that case is a situation of contained conflict. A conflict gets out of hand when an in group does not realize that it needs the outgroup. Then it says, let's get rid of the outgroup. Get the dirty communists off the face of the earth. But do you realize what a fix we'd be in without communists? The whole economy would fall apart because there would be no external threat.

And the communists are in exactly the same situation. They are kind of politics would fall apart unless there was some wretched capitalistic imperialists with whom they could contract contrast themselves and against whom they could organize their energies. Because it is a curious thing that is very difficult to get human beings to organize their energies for something pleasant. It's only under the fear, the external threat to their life that human beings will really get busy and cooperate. So the solidarity of any group of human beings. Depends to an enormous extent on an external menace, and therefore that menace is friendly to the solidarity and the

cooperative enterprise of the group. And this will be true of big groups as well as of small groups.

Even people who say, say in matters of religion, that religious exclusive ism is bad. That bigotry is terrible.

Those same people are actually playing a game called I'm More Tolerant Than You and so constitute an in group of the tolerant opposed to the outgroup of the bigots. There's no way of getting away from this except by transcending it with a sort of humor. When you see that the two groups need each other, you start laughing. When, for example, if I have people who argue with me with contrary opinions and who belong to different religions, I can't get mad about it because I realized that I wouldn't know what I thought unless somebody disagreed with me. And therefore your disagreement is necessary to the preservation of my opinions.

And this is this is the secret of humor.

So.

When you realize that. You are given one of the most important clues that there is.

To the nature of yourself.

Now, you see, we are all brought up in a huge historical, cultural, linguistic background, which has a very powerful influence upon the way in which we experience self. And we experience self as an enclosed island confronted by an enormous outgroup called the universe. Within me, within my body is a palpitating, soft, sensitive reality.

There is the self, but outside.

I don't feel when I hit you, you suffer. But I don't. It's the outside is therefore somehow alien. And it has been drilled into us, therefore, that.

The world as a physical entity of process.

Is an organization that goes on and on and on probably through all eternity,
but that the individual.

Is in it as a brief occurrence.

And is furthermore, as man, a tiny little germ living on an obscure rock
revolving around an unimportant star on the fringe of one of the minor
galaxies.

And that the other galaxies are much bigger and that there are more of them
than you can think of.

And so this puts us in this extremely remote position. As if to say you don't
really belong at all. Now, I explained yesterday a new cosmology where we
can surely say that any point in the universe can be regarded as the center of
it. There is no absolute center, but all points are the center. And so in the
same way, if we can see that, we can make a very curious psychological
readjustment to our life situation.

And learn how. What it is that we call I. It is not. A poor little puppet.

But that the situation of I.A., that is to say, are feeling central to all things.
Is a kind of distortion.

Of the true situation.

Which is that I anus and being anus and.

Existence all the same thing.

Only just as the sense of self requires the sense of other.

The sense of being here requires also the interval.

Of apparent nothingness, which we call this.

Life goes with death in the same sense of self goes with other we saw there
has to be this yang in rhythm, the crest of the wave and the trough of the
way. The crest is the life. The trough is the death, the interval.

Someone has asked me what I think about. The survival of the individual personality. And so you see this problem of death. It's very critical to us.

But you have to understand it and approach it by seeing that the real you is not the individual. If, for example, we draw a circle. And that circle represents the universe. Then we draw rays coming from that circle in such a way that you are drawing. Tangents to the circle which meet at points outside it. So making a star in which each ray is a point which focuses the entire diameter of the star.

Now turn it inside out.

So that the rays go inwards into the circle. So that inside the circle, the whole circle focuses itself at innumerable points within it. And then you have something like what we are. I said, using the astrological illustration that the soul is not in the body, but the body is. And so the soul is the whole universe. Focused at a particular time and a particular place, a here and now. And that is what you really are. In other words, those galaxies that are immensely far off and which you could think would have nothing to do with you, would all.

All that's in you.

And what you call your body or brain, your nervous system and so on is in you to.

Now, you can never get out, just as we can't get at the whole universe in the sense that if there is only one ball in space and that one ball constitutes the whole universe.

I showed you that we couldn't say whether that ball was moving or standing still because there is nothing else in relation to which it moves or stand still. So there's something about the universe as a totality which is always indescribable and get out of article. Now, that is the same indescribable ability and, um, get at ability as your own mind. There is no way, in other words, just as we cannot find a name for the color of vision.

The color of the lens of the eye. And so we call it transparent. No color. Of course we have to, because in the same way a mirror is has no color. Otherwise it would not be able to reflect colors. So at the root of all experience whatsoever, there is the non experience, which is fundamental to it. It can never be described in terms of any of the experiences within it, but its basic. And it lies between light and darkness coming and going. Life and death.

But there is no way of your as it were, possessing it.

And you have to realize that there is no way of your possessing it for the very simple reason that it is you.

So because.

Of the invisible and intangible nature of this reality.

One tends to forget all about it.

And to become fascinated instead with subsidiary features inside it.

Because it has no color, no shape, at least none that could be defined because it would have to get out, it's outside itself to define its shape. Now, for all practical purposes, it doesn't have any shape.

Therefore, it slips out of attention and especially out of conscious attention, because as I've pointed out to you, conscious attention always is a concentration on figures in contrast with backgrounds. And so naturally, the total background of everything that's going on. This is again what tillage means by the ground of being escapes attention. It is the very first thing we fail to notice. And so in this way, we've become absolutely fascinated with all the things going on inside it. And we start identifying with them and taking sides as if, for example, again, when you read the newspaper and you read out about all the terrible things going on, you find you get worked up, you get mad about this, that and the other. And before you know where you are, you're completely absolved. That's just in the same way as going to a play or in the cinema. You know, you get infuriated. You get excited. You get somebody you've identified, you see with the contest going on. If you

could look with at your blood with a microscope and see all the different kinds of creatures in your blood eating each other up, you would think that you were in grave mortal danger.

If that side is going to win. Well, we look at that poor thing. And that's part of me.

And so you get absorbed, you'd get partisan in that quarrel. So we're all in this way, absorbed in the daily events going on, the conflicts and everything like this. And we're taking sides not realizing, you see, that you can't actually take sides because you need both sides. You are both sides. You are self and other, you are inside and outside. How can you take the side of the outside against the inside? Cause if you won, you wouldn't be outside. You wouldn't be inside either. So then the project of ways of liberation, like Hinduism and Buddhism and Daoism is to restore to the fascinated individual and awareness of his eternity.

And his Infiniti.

Not necessarily in terms of what we ordinary ordinarily call personal immortality, a system in which we would be able to go on into a future life with memories of all the past lives through which we have lived or past times in which we have been. So that I could address myself to the pleasures of heaven in the person of Alan Watts. I think there might be something mutually exclusive about that.

But in another way, I'm much more interesting way, because, as you well know, if you think it through that, if you remembered forever and ever.

And it had a kind of continuous cumulative experience that after a while you would want to forget things that had happened.

You see, forgetting is as important to remembering as elimination is to assimilation.

Just as you don't simply eat food, but you let out the excrement. So in the same way in ones that we were discussing this morning while somebody

brought it up, an analogy between the mind and the digestive system. So forgetting is tremendously important to one's mental functioning.

That's why we sleep. That's why we have these intervals of unconsciousness and unconsciousness renews things. You remember, don't you, your childhood when the world was new to you and how extraordinary it was and how very beautiful.

Well, if you want to go on being an adult for always and always and always, you can never have that experience again.

Because you've got to die first.

And see it all anew. And that is why all initiation ceremonies involve a symbolic death.

What you call dying to yourself in various rituals, people are put in coffins and all books of the dead, like the Tibetan Book of the Dead and the Egyptian Book of the Dead actually are coded references to initiation rites and initiation processes whereby you die to come alive. And that is for this reason. Thinking about death is extremely productive. You you know, it's so difficult to think about death, isn't it? Imagine what it would be like for consciousness to cease and never occur again.

To go to sleep and never wake up.

This is a consideration which teases you out of thought.

What would it be like to start out of nothing at all, as it seems that you did when you were born, that equally teases you out of thought? What is outside space? You see all these questions which are beloved of children. Bring you to a point where you have to stop thinking you can't possibly imagine. And that is a creative moment. When Salt is nonplused. Because what you have got to at that point is yourself. Just in the same way as you cannot conceive yourself in its vastness sense, in the sense of being one with the universe, so you cannot conceive these particular questions that I have raised.

And you will find, if you think long enough about death, about the possibility of your total disappearance and which will, so far as you're concerned with the total disappearance of everything else, there's a clue in that you see as to who you are.

If you think long enough about that, that will occur. A curious flip yang leads to yin. You will realize that the infinite nothingness into which you will disappear when you die was the same infinite nothingness out of which you came when you were born. Do you remember not existing for millions and millions of years before you were born? You see how it flips, and so you will see the rhythm of this that, you know, of course, from objective observation that after you are dead there will be babies born baby humans, baby snakes, baby beetles, babies, Biden's baby fish.

Billions of babies.

You've watched people die and you've watched babies born later. So then you will be every one of those babies. Only one of the interesting properties of being a baby individual is that you can only experience yourself one at a time.

That's the game.

There would be no point in experiencing yourself as many eyes simultaneously because the nearest thing to that would have cost of being the self of all the cells in your body, which are coagulated into one individual.

But you are all of those ones that are born.

But each one, of course, experiences itself in the singular. So you can expect very well after your dad to have the same experience in general as you had when you were born. Now it may be that you are born again as a human being. Or you may be reborn as a fish.

But if you are a fish, you will be in a situation where you feel that you're a human being and that people are fish. I mean, there are something else. They are another species. You are the center species, which is the human

situation. So it will be like it is now. It keeps repeating itself only it does it with variations on a theme. That's the reason for the many different species, many different kinds of consciousness. So you do not need if you understand the sense of this, you do not need to believe in any secret supernatural information which I might have access to and you don't. It is perfectly obvious what's going on. You would say, but there is no connection between me and somebody else living later. My dear friends, there is no connection between the molecules composing your hands. There are no strings joining them together. There is nothing but space between. There is, as I talk, no connection between the sounds I am uttering because they are vibrations. And if you magnify the sounds, I'm saying that means you would have to slow them down on a recording system. You would eventually get something that go.

Ah, ah, ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah ah.

And you see, I can goggle that a little so that you can I get a deep bass enough.

You can actually hear the texture of the sound. That is to say you're beginning to hear the spaces in the vibration. What is the connection between these things. Well you say as you listen to it while I'm talking to you, it makes perfect sense.

Or is this one sound. Sounds like it's one sound continuous, but it's not.

It's discontinuous.

But when you look at it from far enough away, it looks like it's continuous.

So it is with connections between lives. With connections between anything whatsoever. There are no connections. You could look at the universe from it, the prickly philosophy. Point of view and see it as purely discontinuous particles.

Pop up, up, up, up, up, up, up machinery. But if you are a good type person, you see it as all continuous to relay these themes that are. But. But, but.

But both points of view are correct.

So if you want to be continuous, you go a little bit to go. If you want to be discontinuous and some people would much rather be dead when they're dead, then you can go over the particles about you must realize you see that the differentiation between particles and waves is a differentiation that is necessary to both sides of the difference. You'll always find this is so whatever kind of duality you make, you will never be able to escape non duality, which is what holds duality is together. So cheer up, the whole system is rigged.

Laughter You're it, only you. You learn to be bugged. Yes, to be bugged, to be phased by eventualities.

See? Well, suppose when you're a baby. See, this is pushed into you by the whole society. The baby know and see when they first arrive in the world. The babies know that. They can't say because they don't have any language. They know who they are. They have what Freud calls the oceanic experience. I don't know really how he found this out.

See, the problem of a child psychologist is that we would just love to teach an infant to talk so that it can tells it how it feels not to be able to talk about how things are before you get any concepts. And so we have a kind of a theoretical notion that a baby experiences the whole world is its own body and that makes no differentiation between itself and its mother.

And so on may be very probable. As a matter of inference, cause none of us remember quite how it was. We don't we can't remember because we didn't have any words to put our memories into no notation. Memory depends to a large extent on such notation.

Well, you can get regressions by hypnosis and maybe they tell us something, maybe they don't.

But at any rate, what happens is that as you start to grow up.

You.

Let me put it like this. I think I can get this across to a baby.

Nothing has any special value. Life is just a thing that you knew you.

Dee dee dee dee dee dee dee dee dee.

See, there's something just happening. There's just the play of energy, see, and there's nothing to say in it that this is the right noise and that's the wrong noise.

This is the right shape and this is the wrong shape. It's all just shape. It's jazz with no discriminations to what ought to happen, what ought not to happen when the baby is in pain.

It hasn't yet been taught that pain is bad. The baby just squawks and squawking isn't necessarily bad. Until mummies teach babies that they ought not to squawk, then squawking becomes bad.

Now when you get enlightened at the other end of the road, you will once again see that everything that's going on is just going yo, yo, yo, yo, yo, yo.

And all kinds of ways. Marvelous. It has no value. There's no it doesn't have to go on. But as a matter of fact, if it stops, stopping means going on later.

It's just an interval.

There's nothing except intervals. You can't just dismiss. There's nothing outside space. You can't stop permanently.

Supposing you take the theory that the universe is called the explosion theory of the universe, that there was a big bang some time or other, and that all these galaxies were flung into space and they are systems of falling energy and eventually they'll fade out.

That'll be that. Well, then we'll. Well.

But then how did it ever get to start? I mean, presumably before it all happened, there was nothing going on, which will be the way it is when it

stops. Anything that happened once can happen again.

So, I mean, you may say I can't prove that. You may say that is my metaphysical leap of faith, that anything that happened once can happen again.

But I would like to be able to bet on it if I could find some way of collecting the winnings, cos if I lose I'll never know I lost.

But I think this is the way it works because everything works that way. Only the thing is that you don't don't worry about not retaining your personal identity because you would get absolutely bored with it if you could.

Enough of it would kill you.

And indeed does so in that far eastern philosophy.

Human life is looked upon very much as one looks on the seasons. And spring, summer, autumn, winter.

And as that is felt, especially in Japanese poetry, it would be an absolutely essential rhythm in the rhythm of the seasons.

So to that is felt to be this marvelous rhythm in the biological cycle, in the life cycle. And you will disappear. But she will reappear. And the interesting thing about it is this.

You could reappear in a form very like what you are now, just in the same way as two performances of a given musical piece are different performances and yet the same composition.

And there are all possibilities of making this energy system.

Go into every conceivable kind of complexity. Differences of shape and differences of games and every conceivable sort of possibility.

And it's going wow, well and all the time.

Now, the moment you see this is an essential step.

You might call it in the meditation process is to see this is to see everything as nonsense, as completely meaningless.

That being just what it is, is what Buddhists call seeing things as of one suchness. The words such as this in Sanskrit is *cathartica*. And that means *Dada*.

See it like this, when you get to seeing everything like that where nothing matters, it doesn't matter if you die this instant because that would be one kind of a jazz. You go on living a long time, it'll be more kind of jazz if this happens. If that happens, it's all just kind of jazzy. You get to being able to see that. And simultaneously with seeing that, it becomes perfectly obvious that you sitting here are a continuous life with everything else all around you.

One life.

But that the jazz, which is called feeling that I am myself as a way of going, Billy, believe me, we will be this way and then feeling that something other is a thing because of rapid and rapid, rapid, rapid like that. You see. But it's all, as it were, banging on the same drum.

And he was a drum.

Well, now, following on from our discussion yesterday afternoon about relativity and about the mutual inter penetration of every individual thing or event in the universe with every other one. And having previously discussed in the morning the yang yin principle, the inter relation of the opposites. We are in a position to take a look at the meaning of this extraordinary classic of China, the book of Changes.

Call the aging, not the way cheap.

I'm afraid that the way that we romanized Chinese words, there's very little resemblance to the way they are pronounced. That's because the scholars have a secret conspiracy to outgroup everybody else, because only if you're in the know do you know how to. The fact that it should be *jing* when

there's no apostrophe after the C H, but Ching when there isn't an apostrophe after this the H.

And so it goes.

So the aging or the book or aging means a classical book scripture. The Sanskrit Sutra is translated into Chinese by Jean. So the classical book. The book of ye, which is change. It is suspected that the character for he was once a picture of a chameleon or lizard. And that because in the same way that the chameleon changes its color on whatever background that's put, so it came to mean change. But you see then that idea of change. It isn't simple, change is an idea of adaptation, an idea of harmonization with surroundings. And one of the basic ideas of Chinese thought about nature is a word that means resonance. As when tuning forks respond to each other. And so the resonance between any individual event and the context in which it occurs is one of the most important things that strike the Chinese mind. For example, if we take blood. Blood in the veins is not the same thing as blood in a test tube because it's in a different environment. It is not behaving in the same way.

And to a very large extent is, you know, I must say that a thing is what it does.

But this I never tire of pointing out this fundamental confusion in our thinking by reason of the fact that grammar contains both nouns and verbs and therefore gives the impression that there are two quite distinct classes of reality. One is process denoted by verbs. The other is.

Stuff. Objects, entities denoted by nouns, but actually there is no need for this division because all nouns or so-called things are processes.

They are particular forms of behavior. And we never can possibly describe anything but their behavior.

We can say what they do, but we never can say what they are and we can never say what does things. There isn't any need for anything that does anything. All you need is doing. That is energy. And that's enough for anybody. What is energy? Well, look at it and you can see for yourself. You

don't need to define energy, just like mathematicians found out that for purposes of geometry, you don't need to define a point. You use points, but you don't say what they are. To say that the point is that which has position, but no magnitude is a lot of nonsense position, but no magnitude.

That's just gobbledygook and it's based on human beings being confused by the words they use. So in this way then in Chinese thought. The world is process. And it's changes because behavior is change. And so they watched the rhythm of behavior and as you see, basically one of the basic rhythms of behavior is a wave. Waves on the water, waves of sound in the air. Light waves. And the nature of a wave is that it's Yang Indian. It has a crest and a trough. Now, you can't have a crest without a trough. You can't have half a wave. There is no such thing in nature as a half wave. So there are always full waves, at least one full wave in any energy system.

And that implies a now you see it, now you don't. An up and a down, a crest and a trough. And those are the crest is the yang and the trough is the yin. Well, now the book of Changes has a very mysterious history.

And scholars are naturally disposed to believe that a great deal of this history is pure legend. But there was supposed to have been many thousand years ago a great sage emperor by the name of Fu Shi, who was followed in due course by a king whose name was one. And full, she is said to have looked around and studied nature and to have felt the forces in it and to have invented what I call the bar gua while the eight tri grams.

Now you see if you will arrange yang and yin, which are represented by broken and unbroken lines, unbroken line for yang, a broken line for yin. You if you combine these in groupings of three, you have eight possible combinations. For example, three young lines which are unbroken will then represent what the Chinese called Chun or heaven. Three broken lines being all young or female will therefore represent the opposite of heaven, which is earth. To. Broken lines. On either side of one unbroken line will represent water and the opposite arrangement to unbroken lines on either side of one broken one will represent fire. And so on until you get eight fundamental elements.

And this this call the back wall you will see on the national flag of Korea. There it is with the Yangon symbol. The two interlocked black and white comers in the middle. And you will find this symbol of the young in and the Barca on ever so many plates and Chinese objects, the backs of mirrors and things like that. It's a very common thing. And the idea is you see that it represents eight elements of the process of nature.

Now, we used to say in the West before in a pre scientific age that there were four elements Earth, Water, Fire, and we got this from India. The Indians at another one actually called Akash, which is space. We say now that is pretty scientific gobbledygook because actually there are how many elements today, 90 something have been established by chemistry. But it's the same sort of thing as saying there are three primary colors, so many colors in the spectrum. So many notes in the scale. It is simply that in order to describe nature, you have to divide it up some way. For example, in classifying people, there are various schemes have been worked out. We talk about there being extroverts and introverts and Young made up his four functions so that he could describe intuitive type sensation types, thinking types and feeling types. Sheldon has his own special way where he can talk about atom morphs, may some offers an end themselves and then have them variously cerebral tonic summit a tonic and visceral tonic. And he could combine these three in various ways.

Now, a man like Aldous Huxley was quite obviously a cerebral chronic victim of the long, skinny intellectual. But if you look at any of these sort of classifications, you can always find flaws and they never really fit.

And so in the same way, the same political classifications that we have don't really fit people because their opinions are always too complicated unless they're quite stupid to be able to be fitted into any of these divisions in a precise way. But nevertheless, you can't do without classification of this sort. You can't do without spectra. We used to have a sergeant in training in the in the army in England.

We used to teach us about rifle shooting.

And he said to die, well, he's going to practice aiming all for wind. Now there are three kinds of wind.

Mile Frisch and Strong and three kinds of women that are stuck with it.

You say because as always, you can always think of this extreme, that extreme and something in the middle. Well, now you've got us something a little richer to play with if you have eight instead of four. And that's the the sort of thing that the aging classification is based on. Now then, that was who she was supposed to have invented these things.

And there is another legend that he saw these tri Grams by heating the shell of a tortoise until it cracked.

And then studying the cracks in the same way Leonardo da Vinci used to go to a filthy old wall where there were all sorts of bird droppings and scratches and markings, and he would do a Rorschach blot on it and he would see a great battle scene.

And this would give him inspiration for a painting.

This is the same thing that you do when you gaze in a crystal ball or when you look into a deep pool of ink. There are all sorts of ways of what is called divining.

To divine is to consult the oracle. Like, it's like a word to divine. You see, there's a subject called divinity, which has to do with the Scriptures, so to Divine is to study the Oracle, just as Lincoln Stein wanted to make a verb out of philosophy philosophy. He always start to do philosophy.

Philosophy isn't just the subject, it's an activity. And so to divine is to call upon the unconscious.

Instead of thinking something out in a logical way, you allow your imagination to flow into something that is useful for an oracle, whether it's a Rorschach blot or a crystal ball or a hex, a gram of the book of changes.

For after Fuji King won combined the eight tri grams and there are obviously 64 possible combinations of eight. And so the book of changes is simply a setting out of the 64 hex grams with a commentary on them.

And when you are a beginner in the art of the book of Changes, you need the book. You look up the commentary to help you find out what the heck's a grand means. But when you are an expert, you don't need the book. You simply feel the meaning of these combinations of two elements. Now, the theory of the book of changes is a very curious one. It is related to G.G. mugging, that is to say the mutual into penetration of all things and events, and is based on the idea that anything that happens at this moment will be related to this moment because it's in the context of this moment.

Therefore, the way I would do something at random at this time will be what we call a sign of the times or a manifestation of what in German is called the zeitgeist.

The spirit of the time on the mind of the time.

Another way of putting it would be the configuration of the time.

And it's in the same way that, for example, astrologers cast what is called a Harare horoscope. That is to say, as of the moment. What are the stars? What is, in other words, the configuration of the universe? And so in exactly the same way the aging philosophy is based on the idea that how one randomly select the arrow stocks or the sticks or tosses coins.

In a given situation.

And you might define the situation by asking a question that random pattern that falls will be related to the situation.

And you can divine something about the situation from it. I remember a Zen master who used to use the edging. He had another way he would take anything. He took, for example, one day a bowl of flowers and he looked at the pattern of the arrangement of the flowers and derived a hexagram from the pattern. And from that he told us about the mood. The person who had arranged them had been in. Now, of course, this is all from our scientific point of view, unverified and maybe unverifiable.

And of course, a scientific person who pulls this kind of thing. Because he was in it's not the way to go about deciding what to do in an important

situation when you have to decide upon action in an important situation.

What do you do if you're a scientifically minded person, if you study all the relevant data and you get information, and then on the basis of that information and past experience and previous scientific studies of behavior, you decide how this situation is likely to turn out. But there is a very serious problem about that. It is not any use for practical purposes.

It is only applicable in trivial situations which are highly controlled in an experimental way. For example, in the old times when you went to the doctor, he would look at you would produce and smell you and come up with some feeling about what was the matter with you. No doctor will do that today.

They say they don't move unless they take innumerable tests. See? So you are tested and measured? Precisely. Then they come back and they think about it. But, you know, they still don't know what to do. Because there comes a point in any decision making process where you have to act on hunch. How do you know when you've got enough data about in situation when to call a halt because you can go on collecting data forever?

There are always infinitely many variables in any situation whatsoever and especially in the human situation. So ultimately, you don't kid yourself. You are always deciding on a hunch what you're going to do.

Even the best informed person ultimately comes to a leap of intuition before making a decision.

So then when you really don't know which way to decide on a certain thing, people say flip a coin.

You know, you can always rip Christians on this because the disciples of Jesus cast lots and to make a decision.

And but we always doing that. You're fundamentally always at the point where you don't decide for what we call purely rational reasons.

So then. Flipping a coin gives you two possibilities. Yes or no? Now, let's suppose you had an eight sided coin.

The six sided dice is a little bit richer. Instead of giving you. Only two decisions are possibilities here. You've got a possibility of variation. Now let's consider a 64 sided coin. That's what you've got here.

Now.

Again, when you get the oracle in the aging. It is never.

Terrribly specific, although sometimes in your given situation it seems to be absolutely specific when you consult it. But on the other hand, you usually use it like theologians use the Bible. That is to say, they read into it anything they want to find. Only you mustn't do this deliberately.

You have to let your own unconscious processes read the oracle for you and decide what it means. In other words, you use the Oracle like a Rorschach blot. And the wisdom of that is this that your brain, if it is your brain and nobody really knows. You see, just to put something in parentheses is the brain, the mind.

Some say yes. Some say no. One would think that the structure of the brain has something to do with the structure of thought. But on the other hand, it may not in the same sense that a structure of a radio has nothing to do with the message that comes over it. Although Marshall McLuhan says he belongs to the other school, see that the medium itself is the message.

What is the relationship, for example, between the grid pattern of a newspaper photograph and the picture? The same grid pattern can convey any picture. So there seems to be a complete irrelevance between the two.

But on the other hand, there is not quite as much irrelevance as you might think because any picture reproduced.

By this method.

Has some connection with a time and with a technology that can produce this method.

It's a rather roundabout connection, that one. But nevertheless, from a big point of view, it's a very close connection.

Depends where what what framework you're looking at it and whether you've got a very big framework or a very narrow one. But so when it comes down to it and you don't know how to make a decision or write you, then you consult your brain. Now I'm using the word brain here to mean a complex organization, which you have at your disposal. Which you don't understand and which is much smarter than you are.

Because you see, whatever it is, that is the mind, the brain or whatever. I don't care what you call it. It takes care of ever so many things at once which you could never possibly think of consciously.

You can't be bothered consciously to regulate your glands, to see that your blood flows all right all the time, but your nervous system is taking care of that. It is regulating at all. Your nervous system is receiving information which you don't know anything about. Because when we look consciously, we by no means notice all that our eyes see. But your mind or brain registers everything that is input to your eyes. So genius in thinking is fundamentally based on being able to trust your own mind.

And not confuse your mind with the content of conscious perception. The content of conscious perception is a tiny fragment of what's going on around you.

You can train yourself to be more receptive than you are in ordinary consciousness. But this isn't quite the point. It is not like how many things did you notice?

You know how you can play a game of children and then when they become boring in a car and they get out a pad and write down how many things you noticed as you went along.

The scouts play this sort of thing. That's all right. But that's not the point here. The point here is not how much did you notice?

Because there's no end to that. You can play that game. And there are infinitely many things that you could notice. The point is to take them all in in one glance.

And you can't do that with conscious attention, but you do do it with your basic neurological or mental equipment, whatever you want to call.

So therefore, you have a choice disposal this amazing computer or whatever it is that can think. Multidimensional. On ever so many levels at once.

Now thousands of years ago.

We don't know how far all this goes back. But people. Naturally, I trusted their minds to tell them what to do.

They didn't make decisions. They did what they felt like.

RS we should call it. They followed instinct as animals do. Then they discovered how to figure.

Through language and through numbers, they found that figuring.

Could be very effective. And they started using it and relying on it more and more and more.

And as a result of this developed anxiety. Because when you don't figure and you live purely spontaneously, you never worry.

If this decision is disastrous, it's disastrous and death will hit you in a hurry and you never know what it is. You don't spend all your time worrying about did you make up your mind in the right way?

And you see that may. Lead to trouble.

But the thing is that people don't realize is that everything leads to trouble in any case. If you develop the intellect and its calculation processes to an

excessive degree, what do you have? Well, you have the weapons lab of the United States Air Force and you have the Russian this, that and the other and the Chinese, something else you have planned disaster.

If you leave it alone, which is what the Dow is mean partly by way or non interference, there will still be troubles in the world, but you won't have to worry about them.

And you will float along and you will feel very free. And the question is to try and calm modern people into living that way.

Now.

I'm putting this you mustn't take me too literally.

Because for a really well-developed human being, he isn't one who simply abandons thinking and planning because after all, that is some faculty that we have in just the same way that a bird has a beak.

And you don't want to, as it were. Amputate your faculties.

The point is rather something like this.

We have to recognize the hierarchical situation of our faculties that the thinking faculty is the servant of the larger mind. Which doesn't need to think. Just as God, if I may use that expression again.

Wolf, you asked him how high is mom long in millimeters. He would say, well, I really don't know.

I'll have to measure it, because to ask that question is to ask.

The relation of mom long to a ruler.

My blog is not in itself any millimeters or meters in height. That is it. What is this is simply a short way of talking about comparing it with a scale and knowing what it is in height is the same thing as comparing it with the scale. So the Lord would have to say, I must get out my ruler. Just in the same way as you don't know how you breathe, but you do it. So the Lord

God creates the universe without knowing how it's done. That is to say, knowing in terms of technical considerations. But you still know how to breathe. Even if you don't know how you do it because you do it. That's knowing how to do it.

You know how to walk. Do you know how to think?

Nobody does, but they do it.

So then this unknown process produces the knowing process, but the knowing process is subordinate to it.

And therefore you have to learn how to include thinking.

In spontaneity.

But it's subordinate to spontaneity. That's when I wrote that thing in the bulletin about Suzuki and ended with a quotation in which he described his own life as a thinker because he was an intellectual. He was a scholar. But he did scholarship. In the spirit of spontaneity. He used thinking he was not used by thinking. And when I say he here, I am referring to the mind beyond consciousness.

Now, the mind beyond consciousness, we discussed that a little bit of this yesterday that we call.

The self with a capital s as distinct from the ego. And I pointed out why the horoscope was traditionally considered to be the map of the soul and that the body is in the soul, not the soul in the body. So the mind that I am talking about is not merely your nervous system. If we will talk about it now in physical terms, it is not merely the nervous system, but it is the entire physical environment in which your nervous system exists and all the relationships operating within it.

That's your mind.

In other words, the kind of mind you have at this moment is impossible without your living in this kind of a society. Your mind includes the

telephone book, the Encyclopedia Britannica, the University of California and everything else going on, say, in the intellectual world. Every one of us exists mentally in relation to the total intellectual process going on in this day and age in society.

You draw on it. It infiltrates you. It provides you with language.

You didn't invent the English language.

It was given to you as a result of a social enterprise. Going on for thousands of years.

So in this sense, when you consult your mind, you are consulting the entire organization of the universe as it is immediately, more immediately reflected in the structure of your nervous system and everything that your nervous system is doing. All the kinds of messages that are running through it. It is these messages that constitute the mind.

And so this is what Buckminster Fuller means when he talks about synergy s why n e RG y means the suit from the Greek scenario. Goss working together and.

He believes.

That any organization has more intelligence than any one of its members. And he therefore goes on to believe that the industrial complex of communication systems covering the face of the earth is developing its own intelligence. And it will be much more intelligent than any one of us. And this may perhaps save the situation. We don't know. I mean, one illustration of this is that I'm very familiar with this, our transportation. Now, every country in the world has invested a fortune in jet aircraft, and by Jove, these things have to run. Otherwise they fall apart. So they must run on time. And this network of air communications is joining every city in the world together, so that by 1968, according to Buckminster Fuller, we have a one town world. Figure it if it takes you an hour to get from here to New York in a supersonic craft. New York is only as far away as Palo Alto. Well, that's practically in the same community. And this is going to include Tokyo and Moscow. And Paris and so on, and they're all going to become

the same place. They'll speak increasingly the same language, share the same culture, eat the same food you can fly in San Francisco.

Bread to Paris, which is being done because of some of the bread made here, is better than the bread made.

You know, it can go the other way to. And we're going to share a common urban culture. And this is the work of synergy.

Also, the aircraft, people get increasingly bored at passport and customs regulations because they hold up traffic.

Well, now. Then.

You might like to see how the aging is used. And.

I have here mainly for symbolic reasons. Three ancient Chinese coins.

You will see that they have a square hole in the middle and that on one side they're inscribed and on the other side they're not, the inscribed side is counted as the thin face and the undescribed side is counted as the end.

And when you. Use the book of changes. You usually face it with a question.

And it seems to me that a good question that it might be faced with is what should the people of the United States do about China?

And you I respectfully request the wisdom of the article in this matter, and you throw the coins down to see how they fall. And what I have is one yang and two yens, strangely enough, that counts in the system and I don't quite know why.

As.

What's called the young. Young. I think maybe I do know why you would think it would be a yin. With two yens and one yang. But it counts as the young yang.

And that's the bottom line of the hexagon. And by being a young, young means it's a fixed line. It doesn't change. Perhaps the reason why that's called the the young young is that when you've got two eons and one young, it means the yen is weakening and the yang is coming up. Because when you reach a point at which the enforcer comes to a maximum, there is in it the seed of the young force.

And vise versa.

And you see, you have to do this six times to get six lines.

So this time we have two yams and one in which gives us the young in not again is a line which doesn't change. And we get to yens and one young, which gives us another young.

And there's made the heck's a gram of water. No fire.

And this time we get three yen, which gives us a changing yen line, which is written like this.

That means that after you consult the heck's a gram in its first form, you consult the hex a gram, which is so far as that line is concerned, the opposite.

Again.

Two yens and one yen giving us the young yen. And we get here. Two hands and one in. Which gives us the young man.

And so we get far over water.

Fire, no, water over fire, water over fire. Cool it, baby.

So that is fine. Sweet, sweet, sweet.

When the 63.

See, the article is often very surprising. 63.

DG Meaning after completion.

This hex gram.

Is the evolution of tie of the hex a gram number eleven meaning piece?

The transition from confusion to order is completed and everything is in its proper place, even in particulars. The strong lines are in the strong places, the weak lines in the weak places. This is a very favorable outlook. Yet it gives reason for thought.

Authorities, just when perfect equilibrium has been reached that any movement may cause order to revert to disorder, the one strong line that has moved to the top, thus effecting complete order in details, is followed by the other lines, each moving according to its nature and thus suddenly there arises again the hex gram P number twelve, which is standstill.

Let's see, we're going to move to.

Forty seven. Now here comes the the oracle itself. It says after completion, which is the name of the hexagon.

Success in small matters, perseverance furthers at the beginning good fortune. At the end, disorder. Then following the judgment comes another part of the oracle called the image. Water over fire. The image of the condition in after completion. Thus, the superior man takes sort of misfortune and arms himself against it in advance. And then there's a comment on the lines.

And we have a an eight in the.

Now a 6. In the one fourth place.

And the oracle here says of this line, which is a moving one. The finest clothes turn to rags. Be careful all day long. Now, there are many comments on this. But we should look first at the A gram it turns into. Which is, uh, no, I say 43.

I think I said. What if seven turns into forty seven?

Well, the one it turns into indicates the direction of the motion of the.

It turns into cotton, which means oppression or exhaustion.

With the lake above and the water below.

The judgment is oppression. Success. Perseverance. The great man brings about good fortune. No blame when one has something to say.

It is not believed the image.

There is no water in the lake. The image of exhaustion. Thus, the superior man takes his life on following his will. There is a comment on this one, it says the lake is above water, below the lake is empty. Dried up. And once the water flows out, exhaustion is expressed in yet another way at the top. A dark line is holding down two light lines. Below a light line is hemmed in between two dark lines. The upper tri gram belongs to the principle of darkness. The lower to the principle of light. That's everywhere. Superior men are oppressed and held in restraint by inferior men.

Now, the commentary on the judgment of the original Hex Gram reads The transition from the old to the new time is already accomplished. In principle, everything stands systematized and it is only in regard to details that success is still to be achieved.

In respect to this, however, we must be careful to maintain the right attitude. Everything proceeds as if of its own accord, and this can all too easily tempt us to relax and let things take their own course without troubling over details. Such indifference is the root of all evil symptoms of decay are bound to be the result. Here we have the rule indicating the usual course of history. But this rule is not an inescapable law. He who understands it is in position to avoid its effects by dint of unremitting perseverance and caution.

And then the image, which is water over fire when water in a kettle hangs over fire. The two elements stand in relation and thus generate energy. But the resulting tension demands caution. If the water boils over, the fire is extinguished and its energy is lost. If the heat is too great, the water

evaporates into the air. These elements he had brought into relation and thus generating energy are by nature hostile to each other.

Only the most extreme caution can prevent damage in light junctures when all of.

Pursuit of Pleasure

We can consider the pursuit of pleasure in two broad senses.

One which might be called lower than the other, which might be called higher, although I'm not very happy with that classification.

There is the pursuit of material pleasure and art. Very much neglected in this day and age. Because it must be carefully distinguished from the pursuit of theoretical pleasure. The pursuit of material pleasure is an art requiring a difficult discipline. Much devotion and much skill. And it ranges through all the activities of man. Engineering. Cookery.

Clothes architecture. Love making. And the so-called fine arts, music, literature, painting, sculpture and so forth.

But we are living in a culture.

Where the pursuit of material pleasure is, as I say, neglected in pursuit of a symbolic pleasure, which of course, like many religions, has its prayer mat because a monetary unit.

Is, of course, useful in exactly the same way that inches and hours, days, months. Pounds, grams and other units of measure are useful. But nobody has yet made a claim to fame by collecting inches. I have more inches than you because it is not a matter of social agreement that the possession of inches represents the possession of wealth.

It is a matter of social agreement. And this is the only validity for money having any value whatsoever is that everybody agrees that the chips are worth so much. And money is exactly like poker chips. Except there's an

agreement between all of us that we will accept them in lieu of goods and services.

But goods and services constitute real wealth.

And we are living in a society where we eat the menu instead of the dinner. Because we are more interested in accumulating the tokens of wealth than wealth. And this flows over from symbols such as money itself into many other dimensions of life, because we tend on the whole to confuse symbol with reality.

The idea that this world that we see with our five senses is a material world is merely an idea.

Materialism as a philosophy of nature, dialectical materialism, naturalistic materialism is a point of view. It's a concept. It's very, very highly abstract notion.

So equally is the notion that this world that we see with our five senses is basically mental or spiritual. That also is a concept. The actual world is neither spiritual nor material. There is no way of saying what it is because it is like mystical experience, ineffable. It cannot be left or spoken from the Greek *fehmi* to say. So. That world, which is neither spiritual nor material, is the neglected world.

Most people think of it as material, but it's very much overlooked. Symbols are substituted for it.

That is to say, we have symbolic goods.

People live in symbolic homes, drives symbolic automobiles where symbolic clothes.

Which are valued for what they cost. Rather than for their quality.

And this is, of course, as I've insisted perhaps that nausea especially manifested in what we eat. We our standards of cooking are improving.

Thanks to Gourmet magazine and a few redoubtable people on the radio like Julia Childs.

But by and large, the food of even wealthy people.

It's disgraceful.

It is symbolized by bread. Which is supposed to be our staff of life and we eat nothing but a kind of consumable Styrofoam fortified with vitamins, and you can read the list of them on the wrapper as if it were medicine.

Also in the pursuit of pleasure, in the form of the fine arts, we don't really enjoy it. An enormous number of reasonably affluent people who attend concerts and go to exhibitions of paintings go there because they think they are improving their minds. That in some way doing things like that is good for you. People go to church for the same reason. That's the last reason for going to church because it's good for you. That is an absolutely morbid interest because it distracts you from what is going on. If you listen to. Bar, because you think it's good for you, you're not listening. In order to listen to bar, you have to swing with it. And then you forget all about whether it's good for you or not. In fact, it feels more like things that are bad for you when you swing with Bach, it begins to feel like sex.

As everybody knows, that's terribly bad for you.

So I'm not going to dwell at any very great length on the niceties and the disciplines of the pursuit of pleasure in that so-called lower sense. I only want to say in passing. That. If you don't have. The realization that the pursuit of material pleasure requires a certain degree of asceticism.

You won't be able to pursue any other or higher kind of pleasure.

Because. Asceticism is not unpleasant.

Asceticism is like an olive between wines you cleanses the palate and what's the matter with olives.

It is like.

Taking some sort of exercise. Which can be very pleasurable indeed, provided you don't do it grimly. There is a dreadful exercise being used today called jogging, which has absolutely nothing to recommend it because to begin with. When I watch people jogging, they obviously show they don't know how to run. They're running mostly on their heels and that jars the bones all the way through and upsets the vertebral disks and so on. And there's a sudden grim determination about joggers. They tend to run in straight lines, which they believe to be the shortest distance between two points. A straight line is not the shortest distance between two points on earth. Because earth is wiggly. It is not a flat surface except by courtesy of bulldozers and occasional freaks of nature. This world, as I keep repeating, is a fundamentally wiggly phenomenon. But wherever human beings have been around, you will see they have a passion for Euclidean ism. Everything is ruled out in straight lines and put in boxes and grid patterns of streets are laid across the surface of the earth. And that tells you human beings have been. Why this passion for Euclidean order?

Because Mr. Euclid had a very, very simple mind and tended to think in these rather uninteresting shapes instead of in curvaceous wiggles. Now, nobody would fall in love with a Euclidean woman. What we appreciate about women is their curvaceous. Now.

And women in this offends some people because they are not sure that they can't figure it out.

You never know quite what it's going to do next. That's why people often don't like snakes, because a snake is the great symbol of wiggly vitality, of undulations, of waves. And all this world is fundamentally a system of wave vibrations. And if you cannot wave with it, if you are rigid.

You will always be resisting life.

So a wiggle in this and going with wiggle in this. In other words, do you swing is fundamental to the pleasure of life. But you see where we think that order and getting things in order is getting them squared away. We always say, let's get it squared away. Let's get it straight. And so there are certain kinds of people who are called streets and squares who do not swim.

And as a result of that, they are out of harmony with a wiggly universe.

And their attitudes range from cookery at one end to religion at the other, because a square religion.

Is one that is too abstract. That resists.

The flow element of life.

It wants a canal instead of a river. And it conceives heaven as a city rather than a rose garden.

Paradise is a garden.

And while the trouble began when people substituted the heavenly city for the Paradise Garden. When, in other words, popes began to be called urban.

And unbelievers were called pagan. Because guns is a country dweller. A man of the Wiggles as distinct from a man of the streets.

Deliver under the sky instead of one who lives in a box. Because the box you see is the great symbol of classification. What box are you in? All words are labels on intellectual boxes.

Is it animal? Is it vegetable? Is it mental? Three boxes. Is it solid or is it a gas? Is it Republican or is a Democrat? Is it capitalist or is it communist? Is it Christian or is it heathen? Is it male or is it female?

All boxes.

And so because we think in boxes, we live in boxes, it's all made out of ticky tacky and they all look just the same. And whereas. Certain kinds of fish live in beautiful shells. Gloria spiraling wiggles on them and lovely colors. And what we tend to want everything straightened out. See? And that rigidity is always in a fight with the surrounding. Fluidity. And so we are, as it were.

Land lovers rather than men of this of the waves and the British have always made a great thing about this because they've always associated

freedom with the ocean.

Who are so free as the sons of the waves and Britons never, never, never shall be slaves.

Because of this seamanship.

Now, we think you see of the sea as fluid and the land as solid. Nothing could be further from the truth, as you've all experienced recently in Southern California. The earth is not very solid.

It flows.

Where I live in Sausalito. We have all along the waterfront a lot of land that has been reclaimed, and not so long ago they built a marina quite close to it where they dredged out mud to make the marina, not realizing that land is liquid. Therefore, the land adjoining the water is sinking to fill up the hole made by excavating for the marina. People just don't think of things like that because they think of land as solid. And so in religion, we are seemingly looking for solid. For something upon which I can take my stand for a firm foundation for the Rock of Ages or even poorer, reportedly for the ground of being.

But we are not living in that sort of universe.

We are living in a fluid universe.

In which the art of faith is not in taking one's stand, but in learning to swim. You don't claim to. You don't try to stand on water. By breathing. And by a certain relaxation, you learn to trust the water, to support you.

This is even more true in flying in the air, gliding especially or in sailing.

In all those arts, there is an adaptation to the fluid, and that is the major thing that we have to learn. If we want to survive as a species and survive happily, nobody wants just to go on. One wants to go on in an elegant way. And even that passion for survival is something against pleasure.

Because nothing ruins pleasure more than the anxiety to go on having it more, more, more, because that shows when you ask for more, more, more and have the anxiety to go on that you're not having it now.

You always think it's coming, that you want jam tomorrow is more pleasing than jam today. And we say of something that is useless, it has no future. That's the most awful thing you can say about it. I would rather say of something that's no good. It has no precedent.

Not that has no future.

Calls the future is merely a promise in the same way as this symbol is merely a promise to pay. Promises, promises, promises.

So therefore.

It is fundamental to pleasure that one learns to wiggle.

And not be stiff and rigid.

As we would say, let them all relax. That doesn't mean become droopy. Relax means to become supple. It also means to learn the strength of your weight.

How to use weight, how to flow with gravity water, for example, always flows with gravity and it wiggles.

It takes the course of least resistance and yet has tremendous strength.

But we in our white Anglo-Saxon Protestant ethical system, not to mention our Irish Catholic one, which is really the same thing only a little bit more fancy and dressed up in lace is to take a line of least resistance is considered cowardly and despicable. Go straight, flowing right through the bulldozer ahead.

Why go straight? We've got to get there fast sway. Shortest distance between two points.

I get back to jogging.

That is not the right way to run, the right way to run is to dance. To dance across the countryside and anyone who dances across the countryside will outwit and out time the jogger.

I don't know if any of you witnessed the World Cup in soccer last year on television. It was won by the Brazilian team and I have never seen such soccer. That's not the way they told us to play it in school.

As the Sportswriter and The London Times put it, they danced their way to victory because the whole thing was like very fine basketball, where instead of being this sort of tough pushing the victory, they were tilting with the ball. And the most incredible teamwork of subtle passing, bouncing it off almost any part of the body with a capacity to give it direction, with one's back, with one shoulder, with one's hip, anything head. It was a beautiful art and a magnificent spectacle. But you see, we are not taught to do things that way because we are taught that life is serious. And therefore must be done in an efficient way. But according to Euclidean ideas of efficiency. In ancient times when people worked, they used to sing. Hardly anybody sings anymore except at a performance of some kind or something like that. Imagine a bank teller singing as they were counting out the money.

Oh, the king was in his counting house, counting out the money, five, 10 and 20, 30, 40, 50 hip hop.

Why not? What would happen if you were confronted by a singing bank teller would complain to the management and say, this is money is very serious. He could sing about it. Everything will go wrong. Can you imagine a stockbrokers working song?

I have seen people. I once had my shoes shined in a New York subway. That was a most extraordinary performance.

Could you do that? Did he do that?

No. And he was swinging. And imagine supposing you were a bus driver.

You know, most people when they drive a bus in through city traffic, they are cursing and swearing and being angry and fighting the clock all the way

through town.

Well, that's a disaster. But imagine driving a bus.

With the idea that going from here to there wasn't the point wasn't to get there, but the promise was to go. And dancing that bus through the streets with very, very skillfully accurate traffic dodging, and when you get to a stoplight in the JAG, you play a little tune on the horn where you pass jokes to the cab driver near you or you play with the passengers.

See, anything can be turned into juggling in playing with balls. That's why they have a ball.

So this bus driver is swinging through the streets and he prides himself in the marvel of his Topsy Korean art. But people don't do because work is not supposed to be pleasant, because you get paid for it. You're not supposed to get paid for enjoying herself.

See, that's what I did.

I think I'm smart.

I talk to you not because I think I'm doing you any good, but because I like talking about these things. And if you pay me for it, then I make my living as simple as that. I'm a sort of philosophical entertainer.

But that's the point that the transformation of work.

Is winging it. And the curse of work that came in the story of Genesis as he work became a curse because the tree of knowledge.

Was the knowledge not of good and evil in the ordinary sense, but of the advantageous and the disadvantageous? The words in Hebrew refer to the art of metallurgy.

That's where the trouble begins.

When we use technology.

To get there fast.

And the faster we get there.

The less worth is the place of arrival.

Because you've eliminated the distance between. And that's what makes the difference between here and there, the distance. If you take it away, then there is the same as here. So there was no point going there. There's no point going from here to Honolulu. None, whatever. It's the same place. To all intents and purposes, and certainly no point in going from Los Angeles to Tokyo. I mean, there are a few nice little bars in Tokyo where you get sushi, but you can get them in Los Angeles, novelist Tokyo's come to Los Angeles. Superior is practically the same place and both have the same smog. The police in Tokyo wear gas masks when they're directing traffic.

You know, crazy is this wealth. You have a hundred and fifty thousand dollar house in Beverly Hills. You live in poison gas. Crazy, that's wealth.

So work then being regarded as a method of getting there effectively. A lot of businessmen imagine that they are practical people. Not an answer philosophy in that kind of thing. I'm a practical manager to get things done.

What?

What is practical? Well, you made money, but that's not practical until you spend it. Did you enjoy it?

And it's very difficult to enjoy money. Money is a great responsibility. Besides, if you get lots of it, you're afraid something is going to take it away.

It gives you the jitters.

I know lots of people think that if that little more money, their problems would be solved and they get it and they worry about their health, though, is something to worry about if you're the worrying kind. Oh, wait, it can get

worse instead of getting better by achieving all those things you think will stop you worrying.

So the first principle. Any we could call it the art of pleasure. Is humor sweet?

And that means, or at least it looks like superficially that you mustn't take anything seriously.

You must realize that life is a form of dancing, and dancing is, of course, not serious. And that's why it's prohibited by Baptists. And you do meet people of that kind. They don't approve of dancing even in the Catholic Church. We don't normally see priests dancing. I mean, it's not because it's sexy. You can dance without partners of the opposite sex. You can dance by yourself, but it's considered undignified. This was all started by one of David's wives. When I think her name was. And it wasn't Bathsheba. I forget which one it was. Perhaps somebody remembers it better than I do. Anyway, way he danced before the Ark of the Covenant and she approved him for being undignified. Because he didn't set stiff and rigid.

But what is the virtue in being stiff and rigid as loud says that man at his birth is supple and tender? But in death, he is rigid and hard. Plants when young are juicy and soft, but when old they are brittle and dry. And thus, suppleness and softness are the signs of life, but rigidity and hardness are the signs of death. I suppose some men confuse. Psychic rigidity was getting a hard on or at least substituted for it. As they substitute guns, rocket ships and other things of that kind to manifest a masculinity which isn't really there. But suddenly women should uphold to us.

I mean, the real secret of women's liberation is the liberated woman, the woman who is the human serpent.

The wiggly one, the gentle one who has the power of water. And we should look to that as loud again said.

The valley spirit does not die. The valley spirit, that is the spirit of the valley, that is the feminine as distinct from the mountain, which is the male.

And so while being a man, you should have a certain feminine element. Because then you will become a universal channel. How old are the masculine? Yes. The mountain is necessary for that to be a valley. You can't have valleys without mountains. But unfortunately, the gorgeous music of Handel has prevented us from realizing the horror of that biblical passage. Every valley shall be exalted.

And every mountain laid low, the rough places made plain, why it's happening all over California. So.

The feminine in the sense of the lily, the playful, the curvaceous, the soft. Is the neglected principle by all us, Euclid NS. And it is the principle of life and of nature.

But the problem that exists for rigid people and we all get rigid in the sense of resistance, resistance to life, resistance to change is how on earth do I stop that syndrome, which makes me girls uptight.

How do I stop that? Because it's useless.

Almost useless.

And do you know that your basic sense of ego of existing here and of being I as distinct from all that?

Do you know it is muscular tension?

Of a certain kind that is your the physical basis of your sense of identity. It is. For example, you can try this experiment, man, and maybe we'll just try it. It's the simplest thing to do. I just want you to look. Little downwards at whatever view is just in front of your eyes, just allow your eyes to rest on that.

Just let the light, the color play with your eye. See, just rested easy. Now, supposing I said now I want you to look hard at it. Pay attention.

To be totally attentive and aware of what is in front of you, so look hard. Now do that. Do whatever you would do if somebody told you to look hard.

Now don't do it. Just see.

Don't love. Now, again, look hard. And now don't do it.

So what's the difference between the two states? What did you do when you were looking hard that you didn't do when you were looking easy?

Well. 1.

How do you tense your brain? What did you tense of muscles around the eyes? Anything else? Temples? Yes. Narrow your focus. Yes. That was a muscular action.

The seed money won. Where do you feel concentration?

You all go tense, tense, although. But you see muscular tension in your jaw and your focal muscles has absolutely nothing to do with seeing the focal muscles of the eyes, all they do is simply open or close the aperture or move the lens in such a way that it becomes in focus. It doesn't need any effort to do that.

In fact, the effort you make when you look hard distracts from your seeing accurately. But we are constantly making efforts to do everything we do. For example, will something. We make all this absurd, muscular straining. Grit your teeth doesn't help you to do anything at all, this accumulates as a constant strain between the eyes and hair, and that's what you call I.

That sensation of totally unnecessary strain that exists all the time. That is the ego, the physical referent of the idea. Ego. Does that unnecessary strain, does that tell you you exist? Teacher I'm trying at least give me B for effort.

And it doesn't work.

So we could say psychic staring. Is the ego. That we feel as being the center of myself, which is opposed to and which is resisting all that is defined as not myself.

And so that rigidity of holding against life, so that I maintain my shape, my form, my place.

All the time that constant resistance makes you uptight and unable to swing through fear of what will happen if you let it go. And so therefore, a non wiggly person is an adaptive and a wiggly world. And so you get these in sexual, mechanical like behavior patterns that have to go on, on, on regularly. Always the same. Chug, chug, chug, chug, chug.

And. They are not adaptable.

And it doesn't hold up as we watch, as it is holding up. The cracks are in the pavements.

And, you know, the grass comes through.

We're squaring all the fish out of existence. Well, what will they be to eat? Somebody said we're gonna be left with nothing but crows, crab grass and an edible fish. So this is it is there. You might say it's a square world, but then you can always not buy preaching at people and condemning them. But by wooing them, you can get them to come off it. See, that's the thing that I've often said, that preaching is no good.

Because on Sunday, you go to church and the preachers baa, baa, baa, baa, baa and lays down the law, law, law, and always he throws the book at you.

Lutheran Church.

The minister wears the same robes as the judge. He's got the book up there and on it is it tell you what to do, he tells God what to do.

As endless talk fest goes on.

And when you get to sing, you sing hymns while hymns that religious nursery rhymes. They all have dreadful tunes and stupider words. And that's all. The singing may be required as an anthem.

Nobody dances.

And there's nothing mysterious going on except in the Catholic Church and they're trying to get rid of it and now translate the mass into English that everybody understands it and finds out the last, but it meant after all.

Sunday is supposed to be the day the swing is a God, worked for six days and seventh day rested as a time out, time out from being rational and methodical and efficient.

It's like a Mardi Gras. It's like the old meaning of an orgy. A carnival.

You got to be crazy a little. Because if you're not crazy at regular intervals, you'll become insane. Because you're too rigid, you don't swing in the wind. So you're gonna collapse.

But again, the problem remains father, rigid person, and we all have a rigidity.

How on earth do we release it?

Because I noticed that people who undertake programmes of derision define themselves. Maybe psycho analysis, maybe therapy of some other kind. Maybe exercises. It may be a sensory awareness training, maybe encounter groups, it may be yoga. All sorts of these rigid defined processes are done in such a grim mood.

I know as a book call, you must relax because then people get into these things and they start playing games.

You know, it's like people who retire and they think they're going to have fun. So they get on the golf course early in the morning. And instead of enjoying golf, which is entirely possible, they begin to think not in terms of athletics, but of mathematics. What is my score?

So they gamble on it and that gives it the interest of the prayer out of the abstract aspect. See how much? What is my measure? Do I matter? That matter is the same as the word meter, say measure. Do I matter? And so they get this religion of golf and playing all sorts of social games tied in with it in its various areas.

Then when golf is over, they'll go to the bridge table.

When they're completely worn out, they'll get vaguely drunk. And this grim pursuit of pleasure goes on. And the religious people do it, too. They do their meditations. At 40 minutes before breakfast. No. Meditate.

Then they've got stages they couldn't get through it and they wonder whether so-and-so so-and-so is doing yoga with Mrs. X and so-and-so is doing it with Swami B and Mrs. X, his followers are afraid that Swami is phony.

And it's not quite the real thing. Well, how do you know whether he's the real thing or not? Well, they're genuine. Swami is can perform magic and they can remain under composed and forest long for an indefinite period without benefit of embalming.

Crazy. Now, what does that prove?

You see, it's the same old thing that is spiritual technology and the people who want power, who want to get there fast. I want results now.

That same temperament that wants it in the management of the material world wants it in the management of the spiritual world.

My yoga is more efficient than yours because it's faster. I'm going to get that.

So we come to the great question, where is there? You're gonna get that. Where is it? What do you want? Where are you going?

Very few people now.

Some people have a precise, I would say, disciplined, clear sense of what they want. And they get it. And then they stop. As G.K. Chesterton once wittily said, progress is looking for a place to stop.

The very few people like that.

Most people you see when they think of pleasure that don't have any very definite idea. Or else they have a definite idea, which isn't really what they wanted. When they get it, they don't like it. So they're saying, be careful of what you desire. You may get it.

But.

Fundamentally, then the question arises, where is that? Where's your rush? Where are you going? What are you progressing?

Stop, look and listen.

Because you may be there already money that you don't notice it. From the point of view of a starving Indian in a Calcutta slum.

We are all as lucky as Mike Rogers. Even the most generous person in this room is, by comparison, the Maharajah.

You know that you've arrived.

But you say it can't last. Eventually I'm going to turn into a corpse. That's gives you the horrors you're going to take a painful route to that end to be a terminal case and hospital on the, you know, a lot of tubes.

So I don't want to disintegrate.

So. How can I overcome that?

So you turn to religion.

And say, well, that's physical demise is an unfortunate limitation of the body. So I'm going to identify myself with something beyond the body so that I can believe that that will go on. That will be the true vehicle of my personality. I shan't lose all that I've acquired carrying around with me my bag of rubbish. I managed to smuggle it across the border. I say you can't take it with you, but you can if the guards can't notice it because the baggage is spiritual. Do you know what the gate of heaven is here about the pearly gates? People think its gates decorated with pearls. It isn't. The gates of heaven. It says in the Book of Revelation is one pile.

It's got a hole through the string. You've got to get through there. And you can't get through if you've got a lot of baggage. So you've got to leave your past behind. To get through now, what happens to you when you get rid of your past? Forget it. Don't forget who you are. The future, of course, is the past reflected in your rear vision mirror. As McClellan says, he borrowed the metaphor from me as right. We like people driving, looking at their rear vision mirror. So you've got to let go all that past in order to get in through the pearly gate. And what is what is left of you when you let go your past? What remains? You can't bring out your education. Can't bring out your ancestry.

Can't bring out your distinguished accomplishments, things you've done, because I say while you've done all that. But let's see what you can do now.

Where are you? Who are you? When you have no past? After all, there isn't any past, whereas it.

Twist your commonsense around and see that you're not being shoved by the past, you're just leaving it behind like tracks. It's not pushing you unless you insist on it will always pass the buck. Everybody does that. They say it's mine. I'm an erotic mess because my mother was a neurotic mess.

I never had a fair chance in life.

And somebody says to your mother, you should you brought up a child like that? Well, she says that it's too bad. I know, but I couldn't help it. I was a neurotic mess and my father was just appalling and my mother was dreadful. And they go back over their shoulder and said, well, it was our parents.

Everybody passes the buck to the past. It gets back to Adam. Any. And you know what happened there? They passed the buck to the serpent.

And God looked at the serpent.

He didn't ask how sweet the fruit of the tree where I told you about us, not eat. It is looked at the serpent. The son didn't say anything.

So this happened. The wiggle, it really doesn't have a past. Because it wiggles from its head backwards to the tail. And it's always the head where it starts. So are you ahead? Are you just a tail? Do you move backwards? Forwards.

Which way you're going? If you're leaving your past behind you, it doesn't drive you. It wells up out of a mysterious presence. Ever knew this moment is the creation of the universe? Starting now to look back and back and wonder whether there was a big bang a long time ago, all you'll see is vanishing traces.

The big bang is happening now is when the world begins. You're doing it.

No, you're not doing it by straining you deeper than the straining you is doing all this the same you that is growing your hair and coloring your eyes and making a thumb prints and all that.

You don't think about it. You don't strain muscles to do it.

But that is what is creating the world. Here it comes. Now. So instead of. Thinking that the past is the reality, which explains everything that happens now.

Let's look at now and see it happening.

Where does it happen from? That's a question asked only by people who think that the past causes the present. There was one of them where it comes from, who started it. What makes it happen? Supposing nothing makes it happen?

As it happens. Well, what is it that happened? Again, we get to this basic question, what is it that you want? Whereas it. What you're looking for.

It's the same question as what is reality? What is now? What is life?

You will get at it by analysis of all sorts of things into their components.

We'll get it by labeling it in various ways and calling it names. You can only find out what it is by looking at. My feeling it director.

And all kinds of classification where we say, well, it's animal, vegetable, mineral is this that the other thing is putting it in boxes and tidy it up.

So tidy up and put everything away in a box. The boxes inside boxes and all that sort of thing that's tied it up, but when it's all put away in boxes, you can't see it. Instead of putting everything in boxes, let's just look at it the way it comes.

Now, that's enough. To start with.

I've therefore discussed the principle of the necessity of wiggling. Only when I say necessity, you mustn't take that word in a Calvinist sense.

We'll talk about the pleasure of wiggling as a means of adaptation to the wiggly world.

The human being is of such a design that it perceives everything. By contrast. There is no way of knowing whether the real world is arranged the same way or not, but we are a nervous system.

Composed of neurons in an extraordinarily complicated pattern, based on a very simple principle called is you is or is you ain't the neuron in transmitting any sensory input either fires or doesn't. So you could represent the fact that it fires by the figure 1 and that it doesn't by the figure zero. And out of zero and one with those two integers alone, you can represent all conceivable numbers. This is called binary arithmetic and it is the kind of arithmetic that is used by digital computers.

Messages in 0 1 language can convey not only mathematical and verbal information, but also information that comes out as television. Both black and white and in color and through the same notation, we can convey solid objects. You can turn a solid object into terms of this notation at one end of a process and have it come out at the other end of the process engraved in plastic, enlarged or diminished at will by the operation of laser beams.

So one is tempted, therefore, to think that is you is or is you ain't is fundamental to the universe. The Chinese thought so and therefore devised the yang and the yin.

YANG Meaning positive minion, meaning negative principles upon which they base the book of changes, the aging.

Showing the various combinations of an Indian that constitute the 64 basic situations of life.

They took extra grounds hex grams made up of six lines.

An unbroken line representing the yen and a broken line representing the yen.

So if you have six lines with two positive, with the two possibilities for each line, you get 64 different hexagrams.

They use this for making decisions when it was necessary to make a decision, you would by a random process arrive at one of the 64 exit grounds and on the basis of that decide what you were going to do. It's rather like tossing a coin. Only this coin has 64 sides instead of two. But it all comes down to is it heads or tails? Is it Yang or is it in? It seems absolutely basic to our life.

And it's rather awkward.

Because when we apply this to the pursuit of pleasure, it seems to be saying. Yes, you can have pleasure, but you will not know what it is unless you can contrast it with non pleasure. And if you want to know pleasure, then you must have known pleasure. If you want one end of the spectrum, you've got to know the other because you can't have a one ended spectrum any more than you can have a magnet with one polar. And that seems to put an awful kibosh on everything we're trying to do. Every sort of achievement, every sort of progress, sort of rearrangement of things always runs into the problem that what you gain on the roundabout, you lose on the swings. And this is dispiriting, to say the least. But in a way, oh, how true. So let's look into this business rather thoroughly, because if you understand the end, in the end, you you really understand something.

The first point is this. Let me sort of clarify the situation in its most simple terms. We'll take the contrast of black and white. Now, obviously, if I'm

confronted with a black background.

There is nothing particular to register upon my attention and I am as good as blind.

If I'm confronted with a purely white background, there is nothing in particular to try to attract my attention and I am as good as blind. If, however, I'm a naughty little boy and I'm confronted with a black wall and I have a piece of chalk, I am tempted to make a mark on it. And if I am confronted with a nice, clean white wall and I have a piece of charcoal in my hand, I'm tempted to make a black mark because nature abhors a vacuum.

So here I have a black ground with a white dot on it and a white ground with a black dot. Interesting.

Now of black and white, which is positive and which was negative.

If I look at the white background of the black dot, I shall be inclined to say that the black is positive because it's the thing. It's the mark.

If I look at the black background with the white dot, I saw on the other hand, he's inclined to say that the white is the positive because it's the thing, it's the mark.

I can think of white as positive in general in that it's light and black as negative because it's darkness. But I can also think of white as negative because it's blank. French Blanche.

I can think of black as positive because it's not black. It's all filled up.

Then again, I can think of the DOT as being the negation in both cases because my black background with a white dot has a picture of a wall with a hole in it.

And my black and my white background with a black dot. There's a picture of a box with a hole in it.

I can choose it either way, I like call white negative and black positive or vice versa. But it's difficult to do both at the same time.

Now, they are, of course, these two as different as different can be, we say. It's as different as black and white.

Or we also say these two points of view are the poles apart and we use the word polarization rather incorrectly to indicate an increase of discord in the society, whereas polarization is really a form of harmony.

The two poles of the earth are the harmony of the earth. The two poles of a magnet of the harmony of the magnet, because they are like male and female. A man and a woman are not the poles apart in the sense that they have no common ground.

We could say you can't have a fight between a shark and a tiger.

Because they have no common ground. One lives on land and the other in the water.

But there is common ground between poles. Obviously, the common earth has the common ground between the north and the south and the common magnet. If it's electrical.

The circuit runs from the positive to the negative, and the circuit won't begin to run until a negative pole is established. That's what happens when you turn on the switch. So therefore, although the black and the white, the positive and the negative are as different as different can be. They're also the same because there are differences of one of one field.

And this is what makes the difference between what we'll call an esoteric point of view and an esoteric point of view. In philosophy, religion and so forth from the excerpt very point of view.

The black and the white. Our emphasized with respect to the difference.

Good and bad. Life and death. How oh, how different?

Light and darkness.

God is light, I in him is no darkness at all.

That's the esoteric point of view.

But always behind that, there's a secret. Every religion has a secret. There's always something esoteric. What is the esoteric thing that is only revealed to initiates to people who can stand it?

It's simply that black and white, although explicitly different, are implicitly one because you can't have one without the other.

You could say black is white. If by the word is, you mean implies.

The Buddhists say emptiness is form and form is emptiness.

The Chinese way of saying it is not quite the English way it doesn't equal. It rather means Chinese is saying void that form, form that void.

In other words, it implies it goes with. If I may invent a word.

So we say that is esoteric. You mustn't let it out in church. That God has a dark side as well as a light side.

But it says so I say forty five, seven.

I am the Lord and there is none else. I form the light and create the darkness. I make peace and create evil. Either Lord do all these things.

Well, that's your answer to the problem of evil so bad that you see, we don't let up because someone who wants to commit a murder, they say there's no reason I shouldn't commit a murder, because if I didn't if somebody didn't commit murders, you wouldn't know what nice people were.

Somebody didn't steal. Or cheat. You wouldn't recognize honest men.

Like, if it wasn't a wet day, occasionally you wouldn't enjoy the sunshine.

There's no getting around it. That that's true. St. Paul wrestled with this problem. When he saw that.

The law of Moses made people conscious of right and wrong.

I had not known that there was last except the Lord said thou shalt not covet.

So therefore, he said, asking rhetorically, shall we sin that grace may abound or missing in detail? Heaven forbid. So you have to be careful. That you don't let this get into the hands of children. Like it says on the bottle of poison. Keep away from children. And yet we have poisoned and we have uses for poison. So in the same way we have uses for evil.

In the ordinary way, we do a balancing act between what we do is this we establish an in group. And say this in group, which is us, has a collective ego and it is wrong to do anything evil to any member of this group. But it's all right to do it to somebody who is not in the group. Therefore, when we are going to be very evil to someone, we have to define that person as outside the group.

And so we like when Hitler was going to persecute the Jews.

They were defined as not really human. And likewise, if we are going to persecute the Negroes, we define them as not really human. People can easily see they can imagine that because a Negro looks so different from a Caucasian that he's more like an animal.

Or you can take people who are generally thought to be insane and you can deprive them of civil rights without due process.

They're insane. They're defined as not all there. They're not human, merely bodies. Their mind is absent.

We we used to do that with heretics and other very seriously disease people, lepers and so on.

They were outcasts. They were not humans. And they were therefore outlawed. They didn't have the protection of the in group. So the worst thing we can do in eating is cannibalism. Don't eat your own kind. You made everything else, but not your kind.

But that still doesn't get away from the fact. You see that you cannot eat. You cannot live without eating. And you cannot therefore live without death, without committing murder. I don't know what a practical solution to that is, except one I've suggested is that if you do eat any living creature. At least you can show your respect by cooking it well.

As Lynn Newtown said, a fish that has died for you and has not been well cooked has died in vain.

Now, there are very, very interesting applications of this theory. Let's look at some of the contrasts in terms of which we are aware.

Primary, of course, is what is myself and what is not. Which is a sort of contrast, not of two ends of a poll, but rather of the center of a circle and the circumference of the circle. Because there's a two ends of the radius, one and still the other end moving.

And we say we feel there is a great difference between myself and other. I do not know your thoughts. I do not feel the pleasures and pains unless I am in a sympathetic relationship with you.

I don't know what you're going to do. My actions are voluntary. Yours are involuntary so far as I'm concerned. Yet when I think it over, I realize that I could not realize self.

Without the contrast of other.

I wouldn't know what I meant by myself. Unless I meant something contrasting by someone else or something else.

Self means self only because other means, other just in the same way as is means is only because you can think of isn't. And you know, isn't what isn't means because you know what is means and you know what is means because you know what isn't means.

There is a relation. And so. Likewise with the black and the white, we see the relation.

But that implies that self and other are inseparable.

They go with each other.

Characteristic of the difference between self and other is voluntary behavior and involuntary behavior. What you do on the one hand and what happens to you on the other.

This is not always quite co terminus with the difference between self and other.

Because when you have hiccups, you'll feel that it happened to you, but it was your hiccups or belly rumbles or headache or whatever. What about when you breathe?

Do you do it or does it happen to you? That's a very moot case because you can feel you are doing it.

But you can also feel it happening to you.

So perhaps the distinction between the voluntary and the involuntary is a little a little arbitrary, a little vague. Suddenly it is when it comes to breathing. But once again, I think how could I say of an act I have done it unless there were contrasting acts of which I could say I didn't do then. So I need the involuntary if I'm to have any voluntary. So that if there is a union, you union of implication between the two. I get the same sort of relationship between them, as I explained when I said you can use white for either the positive or the negative symbol.

In other words, I can regard what I do as what happens to me and I can regard what happens to me as what I do. It is in the sense that a Hindu or a Buddhist will say, if you have an accident, it was your karma. Because the word karma means nothing more than doing.

You had an accident. It was your doing.

Well, we would say that's not fair.

And naive people suppose it was their doing in the sense that this mishap is a punishment for a misdeed you did at a former time.

That's only a superstitious meaning of karma, karma means literally. You did it. But you did your accident in the same way.

You see, as you do certain other things that are classified as involuntary, like growing your hair or digesting your dinner.

Because it all depends what you mean by you. If you restrict itself to the voluntary.

Then you get the distinction between what you did and what you didn't do. But if the self really must include the other and the involuntary.

Then others are your others and involuntary happenings are your deeds.

That's rather interesting.

You may feel as a result of seeing that one of two things, you may feel that you really don't do anything at all, that you are not completely deterministic universe where everything happens. That your own voluntary decisions and deeds spring out of unconscious mental mechanisms which determine them completely so that you are at best only a witness of what happens. All you can feel the opposite of that, you can feel that you are God, that you are doing everything.

That rocks fall. Water is wet and fire hot because of you.

Which is in a way. True. Because the sun would not be light. Except in relationship to Ayers.

Can see light.

Norwood rocks be hard except in relation to relatively soft skin. Nor would they be heavy except in relation to a sudden musculature. So, by the way, you are you evoke the way the world is.

We might say there are some vibrations out there that are really out there.

But these vibrations. Are not colored or soft or hard or light or dark or light or heavy until in relation to some sensitive system.

But then again, the sensitive nervous system is part of the external world. And the external world is an event in the nervous system.

The inside of the box is outside the box and the inside and the outside is inside. I mean, you know, it seems to flip flop perpetually.

Take again another contrast. The solid in the space. Most of us think. That reality is solid. Rather than space. We talk about hard facts.

We talk about impenetrable reality, even brute facts. The heart always seems real, just like the black mark on the white background, even though the black thing, even though the solid is.

Untransparent and luminous, it seems to be more real than blue sky. This is a very partial point of view.

Can you imagine a world that was solid without any space? The edges of the solid would be, of course, invisible. There would be no edges because an edge is a point of interface between a solid and a space. So if you take away space, you take away solid. Most tests take away solid, where's the space? After all to say of space. It's a space between if there are no limits, there's no space.

Even if you imagine purely empty space was got the sense of yourself looking at it. And that's the solid.

That's a very awkward.

Because we are quite sure that space isn't there. We take no account of it and therefore get puzzled when our mathematicians and physicists begin to talk about curved space or properties of space or expanding space. KAHN People say the ordinary, average person, you can't talk like that, that's public space can't expand because it's not there. It isn't anything you can do anything.

Well, let's see if a solid can. Let's investigate a solid. You know what happens when you start going into nuclear physics?

You'll find that in any given solid, however dense a piece of steel, it may be a great deal more space in it than there is any solid. The distances between molecules, the distances between atoms and subatomic particles are relatively vast. In something there's a lot more nothing than there is any something, because as you investigate and penetrate the solid, you'll find it to be increasingly spacious.

Now, what happens when we investigate the spacious.

How do you investigate space? My Yugo, the. You bring in a solid. You map it.

So space and solid are really like poles that limit. And it's the same with yourself and the other the organism and the environment, the individual in the world. Go thoroughly into any one and you get the other. Ask, for example, the question, what do you mean when you love yourself? Love yourself thoroughly. I want you to be completely selfish as possible. Tell me, what do you love? Wow. We see. Well, I like to.

I like candy, beautiful girls.

I like beefsteak wine. I like good bread. I like the sun on a lovely landscape. I like clear water.

I like music. Come on and talk about yourself, will you, for a change.

I suddenly realize I can't when I love myself. I think of all things other than myself that I love.

It's very clear.

But that's what's called the basic flip flop ability between the powers of opposites.

That's why the Chinese represent them with these two interlocked symbols that suggest the kind of blue, blue, blue rhythm so that when you

get the full development of Yan, you get the beginning of yin.

And when you get the full development of yin, you'll get the beginning of yang. That is the one implies. And the other. So they're always flipping, doing a flip and doing a flip is the love that makes the world go round.

You've got a double helix, so the male and the female. That's the love position. The double helix spiral nebulae do this. So two creatures in sexual intercourse. The double helix, I'm chasing you, you're chasing me.

I love you so much. I could eat you.

I realized myself, you see only three other.

So in this way, then we get another marvelous instance of the pairs of opposites. We've got the differences and we see a unity between them. Then let's contrast the principle of difference with the principle of unity.

Here we are again. We know what we mean by different because we know what we mean by one.

So difference implies unity and unity implies difference. Now, what is it that lies beyond difference in unity? See, we found unity lying beyond differences. North and south. The difference is united in the end. They are poles of one. All right. Now let's take difference in unity. What lies between them?

You could say your mind.

As in the magnetic tape.

What lies between the on signals, the one signals and the zero signals? Of course, the tape.

They're both on the tape.

Only the tape as such doesn't register. It registers only in terms of yes or no. But you don't get a signal tape with yes, no tape because it's irrelevant. Makes no difference. And yet if the weren't the tape, they wouldn't get the

signals at all. So is there something underlying. Yes and no. Life and death, light and darkness.

Well, that's what we call God.

Only we can't say anything about it. Because everything we say is a statement and that implies an opposite.

But we. But as I pointed out in the beginning, this is so frustrating. Because.

We want to play a game with these opposites. You see, just like we have opposites in chess, the black side and the white side.

We want to win.

And we want to win. But then when we think of the other fellow, we realize that if I'm going to win, you're going to lose. It's rather hard, isn't it? Couldn't we arrange for a game in which everybody wins?

Then nobody wins. Nothing happened. There was no game. So to try to play a no lose game is impossible. We set ourselves an impossible task, and that makes us feel very frustrated, always frustrated because we're trying to do what can't be done. You want to good all the time? I want sunshine every day. OK. A desert for you. That's not what you wanted, was it? You really want a world which is all positive. No, nobody really does. I mean, we think we think we do. We think we ought to.

But it still bothers us.

Because after all, if I come to the conclusion that this really doesn't make any difference, it's going to be black and white, black and white. Life and death. Good and evil. Ultimately, forever and ever and ever. I can't improve this world. I feel sort of sad. And I'm just gonna sit around and vegetate.

Only got some on Artemis.

And yet and yet I can't put up with that.

I have an itch. Surely there must be some way of getting through.

So what is it? Is there a greater pleasure which lies beyond the ordinary contrast of pleasure and pain?

What are they Hindus mean when they say that Brahman the absolute reality is such hard and under soft reality shift consciousness under bliss? What is under what is metaphysical bliss? Joy beyond pleasure, pain. Good, evil.

Has such a conception even any meaning? Well.

In all the various accounts that are given to us of the mystical experience, they have an intense, joyous annus.

The sudden realization that the dark and the light constitute a harmony there are not discordant.

That somebody once put it to me, this was a lady of 60 or so or was in an accident with an elevator and she had her leg crushed and they couldn't get a rescue crew to her for half an hour. But she said during that time I had the most extraordinary experience. I realized there wasn't one grain of dust in this whole universe that is out of place.

Pretty weird.

But from a strictly philosophical and logical point of view, it doesn't mean anything I say everything is good.

No sort of a Christian science added.

It doesn't mean it it's no law in them from a logical point of view than saying everything is everything. Doesn't tell me anything. It's all good. It's all happy. It's all harmonious.

And yet, if any one of you ever had an experience of cosmic consciousness, you know jolly well that that those are no idle words.

As you can see.

The positive and the negative, the yes and no singing together, constituting each other in this fantastic dance. In which the outward radiance flowing outward of the white light.

Is at the same time the withdrawal of the black outline and that withdrawal seems to be drawing aside a veil to show the white light. And if the veil didn't draw back, there would be no light, the veil to the drawing, back to the light shine.

Or did the light shuffle the veil back if it didn't show, it hadn't got a veil to shove back. Well, with the contrast be. You see the light in the dark. Playing with each other.

So there is a concept in the game called good sportsmanship.

Which means that.

You can be a good loser, but you can play the part of blues with the same enthusiasm that you can play the part of win.

And.

Therefore, what you look for is a good opponent, someone who really give you a run. And so what you do is you let the opponent win every so often and you have to try and keep yourself on top as just a little edge on the other one. See?

Well, after a while you see your consciousness changes and you find your always a little on top when you average it out and that gets boring.

So you're going after a while to let the other person average out.

But then you're going to count the spaces. Do you see?

For a year, you average out that you will allow your how your partner to have six months of being averaging out better and you get a little more dairy and give him seven months to catch up with you just at eleven months. And I'm going to come in again and I'm going to add another 12 months in which I'm the usual winner.

The more you think of that. The more you think I'm kind of a cad to be like this, you're going to let the other person. Because you can't maintain consciousness without the contrast in.

You that's why people go in for adventure.

Why we take risks, why we do absolutely foolish things.

Toss a coin and see what happens. Go skydiving. Let's go roaring around in racing cars.

At some even have wars.

See what happens. US.

Some people are cautious and say life is like a fire. And the thing to do is to keep it burning as long as possible. There are two kinds of pipe smokers.

People who take enormous puffs and I mean vast clouds of smoke and pipe burns out very quickly and other people who very slowly take a puff and keep the pipe going for a long, long time. Some people like a quick, enormous flash. Others like a long, long, slow glow.

Who's right? Who's left? You can take it either way.

You may go off with a whimper, but we will go after the band.

The morning glory blooms for an hour, and yet it differs not apart from the giant pain that lives for a thousand years.

Fruit fly at one end, it lives a few hours, tortoise at the other, slow, solemn daughters, lives for 500 years, but slowly.

Maybe they're both from their own point of view, lived the same time. Maybe the fruit fly thinks a few hours are very long and the tortoise thinks 500 years.

But four score and ten on all flesh is grass. From your own point of view, it's always the same. It's your point of view.

If you are a person born to riches, you will feel it's terrible to go down the poverty. But if you're born to poverty, that will be the usual state of affairs. You'll think it's extremely lucky if you rise to riches. But you see, I haven't really answered the question. Is there any way around this?

Now we can be a good sport, but it all comes out the same thing in the end. I mean, it balances out. And so what it means, so what?

What's wrong with it doing that? Would you rather it was different?

Well, if you really go into your thinking, you find you can't rather that it was different when you see that you cannot have the positive without the negative. And if you want the positive, you will have to take the negative. You say, well, it's a making me making the best of it. You know, as if to say, well, things kind of a lousy deal, but I'll take it. But I would ask you, what else would you have suggest me a better arrangement. You suddenly find that if you do suggest what you think is a better arrangement. They did. That won't be what you wanted. You finally have to admit that you wanted the way it is because the whole nature of wanting involves contrast. You want the good to be good, don't you? You wanted to be real yummy.

Okay.

Not so I give you nothing but chocolate eclairs with honey and a glass of champagne for breakfast everyday and for lunch and for dinner.

Will soon get sick of that. Or I'll give you a hard. You just keep it up day and night.

Pretty soon he was. Someone take me to a bar.

So by following this through the relentless logic it is you is or is you ain't you come to the curious sensation?

That, after all, if I really go into this problem of life, it is the way I want it to be. If I look at it superficially and in a sort of short run view, well, it isn't the way I want it. I want it changed right now. See?

And I will see. Life is like sleeping on a hard bed. You lie on her left side for a while and then you say this I can't stand this anymore and turn on your right side. Same with politics and you get tired of that.

So I say, well, I'm not on my left. You get tired of that little bit faster than you did before. Try the right again. It's boring. You try it back. That begins to get up, that you turn over light on your tummy. Then you switch to your back and then your tummy. Then you try your right side again. Your left. I see.

And so you proceed.

But.

What else do you suggest?

I would like it to be so that I was always comfortable.

But you can see that if you were. You wouldn't know what comfortable is.

So here's this puzzle.

It's got two sides, side one. I cannot beat the game of opposites. I cannot have more positive than negative side, too. I wouldn't want it otherwise.

Because I cannot imagine how to improve it.

So involved in this as a sudden and curious initial deflation.

I'm out of sorts. When I feel that there's no impression I can make on it. As it's.

And yet I find.

Who is this I try to interfere and wants to be challenged and is put out of sorts.

Well, when I look for it, I can't find it.

I cannot find an AI myself opposed to Vai or it. Because how could I have the one without the other?

So.

That feeling that I had of deflation, of frustration was simply the realization there is no such thing as a separate eye.

If you don't want to feel that truth, you will resist feeling it.

But if you're open, this logic of the opposites of the game of black and white will lead you ineluctably to the conclusion that you have no separate self apart from what is called other. So there you are. You find that you are the vibration system, which is what's going on.

You are the undulations, the palisade and called existence. That's you.

And it's game 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1. And ever so many different ways.

Well, say, is that all?

What more did you expect? Well, I don't know what I wanted. Just a little something more.

You mean you want to surprise?

I think we're back where we were a little while ago. But.

The surprise is it is in a way. This. We are locking in this system for that for that little something more which will give it meaning.

But. We're looking for the wrong kind of meaning. The meaning of this. Now you'll see it.

No, don't is who is or is you ain't Alsatian. Good, good, good, good, good.

The meaning of it is not apart from it. Away from it. Something different. The meaning of it is the dance, you see. That's why we get back to the point I made this morning to get with us.

He got a swing and swing means. I'll give it to you in a Zen story.

A Zen student said to his teacher, it's terribly hot. How do we escape the heat? He said why not go where it's neither hot nor cold? I said, was that the teacher said, in summer we sweat. In winter we shiver.

So.

It's a different from in Shakespeare's Richard the Second. Bolingbrook is about to be banished. And John Gaunt, I think it says to him.

To all places under the eye of heaven. To a wise man, Potts and happy havens. In other words, I don't think the king has banished. You think that you have that banish the king. You weren't fired. You quit babbling. Brook require replies.

Oh, who can hold a fire in his hand by thinking on the frosty caucuses a while naked in December. Snow by thinking on a fantastic summer's heat. Fell sorrows tooth that never rankled more than when it bites and Lance is not the sore.

In other words. If during the winter, I think of the summer, it's colder. If during the summer I think of the winter ice cream, it's hotter. So that's why the Zen master replies, in summer we sweat, in winter we shiver. When it's hot. Eat curry when it's cold.

Try ice water. Swim with it, roll with a bunch. This is due to the cold you make it, the hotter it'll get.

Now we'll have an intermission.

Now, you must understand that yesterday I was doing a demolition job. The negative aspect of what we're talking about, the pursuit of pleasure and by approaching it from two different points of view. I was explaining the fact that there really isn't anything that you can do.

To transform your consciousness into, shall we say, the state of pleasure or Ananda Bliss, ecstasy.

Especially the very high ecstasy of everyday consciousness.

There's nothing.

And I worked on this especially through an analysis of the nature of the opposites of perception.

By contrast.

And so that leaves you flat.

And so from that place where we can apply the Turkish proverb, he who sleeps on the ground will not fall out of bed.

We can proceed to the positive aspect.

Now, what happens when we are at the end of the negative aspect? When we come to the depths of the in motion. Which is the seed point of young. What happens when you are really convinced?

That, first of all, there is nowhere to be but now impossible to be anywhere else, to be conscious of anything else except what is present.

And that there is no trickery which you can play on your mind. Whether it be by. And iron forced discipline or by self hypnosis or by any kind of hocus pocus to bring about.

A Sartori. A state of illumination of cosmic consciousness or whatever you want to call it. Because this will always be a case.

Of a vicious circle.

In which the person who needs to be transformed is attempting to do the transforming.

In other words, it's the old story of trying to lift yourself up by your own bootstraps, trying to bite your own teeth, look into your own eyes without a mirror, gild the lily, put legs on a snake, beard on a eunuch and so on.

Count me.

So at that moment, when that is clear.

Where are you?

You may feel depressed.

And what will you do about that? Well, it's nothing to do about it.

Because you would have discovered at this point that the depression, when it's there, is the you of the time.

And if you try to get out of it by some sort of distraction.

You won't really do anything except cover up the dirt with white paint.

So if you feel let down. Meaningless. Somewhat depressed by this whole thing.

And you see at the same time, you can't do anything about it.

What happens? Why? You're simply. Watching what's happening. You don't know what's going to happen next.

And it isn't just watching something that is formally identified as a depressed state because a lot of other things going on to.

Thus the world around you.

There's your breath. Breathing still, your eyes looking still, your ears hearing still all that's going on. You don't know what to make of it anymore. You can't believe anything about it because you know that it's all a hoax.

So there's nothing left for you to do but watch it. And you have become inwardly rather quiet just because you're worn out.

There's nothing to do.

Then you realize that all escapes lead back to the thing you were running away from.

Take a detour, detour, detours, detours, but they always get shorter and you get back to where you started.

So when this sort of defeat of all enterprises and ideals and aspirations occurs.

You find yourself naturally and not in an affected or forced way in the contemplative state.

Where you're just watching what goes on and even if you're automatically thinking about it because you realize that those thoughts are futile so far as changing anything is concerned.

You might as well try to sweep dust on the stairs with bamboo shadows.

And so you watch your thoughts. As if they were the ticking of a clock. Oh, birds chattering outside the window. Or water falling or a leaky faucet. And they just chatter on and life does its thing and you watch the thoughts because they're just chatter begin to go away.

And the past has disappeared because, you know, it's just memory. The future has disappeared because it hasn't happened.

Never does. You know, tomorrow never comes. There is no tomorrow.

And if you don't realize that it's useless for you to make plans for it, if you do realize there's no tomorrow, then maybe plans will be of use to you, cause when they work out, you can enjoy the result.

But if you're not all here, you can't.

So tomorrow can only be handled by those who don't take it seriously.

So there you are.

Now, if you've read the literature, which many of you have of mysticism and.

Yoga, Buddhism, Vedanta, so forth.

You know, it said again and again and again.

That.

This kind of vision, this way of seeing, is always dependent upon transcending your ego in one way or another.

Giving up. Well, here you are. You've given up.

Only you are not able to pride yourself on having achieved a great achievement.

And this is this now for all people who go into these spiritual disciplines that make a project of getting rid of their ego. They're terribly proud of it. They come home and brag about how much they suffered, how long they sat and had their legs hurt so much. Their absolute ball was.

And this spiritual Bradbury is nothing more than blowing up and inflating the ego to a colossal degree, because the ego is undertaking the actually impossible but seemingly incredibly difficult task of getting rid of itself.

So.

When you run into this kind of thing, don't be beguiled. All those disciplines to get rid of your ego have as their underlying design to persuade you that it can't be done. Not in a merely theoretical kind of persuasion, but so that you actually realize that you can no more get rid of your ego than you can put out fire with fire.

It is precisely you see the ambition of the ego to be legal as. When you find a person who is what you might call frankly, egotistic, makes no bones about it. He will be less egotistic, actually, than people who are very self-effacing. That's a curious thing. People, for example, who speak very frankly and tell the truth and come right out and say whether they like you

or whether they don't, whether they want you around or whether they don't, and you say, well, can I stay overnight? And they say, sorry, but I'm tired and I don't want anybody around. You think, well, is that selfish?

But that kind of selfishness is not really selfish, because with a person like that, you always know where you are. Nobody likes to impose on anyone else, and you can't impose on that kind of person that makes for a very comfortable relationship.

So you owe it to other people to be as egotistic as you are. Then they know where you stand, but if you come out full of love and full of good intentions and make promises to all kinds of people and say, oh, you'll do this, that and the other for them and then you forget about it or you're too lazy or you think you'd rather not.

They've been relying on you for your promises and then you let them down simply because you weren't selfish when it was time to be selfish.

So, you know, if somebody asks you, will you help me? Will you give me some money or something like that? If you're not going to do it, say no.

And you shouldn't be ashamed of saying no, because if you're going to do no eventually, do it now. But if you say, well, I'll think it over, I'll go back and look at my bank balance. That means.

I know, but I don't want to say so. People always following each other up that way.

So it's very important to be as egotistic as you are. Because the ambition to be less egotistic than you are is a form of very insidious form of egotism.

And there is nothing more reprehensible than the ambition to be a saint.

So you found that out. You see, not by going through some project, some fierce discipline to get rid of your ego unless, of course, you were the kind of nut who had to go through that and couldn't find it any other way.

That's why I have nothing against gurus who put people through all sorts of complicated obstacle races because those people asked for it, they wouldn't have respected the guru unless he had made things difficult.

It's on the principle of anyone who goes to a psychiatrist should have his head examined.

It is because let me repeat the point.

You are responsible. And when you go to a guru, you did it and you gave him authority to take charge of your spiritual development.

And he's going to show you that the authority was always yours. But he can't do that by just talking. He has to carry the absurd things you are doing to their logical extremes so that you will find out.

You are making yourself miserable. He will increase your tendency to do so until you find out that it's you who are doing it. Well, I say you find out if you are doing it. Who is you? We never have to define this because it's become like a point in modern geometry. Mathematics in the old Euclidean system, we say the point is that which has a width no magnitude, the kind of absurd definition. But in mathematics today, we don't define a point at all. Say it's a limit of size. And. It's much more useful that way, so when I use the word you, you know what I mean?

But I'm not going to define it because then we get to thinking about is the you immortal or mortal or mortal or immortal, is it eternal or not eternal? Is it a separate? Or is it one with, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera? And all these are silly questions.

The word I, as William James said, is.

A pronoun of position like this or here.

Or like it, it is raining.

So when I say I know I do, I'm not thinking that there is some agent I.

Who is the doer of deeds? I do.

I say means the saying is coming from here as distinct from over there.

And there is no disjunction between the eye and the staying. I am what I say because the saying is the act. This is I while I say it.

So with the rest of the body I'm heading, I'm Harding. I'm a stomach boning and that's the I while it's happening.

This particular boning and stomachache and Harding and Browning, same. It's all process or wiggles.

But so then when you find naturally.

That the supposed ie the mythical soul in the body, ego in the brain, or whatever it is is fictitious, is a social convention like the equator and can't do anything except the thought that it can do something simply gets your psychic processes going in a vicious circle. So then at that moment, you are in the contemplative state naturally.

You are neither trying to do something about it. You are certainly not trying to do nothing about it because you find the only thing you can do. Now, this is interesting. What? The only thing you can do is let it happen. Whatever's going on, let it happen. And you're not even letting.

How can you stop it?

Because if you try to stop it, that trying to stop is all part of the happening. See?

So what have you discovered when there is absolutely nothing to do except it happens, whatever it does happen, you suddenly discover that you are what happens.

The church not limited to what goes on inside your skull.

That the wind blowing outside, the cars pouring down the road.

The rattle of human life, the sun shining and all that, that that there is no you there is no reality that is apart from that.

Then stay with that awhile.

Just don't don't try and get that recognition back as something you had remembered, you had suddenly this flash this inside of Satori. And then you think, oh, let's let's hold onto that, I don't want to forget that. Let's make a note of it.

See? And America is still trying to pull a trick here. See what happens next. Don't stay with that. Go on. The moment is always new, always fresh. Whatever's going on. Don't try to fix it into any mold. And say, ha ha, that state of mind is Sartori. See, I that that I must keep don't keep anything. You can't. It's just like pouring water into a bottomless bucket. Let it flow through. Let it go on. And as you go on, you see something is coming to you all the time. You don't know what it is. You don't know what's going to happen next. So you just watch. But don't slide back. You're always right where it's happening right at the critical moment, which is the moment. And don't worry about whether you're right or whether you are wrong. Whether this is what you're supposed to do or not supposed to do, there is no script.

Unless you insist on making somebody else's script, your script.

And you see it coming at you.

And yet you realize it's not coming at me from somewhere or someone else. This spontaneous arrival is me. There isn't any me besides it's.

So when the chickens cluck outside. That's just the same as my having belly rumbles. It's awfully big. From each one of our points of view.

Now, then, as you well know, those things in life which are most pleasurable.

Almost invariably happen unexpectedly.

They are not contrived.

When I take students with me to Japan. The first thing I tell them when we sit down together. Is that this is not going to be a scheduled tour except within certain rather vague limits.

Many people, when traveling in foreign countries see nothing.

Because they see what they're supposed to see. Somebody tells them when you go to India, you've got to see the Taj Mahal. You must see the caves, that agenda. You must see the burning guts of bananas and so on.

And they all go and see that so that they can say, I've said it, I've seen it. And then they take these little black boxes which are capturing devices for grabbing experience.

And they fascinated me. Go round, click, click, click, click, click like this and never see anything.

They're always looking at the aperture, figuring and see that. That's right. And so on. And as an absolute drag, taking a camera. Especially if you are not a professional photographer, you know, you just have to preserve this memory of this one thing once in a lifetime. I got a chance to see the Taj Mahal click.

What I say to these people is, look, the Japanese have a phrase which is like our phrase, just follow your nose. They say follow your feet. Because unlike the United States, Japan is a very easy place to wander in. I mean, here it's very difficult to wonder. It takes narrow streets. Funny courtyards, curly kind of places for effective wandering here. You're not allowed to wander if you go wandering in any nice part of town. The police will stop you.

Because where are you going? Nowhere particular. Well, that's very suspicious. Not to be going anywhere particular. Where are you from? Have you got a paper that proves that you are there? Paper always being more reliable than people.

So everything is straightened out. You know, it's the shortest distance between two points, Ghazali. Fast as possible. No wandering allowed.

But in Japan you still can wander. It's a miracle. You can still.

But you can. And you can take a side turning, not knowing where the faintest idea where you're going.

And suddenly you discover the most amazing garden in a courtyard.

Or a funny little restaurant.

Where the most unusual food is being served are a bar where there's room only for two people to sit and they're serving broiled sea snails.

Or a shop where rare pottery is being sold.

And although the shopkeeper can't speak a word of English, you go in and the utmost courtesy is shown to brought out tea to drink and.

Very pleasant, friendly surroundings. You didn't get shown as you followed your feet and discovered it. And now all of the best things on any journey I've ever taken were unscathed. And most of the scheduled things were a disappointment because of the big build up of expectations and then flop.

So therefore, the essential principle of the positive side of the pursuit of pleasure, you see, is the unscheduled life.

Now, of course, for the convenience of other people, some schedule is always necessary, but it's best to make it a kind of humdrum habit thing.

And don't get uptight about it.

Because it is nothing more. Just as the skeleton is a framework for the flesh. So a schedule is bones for Wiggles.

Snakes and ladders and.

We need some bones, you see, otherwise everything gets too gooey.

But don't take your bones too seriously. Always allow for the unexpected.

Because this is true at the level of the most simple, sensuous pleasures, as well as at the level of high mystical experience.

So the paradoxes that come into mystical literature. Such as that he that would save his life must lose it or lose it.

Or.

The highest knowledge is not knowledge in the.

Caner will punish hard where it is explained that Brahman, the Supreme is known to those who know it, not all that sort of paradox is simply this thing that.

The cosmic consciousness. Is water rises of itself. When you see that nothing arises at all except what arises of itself.

In other words, life isn't something on the one hand happening to you on the other or being done by you on the one hand to it on the other.

The whole thing. You and it is a spontaneous occurrence.

That.

Is going on and the word spontaneous in Chinese is means of itself. 1 means in Chinese. What is so of itself and it's their word for nature.

And be careful to remember what I said yesterday, that they're happening. The spontaneous is not something you can preconceived and by pretty conceiving, it imitates spontaneity by going against social convention.

Because then you are merely acting out the obverse of the convention and being conditioned by it as ever. The truly a spontaneous can only happen of itself and you cannot arrange it.

So then you may say, well, now, does that mean, as we say in kind of everyday talk, just take things as they come?

I mean, just live day to day. Song.

And. Then I know if a person asked that.

That they don't take things as they come. While they do have as they have a concept of what it would be like to take things as they come and they would say, well, the ordinary person is anxious and full of plans and schemes and therefore let's be the opposite of that.

They take things as they come see, and that's the same as fake spontaneity. Because this true taking things as they come doesn't mean that you imitate a placid attitude.

Or that you have some kind of expected behavior like, say, one expects of a psychotherapist, a certain kind of act which he puts on to accommodate you, if you say to a psychotherapist, you know, I have just raped my daughter and murdered my wife. He says that.

And, you know, it's an amazingly unhuman reaction.

Oh, also, then you see, you people have preconceived notions of a mystic or a Buddha or a sage, and they think he has no emotions.

And so if when Zen masters, for example, get angry, they get so angry that the room rattles and. But when it's over, it's gone.

It's like a child's emotion. You know, a child can flare up and scream and suddenly it's vanished.

People think, well, he ought to have more control over himself. Is niece supposed to have all that yogi self-control and all that? No emotion and be completely serene and placid under all circumstances?

Rubbish.

That would be to say that a stone Buddha is as good as a living one.

That isn't to say we will test your virtue by taking out our stopwatch and we will bang you about and see how long it takes you to scream.

If you don't scream at all, then, of course, you win.

But it doesn't make much difference. You might as well be dead.

Is that a test of anything? It's simply a test of insensitivity.

So I don't think, therefore. That there is some kind of stereotype.

Of what this state is, we don't know what this state is. And those who have tried to write it down and explain it have always said, but it's ineffable. And what I'm trying to describe as I'm doing my best, but I know I can't really get it across.

So you would say then going back to the point that I'm making here, the person who said, well, it's just taking things as they come.

And by that, you'll think of something like, come here.

Get up and brush your teeth and take a shower and look out of the window. And then you put on your pants and have a boiled egg for breakfast and then get on the bus and go and do some business.

And so on. And that's. That's it.

But that is no to it.

Because when you are in the state that I am talking about. What from the former point of view, would have appeared to be nothing more than ordinary everyday life. It suddenly seemed to be a magical process.

Absolutely weird.

So that you can see that you might be just rubbing around in some ash.

It becomes perfectly obvious that that's the whole point of the universe.

I mean, it's all there.

Infinity and the grain of sand and everything.

That's it. And you look at other people.

Rushing around when it made people's noses, when they're in that state of rushing around a more pointed somehow than they would be otherwise.

The nose seems to be leading out, the eyes wildly searching and people going about their business every day. Serious? No. I'm gonna get that going to make this thing. And they're quite mad.

You feel sorry for them? You don't feel angry at them. But they are quiet, man. They don't realize that that now is it.

That's that's where it's all going as well as where it all comes from. The Alpha and the Omega.

There's no.

And indeed, the angels keep their ancient places turned by the stone and start a winged.

The whole surround of us is completely magical. Now, of course, we become aware that imaginative people are conscious of this.

Imaginative people show their consciousness of it. By the way, they act. By.

That taste.

In whatever they surround themselves with. You begin to notice that there are some certain people with whom.

You either have great accord or great fear because they're not ordinary. Because they have an atmosphere of magic.

They have imagination and they are not hiding under an attempt to conform. To the ideal of being ordinary. And the artistic people are here.

They're also people you can call relaxed people.

Relaxed society.

There's a very wonderful class of people. They're not on edge. You know, there are some people who are edgy all the time.

And you you feel that your very presence around their place is a mess. If you know what I mean.

But relax. People have what the Arabic is called Baraka.

It means divine grace. But it also means the quality of an old frying pan that has had long years of use and is just perfect.

That's Buttercup. And there are people like that, too, to.

And all these other great spontaneous virtues that cannot be contrived. We can try to produce Barca by finding some scientific process for artificially and taking things. For putting patina on bronze and five minutes for a pre aging wine or something like that, I mean, none of it works.

It's all phony. Because this thing can only come in the process of growth.

So you say, well, do I have to wait? But the whole thing is in the waiting.

I don't mean the virtue of patience. I mean waiting when there is nothing to do but wait. And when you see there is nothing to do but wait.

Then it happens. But it won't be hurried.

Because the minute you're trying to hurry it, that introduces the one thing that stops it.

The miracle, the magic thing is happening all the time, but you can't see it when you're trying to get it and you can still less see it when you're trying to get it fast.

So there is no alternative but to go through the point of you can't get it at all.

You are going to be you. The same slob you've always been. See, you can't change it and all your good resolutions are just bombast. And then you start

to be real.

So just as the in traveling or in ordinary relations with your friends every day, these gorgeous things happen of themselves.

Those are the true pleasures. So at the level of mystical experience, the most astounding insights.

Of, you know, where you can go into the deep, most trivial everyday affairs. This is behind all those Zen stories of the monk who was sweeping the courtyard and a small piece of broken tile zipped out from under his broom and struck against the bamboo and made up plop. And that sound he suddenly saw as containing the entire secret of the universe.

One can do it from anything. As I say, it could be the ashes in the ashtray. It could be light in a dew drop. It could be the sound of a bell. Any point becomes the takeoff point because as a principle in operation, which the Japanese call G.G. M.J.. Now, the word G means any experience which you could identify as a thing or an event. And the doubling of the word G.G. means between saying event and thing event more gay, more means no gap means barrier or obstruction.

I'll put it in another way. Everything event implies all the others.

And here in this way, you begin to see that that is actually so. When you pick up a chain, you pick up one link and the rest comes in this, you pick up one thing event and the universe comes up with it.

Because you see. There are no separate things.

It's all a single unified process, no longer divided into the voluntary in the involuntary. The I and the you or the I on the hit because it is the big happening, which is neither voluntary nor involuntary, which is neither free nor determined. All these are mere ideas about it and about.

You've abandoned all that, you've abandoned philosophy. Totally. Because you see, it's just a net designed for catching water.

And when all that's gone and their whole attempt to crush life, to capture the pleasure has disintegrated.

There it is.

And you needn't feel anxious about will it stay? It's a gorgeous thing to feel we no longer got to worry whether it will stick around. Because you know that if you do worry or shoot away.

So it's a tremendous relief to see not to have to bother with will it stick around?

Will I lose my insight with my satori, take wing and go off with the bats, use it again.

Because the more you let go of it, the more it stays. And you don't even have to worry about, will you be sure to let go of it? That, too, is a hang up.

And you can begin, you see from your very weakness, that's your strength.

It's not your big ego and your big will. That is the strong thing here. It's your it's your sloppiness, it's your weakness. It's your foolish side that is your strong suit.

You see. Yo, Condi, she puts it in this way. You cannot take hold of it. You cannot get rid of it.

In not being able to get it. Let me repeat this is not being able to get it, you'll get it when you are silent. That speaks. When you speak, it is silent. The great gate is wide open.

And nobody obstructing it.

So we'll have an intermission. And then quite.

I suppose many of you are familiar with the work of Krishnamurti and you will of course recognize that there is something in common between what he says and what I have been saying to you, that probably you will also notice that the something different. Because Krishnamurti is more of a purist than I am.

And he takes a apparently a rather negative attitude to things that are recognisably religious.

That is to say, he sets no store by religious literature. By ceremonies, by meditation practices, religious ideas and so forth.

And does without them.

He wouldn't dream of being involved in a ritual, least not one that would be mistaken for a religious ritual.

I, on the other hand, have a different attitude about those things.

Because I first of all, I'm not going to argue with anybody about their religion.

Because everybody's religion. Is that same sort of thing as their life?

You may be living a very weird life.

But I could say speaking sort of from a Hindu point of view that that's your trip this round. If the generation of Maya of the World Illusion is the play of the Godhead, then he will play the villains as well as the heroes, the fools, as well as the sages and the sinners, as well as the saints. And that's why I am not out to convert anybody or win souls because. It's as if I would go and talk to a pig and say, my dear pig. You should be a cow. Or to a giraffe and say your neck is too long or too an elephant and say you are too heavy. I tried to see what people are not in the sense of trying to classify them or type them, but to see if it is possible to find what is called divine in every disguise. And be aware, old man, cobia was when he came to maturity. He used to look around. He was a mystic who was part Hindu, part Buddhist, part Islamic, who lived in India in about the 15th century.

He used to look around and say, to whom shall I preach?

Because he saw the beloved the Godhead on all sides in every being and therefore felt it would be presumptuous to make any recommendations.

That's a strange state of mind because it's so easily made over into a very shallow, Pollyanna ish optimism.

But, you know, in the mythology of the Hindus that they have some very nitty gritty characters. Let's take Kali Kali, the female one of Shiva's girlfriends, Chuck D. She is really represents the dark side of yin, the feminine of feminine.

The spider mother, the devouring feminine. The night, which sucks in all days.

But also, Carly is the mother of the universe.

But it emphasizes the dark side of the mother, and she is shown with fans black skinned. In one hand, she carries a scimitar and another a severed head and she is a bloody character.

And, you know, there are colleagues all around us.

And it's not like saying.

Ocala is not so bad after all. She has a good side. The thing is to see a bad side as an aspect of the divine.

And then genuinely be able to refrain from saying, I wish you would improve and say it's some sort of tough to do that.

I mean, I feel the same way when I'm confronted with a representative of the militant lunatic fringe of Protestantism, a Jehovah's Witness or a Southern Baptist or a Billy Graham type.

I have a men's personal distaste for that kind of religion.

So I wonder, and I look at it and I think where is the real kick in that one of those people really doing what do they get their basic pleasure from in this? How can God be playing that game?

It's a very mysterious business.

So I try to look at it that way.

Instead, our blanket is saying, well, all your religious gimmicks are vanity.

Therefore, cease and desist. Because although many religious gimmicks are vanity from my point of view.

I yet think of Blake's saying the former will persist in his folly, will become wise. And for this reason, even foolish religions are ways of realization.

Because the more far out you get from realisation, in a way, the nearer you get to it because the path is a circle.

Then on the other hand, I suggested this morning that there's a way of looking at religion, which is quite different from what will it do for me? What can I get out of it? What magic can I perform? Here is yoga. Here is meditation. Here is zazen. Ordinarily, we look into those practices and say, I wonder if that will do something for me. Now, I'm suggesting that we look at them quite differently as art forms. And instead of saying what little painting do for me, what will sculpture or music do for me? I don't think we ask that.

We say I enjoy music. It's it's fun. It's beautiful. Let's do some. So you're not looking for something from it.

And that's the attitude which I take to any practice which may be designated religious.

That it's an art form, that it is a way of expressing exuberance, delight and above all, the sense of wonder.

Appreciation of the magic of being. And I've often quoted that saying of Van der Loo that the mystery of life is not a problem to be solved, but a reality to be experienced. And the people who tried to explain mysteries are people who try to destroy mysteries, and that is in a way to destroy life.

It's often said by men that women are mysterious. Is that a complaint or a compliment? I take it as a compliment. May they remain mysterious and

may men remain mysterious to women.

But you would see that it there seems to be, after all I've said and after all that Krishnamurti says there would seem to be something inconsistent in.

Practicing meditation or going to church. Are participating in a ritual. If we didn't do those things.

I think myself that life would be very much impoverished.

All the churches would be turned into museums. The holy scriptures would be used for fuel.

The rituals might live on in funny dances, but we should be scrubbed clean of superstition. And I don't exactly look forward to that prospect from an aesthetic point of view.

I like magical toys. I don't believe in them in the sense of thinking they will help me in the competitive games of life. But when I see a figure of the Buddha.

Seated on his Lotus throne with an Oriole behind him, an incense burning in front of him.

I feel something glowing. Wong Civilizing, humanising.

And also mysterious.

Very hard to say what it is to put your finger on it, because I don't think it would be there if I could.

The especially the Mahayana form of Buddhism has spread a kind of warm glow all over northern Asia.

It's such a bane.

Such a sophisticated religion, it doesn't harass you with prejudice, it doesn't pursue you. It doesn't make a busybody a nuisance of itself.

And he it fosters the arts.

It fosters compassion and concern, but not of the kind of concern for people that shovels what is good for them down their throats.

And.

It's so it's so roomy. That's why it's called the Maha Yana. The great vehicle or the great cos it has so many different ways in so many different practices and there's no kind of scrubbing people down to the basic essentials.

It's not plagued with efficiency ology. So personally, you see, I dig that.

I also like that side of Christianity where it's expressed in Roman Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy.

I don't like scrubbed Christianity, the Protestant kind, where they take away the candles and the vestments and the mystery and the innocent and make it all rational.

Because when you go, you ask the question, what are the essentials of a religion?

To my mind, when people reduce any religion to what they call the essentials, they get rid of all the important things and leave in only the misleading ones.

Because when we get it down to essentials.

We say we get back to this question. You see that all religions offer a way of salvation or of liberation or whatever it may be of union with God and the Protestant would say to the Roman Catholic. Well, all your rituals and obscure ways are getting in the way of man reaching God directly.

We want to get all that crowd out of the way and find a more efficient way of getting to God so that we can reduce the costs from five years to 10 weeks.

Now have to take off all those holidays, too, which distract from business. It gives our apprentices holidays and we don't want to lose time. We are where we are on the make. Do you see the moment you reduce, the time it takes, you take out the religion because you make it into an enterprise to get something, and that's what I've been telling you all this weekend. You can't do because the moment you try to get God, you assume that you aren't there. When you don't try to get there's a chance that you may discover that you are there already.

We were thinking over lunch how funny it would be if we got a real speeded up easy course in meditation without tears. All the nonsense taken out of it. Only the essentials. But the big headline. They laughed when I sat down to meditate.

So here all the merchants are telling you the quick way.

But what is fascinating about.

The non efficient religions. Is precisely. They are California's all the other essential things they do.

All the exuberance of flowers and smells and ornaments and color. You notice in efficient religions, the first thing they take away is color.

Why do people take away color or they say color shows the dirt. You have to wash it all the time. So you wear black because you live in a grimy city. You don't want to show the dirt.

That's efficiency. But color is the first thing that goes.

But let's suppose we look at religion in an entirely different way. We have begun.

First of all, you see with the understanding.

That religion is not an acquisition and therefore there is nothing you can do to acquire it. You begin from the point of recognition that you are what you are. You can't improve yourself because if you try to, you'll only make

yourself more tied up in and messed up. You have to recognize that because there's no alternative. And then you're in a position to be very simply and ingenuous, fully aware of life without trying to do anything to it. You let it happen. And then it begins to show its color.

And then you feel intensely the marvel and magical nature of the world so that whatever you do by way of a religious practice is an art form.

Like singing to express the marvelous feeling that comes out of this. Not to secure yourself.

Not to acquire anything and a reward, but simply to.

Live it up.

It's difficult, perhaps, for many people to understand how you could be living it up by meditating. Meditation seems on the surface so, so dull. Why sit still for a long time?

That's awful. You know how when they tried to make you sit still as a child, how you resented it and be jumping around looking for this, that and the other all the time, because you can do that, you can take up dervish dancing as a form of yoga.

If your temperament suggested. But what about the more ordinary is still sitting kind of meditation?

Nobody seems to realize that it's supposed to be fun.

You know, when you have been sick. And you just have to lie in bed. There's nothing else to do.

While everybody else in the world goes about their business and you're left with almost nothing to do except listen.

And you hear all the funny little noises that you don't normally notice. Of not only people, but also animals and birds and things going about their daily business.

And it suddenly occurs to you that this is an unheated symphony that's going on. You notice the sunlight leaving curious patterns on the painted walls maybe of a hospital room where there are patches of damp and cracks in the ceiling. And because you are in a condition of complete receptivity and passivity, all this starts to come to life because, of course, passivity is the root of life. Activity is the end of it. But passivity is the beginning. It's the wound from which creation starts. And so in the same way, when you meditate in some schools, you will be given something to meditate on. Although very often when an Oriental explains that he meditates and a Westerner asks as he will. What do you meditate on? The Oriental will look vaguely surprised. I did. I don't know what you mean. I don't meditate on. I meditate. Although, as I say, you might be given the practice of concentrating on a visual image of a chakra or a mandala or a syllable or humming a sound or some focal point.

But that isn't necessary.

When you are at the point at which I am speaking, where you are simply not doing anything, even not trying to do nothing. You can't. Then you are sitting.

And you are as aware as can be of every tip of a half. And you've got nowhere to go. You're not in a hurry. There is a period of 40 minutes an hour or whatever it is. Where is it only required of you? That should be. Now, normally at that moment, one is impatient. Somehow bothered by having to be restricted.

If you take it easy.

You will feel no restriction. I'm trying to think how I can explain this. If you lift up a heavy weight and hold it up on the tips of your fingers, it's a big rock.

Normally, we think of that as an effort to maintain it.

But there's a certain way of looking at this where you say.

It isn't an effort, it's just going to stay there.

And instead of fighting against any feeling of tension that the rock causes.

You just turn that tension into. It's gonna stay the.

It's a curious thing. You can support a heavy weight for a very oddly long time doing that. So in the same way, when you're certain, even if your legs hurt or you get uncomfortable, there's the sudden attitude wherein that just disappears and you've got this extraordinary. The only thing it does is it keeps you awake, which is fine. Then you got this extraordinary feeling of the amazing nature.

Of looking at reality, at life.

Without doing anything to it. Without any sense of hurry, without any wish to improve it, just let it happen.

And you can understand then why Buddha images look blissful.

Because cats do this. Cats will sit for ages and watch. American Indians will do it. They'll set the hours by a roadside.

We think they're done. You know, sometimes I sits and thinks.

But mostly I just said they have nothing better to do.

Someone else was saying at lunch that if you bothered on the phone and somebody asks you, could you come over this morning and do that? And so perfectly legitimate to say, no, this is my morning for a hair appointment. This is my morning to go down shopping, etc. And I can't come. But if you say this is my morning to be alone, people would think you were very strange.

Because you wouldn't be doing something for the world. But hermits, for example, and people who live solitary lives and meditate a great deal are doing an enormous amount for the world. Just a very early suspicion that people exist like that is marvelous for everybody. Because it says to all of us. Where do you think you're going? Why are you making? Why are you raising so much dust? Because you think you're going somewhere and

you're already there and this dust is getting in everybody's nostrils and it is polluting everything in all because you are so busy to put up this big thing, whatever it is, it is getting top heavy and it's getting a bar holding the thing up.

So to know that there are hamlets.

Deep in the forest is like knowing that there are still streams and flowers, which no one has ever seen. We are mostly of the mentality that if we heard of a hidden valley full of flowers, which nobody has ever seen. We would say that should be open to the public, should be bought for the nation, and they should put in a ranger station and toilet facilities and a picnic ground. It would be still worse if there were one person living in there and enjoying it all by himself. Let's say the selfish bastard. He should live in that beautiful, flowery valley all alone. Open it up. Let's all have a look. And then when everybody's had a look, the place is a desert. Now I live opposite a forest. It's in a state park and I can see right across to that forest. It's a very big and very dense forest.

Occupying the whole side of a valley and I think sometimes be fun to explore it. And then on the other hand, I decide I'm not going to. I'm not going to disturb it.

The only one who lives there is an old she goat who comes out every so often and dances on top of a big rock. Oh, of course there are birds and probably deer and skunks, rabbits. But nobody ever goes there.

You never see anybody in that forest. And it's just wonderful to leave it alone.

So you see here two things, two cranes of my thought. Connect. The first train was you see the folly of trying to do good. And the second train is that you are doing good by doing nothing.

The very hands off. On this thing called life.

The meditative attitude which realizes to you how magical it all is.

Also.

It benefits other people in the same way as the untouched forest and wilderness land benefits people. It's essential to our sanity to have those areas of UN interfered with life.

So we might say that is the passive side of exuberant religion is the meditative.

The one activity in which we are completely here and now and not seeking any result. The other side of this exuberance is, of course, the musical dancing, ritualistic side of religion. When you see another kind of ritual, nobody is expecting to get anything out of this ritual because it's not considered as magic, it's the Japanese tea ceremony. It is apparently a purely secular ritual. It is a way of drinking tea together socially. Actually, it's a Zen Buddhist ritual. Because in Zen, you get to a place where there isn't any difference between religion and everyday life. But they don't. Therefore, not the ritual art of everyday life. They put the ritual into everyday life at the tea ceremony.

And they're the beauty of gesture and of the primitive style vessels that are used. And the serenity of doing this ritual for no reason except the ritual is a very lovely experience.

But you see in the life of America today, and you notice it here in a rather special way. There is very little joyous ritual.

I mean, there are Freemasons and there are shrines and Knights of Columbus.

But those people laugh at their own rituals. Really?

They they they don't understand them.

They have no real feeling for it. It's it's it's a kind of clowning affair where you dress up and you do this and you give the money to charity and so forth. And in the Roman Catholic Church, they don't understand ritual. So

that you get the impression you see that, you know, you put a quarter in the slot and political outcomes a goody.

We've got a confession.

And you'd only make the full confession that they would, you know, to say that the sins of a member of songs on Sunday in the present. And it is done. I see. And I remember once watching a midnight mass in New York. I never saw anything go so fast. I don't if any of you ever remember a story by Alphonse, do they call it Obama's bus? The three low masses with a play on bus lo was the three masses of Christmas being celebrated in one hell of a hurry because the priest and the acolytes all wanted to get the dinner and they gave themselves such indigestion at the dinner that they died and their ghosts were compelled to celebrate three masses through all eternity.

While this mass was just like that, I never saw anything like those. I the people at the altar, while that there was somebody and the acolytes suddenly went up, genuflect and vanished.

They reminded me that passage in the book of Genesis, where it says in Enoch walked with God and he was not for God took him.

He just disappeared.

I mean, so there's nothing stately about it. There was no rhythm, no sense of a dance. Well, let's get this thing ground out as fast as possible. Most of us now have a greater love. Many believe the mother will move. It doesn't really up his death.

Now, I can understand that being done because somebody digs a kind of.

Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait.

I assume you see, but this isn't done that way, it's done to get it over with. So nobody digs it. This ritual is just a magic to be done as fast as possible. It's like a prowler with an electric motor on it now. Well, you may laugh at prayer wheels. You ever try to use a prayer wheel? You get one. They're all over the place. Nowadays you rotate it and see it has a cylinder and a little

chain and a weight on the end of the chain. And you get this thing going. It says inside own money. Pardon me. You get this going and you know, you've got the earth going round the sun. That's the same sort of process. You've got this going like this. It's a little bit of a trick to it, so you don't want the chain to get loose and drop the weight on the end. So you've got to keep that rhythm going. Once upon a time, there was a miser and Buddhist priest. Was his friend going to trick that miser, the Buddhist priest said atomizer, look, every time you say the religious formula are normal. I mean, tablets, which means normal like Halo or early means the name of Army Harbor, the Buddha. That's the great sun Buddha. I'll give you one scene, which was one hundredth of a yen that was a very small amount of money, but all you got to say, it's a number I mean, books, I'll give you a sentence.

The miser thought, that's crazy. Think of all the money only.

So he began took out a brush. I mean, it was dumb, I mean, it was I mean, it was not I mean, it was no more I mean, it wasn't I mean, it was numb. I mean, it was not what I mean, it's not what I mean. It was not what I mean. It was no, I mean, it was not I mean, it was dumb, let me say.

And the priest used to come and look at him every day and see this huge sheets of paper accumulating with all accounts. He had done one sandwich.

The priest is very happy, is not what it was. I mean, it was dumb. I mean I mean, this one day he came, there was a miser sitting say no money. There was no one. There was no I mean, he wasn't making any marks.

In haha heart.

And another day. Still seeing nothing happening at all.

And then one day the priest came and he opened the gate at the end of the garden path and the doors flew open and the miser came rushing out and he embraced the priest and says, Oh, I can't thank you enough. You don't owe me any money at all.

Well, that explains the prayer wheel, you see, if the prayer wheels to do that thing or other you are to do that thing, you mother, you can't be in a hurry.

You can't be trying to get away. You must be fascinated with the possibility of C and you just do this to true to you at your wits end. It's why you're a kind of a nut. You have to be easy to do this. You're at your wits end. All there is. You don't have to say anything. You don't ever think anything. You don't have to be virtuous. You don't have to believe anything. Only up there to go to. Good, good, good, good thing. That's that's it. And so you can have a ball swinging that thing. So that therefore we need to be delivered from a utilitarian religion altogether and come to the realization that the highest form of religion is perfectly useless. And this is the true nature of play. And of course, it's the true nature of the universe. And see, what I'm doing is I'm playing a sort of little trick here because I'm showing you the importance of the unimportant. See, we got ourselves down to being absolutely incapable. That's what we did to begin with.

And show you that that's where you really begin to live.

So now, again, we're going to get down the very highest that there is the Godhead and religion and the Saints and angels and the tiny Buddhas in their Mandela's sitting at the heart of the universe. And we're going to show that they are all quite useless.

They serve no purpose, whatever. They are not good for anyone else or anything. Why they don't need to be. They're not going anywhere because they're now.

And the expression the Maya of the universe, which they show.

Is not done.

Because they have some purpose to work out.

It's the way you spend your time when you don't have any purpose to work out.

Then you can afford to be devious. You don't have to go the direct way. If you've got a purpose, get that baby. See you like that. Get that.

If you don't have any purpose, you wonder and you go and suddenly you say, well, that's the outline of a leaf.

And all those veins going through it a little earthy, so you get the wiggly path instead of a straight path.

Go round in circles.

So the planets go around the sun. They're not going anywhere. What's the sun going around another star? Oh, this thing is a great spiral nebula with its center somewhere beyond the constellation of Sagittarius going around and around. So in the religious dance, we all join hands and we go around. In meditation, you make your breath go wrong. It isn't just in and out like a pumpkin. It's not like that. It's like goes like this. And there's no sort of hitch between the in and the out. It flows the whole way. Yoga. Called the Chinese. Call it the circulation of the light.

It's going around.

In Buddhism and in Hinduism, they talk about the world as samsara, the round.

Sorry, around the sorry go round as distinct from the merry go round. Samsara, the wheel of becoming the power Chocola.

The wheel of birth and death, and so Edwin Arnold and his poem, The Light of Asia makes the Buddha say you suffer from yourselves. None else compels, none other holds you that you live and die.

And were upon the wheel and hug and kiss its spokes of agony, its tire of tears, its neighbor and nothingness. That's the rat race thinking you're going gonna get somewhere. Spin that wheel, baby.

Round and round that wheel of fortune.

Weigh what you gain on the roundabout and you lose on the swings.

And on the other hand, there are certain people who have a different attitude to the wheel of Fortune spinning for fun. Let's gamble. Not to make money

just because it's fun to gamble.

Now, you see that as the gay newsman, he's liberated.

He's not. He's not hung up on the game. So in the same way that Mandela is a symbol of the transformed rat race.

Now, what's the nature of the rat race? The barber chapter, a symbol of the six divisions of life with the successful people at the top. They're the angels, the unsuccessful people at the bottom. The Naka or the. The poker. Purgatory. Or States of extreme suffering. And then in between are various graduated states. The humans, the frustrated spirits, the furious spirits. And the animals seem at the top of the gods. At the bottom are the demons and the tormented spirits.

So everybody is moving to get up to.

So in a way, wherever you lie or at the bottom, you're tormented if those gods are trying to stay up in. But is no way higher than heaven. And the only way is down.

Down and out.

So they got that theme running, see?

Now, importantly, recognize on this wheel that being at the top is not being a Buddha. You may be a God, you may be an angel, a diva from which we get our word divine as well as devil.

But you are not a Buddha. You're not liberated from the wheel. How do you get off? Why? Knowing that wherever you are on the wheel, is it?

Peter?

Let's say we all at the bottom because honest squirrel cage wheel, the running squirrel or rat always stays at the bottom. So you're as low as you can get. That's what I was pointing out this morning.

Can't get any lower. You're in the Naka. The bottom of hell. But there you are. Now what happens?

You realize that every point on the wheel is there.

And so you'll get a different picture of the wheel, not as the significance of it is no longer in the Rotary movement around it, but suddenly in the movement from the center to the circumference and from the circumference to the center, you'll get a flower.

The path of the pedal and your wheels suddenly becomes a mandala.

That is to say, a circle's subdivided in by petals or other symbolic petals to be a floral shape. And there you see the great Tibetan paintings of Mandala's.

We go back to the five great Buddhas, Dynegy, in your eye, as the Japanese say is in Sanskrit, is Maha Varro O'Connor Buddha, who represents the basic energy of the universe, the great sun Buddha. He's in the middle. He has around him Mummy, Taba, Shabbir Rudner, some barber and some barber and a megacity, and they're all a beautiful jeweled creatures in their places and you see the balanced wheel, the joyous wheel.

So this is the transformation of the rat race.

And this also is a kind of ritual ization of everyday life.

And this you see, just as the rat race has transformed into the mandala.

So far, the person who is a master of pleasure.

The little things of everyday life are likewise ritualized.

Not because somebody is compulsive. You know, all the dishes must be without spot. Give me my magnifying glass.

Not that, but that doing any simple action with delight looks ritualistic.

If you watch a very skilled craftsman at work or a surgeon or a good dentist. Or a shoemaker or a potter who thoroughly loves the work. You'll notice that caressing hands, the delight, the dance they do. To do this thing, the doing of it is more important than the dunning of it.

You see, they look ritualistic in their action.

It's a ceremony and you think he's worshiping some kind of a God. That's because he's turned the rat race into the mundane. So you can do that with everything if you're not in a hurry. And you're not in a hurry if you know there's nowhere to go. I mean, they said he has the end of the line and there's a place called death and a tombstone on it says, well, he. He did it once. We write his name on the tombstone.

That's the end. That's where you're going. If you look at it from that point of view. But if you're going here.

And you've already arrived. What is proper behavior for a Buddha?

Supposing you are as rich as rich can be. And you are. The whole universe is yours.

Supposing you got all the time you need when you do have now is enough of what what what what to do, obviously.

Well, of course, live it up.

Take delight.

In all the ordinary things that are to be done.

Instead of trying to get them out of the way so that you could do something else which is supposed to be better or more rewarding. You'll see the reward is everywhere because there's no hurry. In this way now, the world is transformed in this way. You might have a utopia. Because as Gary Snyder, my friend, has put it, there is no possibility of your doing anything effective.

To.

Save this world from an terrifying ecological disaster unless, you know it doesn't need to be done. If you can see the dissolution of this world, the end of the human race. As the Kali yoga that Hindus talk about, the cosmic cataclysms, which comes at the end of every four million two hundred, three hundred and twenty thousand years, every culpa and realize that this ecological disaster is simply the periodical death of a world system.

And therefore, there's nothing especially tragic about it.

It's the way things go. Just like the death of every individual. You would think that such a realization would make a person cold, indifferent. But no. If you understand that and you're not fighting it, you are not afraid of it. And if you're not afraid of it, you can handle it.

But you have to show that the preservation of the planet and of life is not a frantic duty.

It's a pleasure.

And you won't convince everybody at the pleasure if you go and scream in the streets. Start throwing rocks.

Then you are saying it's your duty. To whom? To whom do we owe this duty? Do you owe it to yourself? Well, that depends what you want to do.

Do you want to go on chasing on the wheel? Do you want to think that by a fierce political action we will have a better world to live in and we'll all be so happy?

Five year plans and then another five year plan. And then after another five year plan, like my music teacher when I was a child, it's clear scale is ridiculous.

Diddy and you know, she said not once more applied, played against it. Now, just once more or once more, but a little about, you know, horrors. But you can find or realize the great life.

If you're not looking for.

Religion of No Religion

Journey to India

Now then, we have to get on to Buddhism. And in order to introduce Buddhism, it's necessary to remember the whole background of the world view of India. In other words, what we're going to study first of all to understand Buddhism, is Indian cosmology. Just as you would have to study the cosmology of the Ptolemaic view of the world in order to understand Dante, and in order to understand lots of things about medieval Christianity. So the cosmology of the Hindus, their view of the universe, has come right into Japanese life, through Buddhism, but it antedates Buddhism. Buddhism simply adopted it as a matter of course just as now if you invented a new religion you would probably adopt because military of modern astronomy astronomy.

Well now, how does the Hindu see the world? You know there are really three great views of the world that human beings have had. And they go, one is is the Western view of the world which looks upon the world as a construct. An artifact, by analogy with ceramics and carpentry. Then there is the Hindu view of the world which is dramatic. Looks on it as a play. And then the Chinese view which is organic and looks upon the world as an organism, a body. But the Hindu view sees it as a drama. And it's simply this there is what there is and always was and always will be which is called the self. That in Sanskrit is Atman, A.T.M.A.N. And the ATMAN is also called Brahman. Brahman from the root Bre to grow to expand to. Well, is that actually related to our word breath.

So, Brahman the self, according to The Hindu view, plays hide and seek with itself for always and always and always. How far out, how lost can you get? So here each one of us according to The Hindu idea is the Godhead armed purpose getting lost. For the fun of it. And how terrible it can get at times, but won't it be nice when you wake up? That's sort of the basic idea and I found it's an idea that any child can understand. It has great

simplicity and great elegance. Now in part of this cosmology we must understand another feature of this conception of the universe. Not only you remember now the Kalpas the periods of time the yugas, the qualities of the time through which the universe goes, but there's the final thing which are called the six worlds, or the six paths of life. And this is a very important for Buddhism although comes from indoors and is represented in what is called the poverty Bhava, means becoming B.H.A. V.A. chakra C.A.J. K R A means wheel the wheel of becoming, the wheel of birth and death.

And it has six divisions. It has the top people and the bottom people the top people are called Deva D.E.V.A. The bottom people are called Naraka, N-A-R-A-K-A. Devas are angels and they are the people who are the Supremes spiritual successors. The Naraka are tormented in purgatory. And they are the Supremes spiritual failures. They are the Poles, the happiest people and the saddest people. Then in between there comes the world of the pretas. Next to the narakas, next to the purgatory. The pretas are frustrated spirits who have tiny mouths and enormous balance huge appetites but very very limited means of satisfying. Then next, they come between the narakas and the Davis at the top. Next up from the predators are the human beings, and they are supposed to hold in middle position in the six worlds. Then you go up from the human beings to the Devas and then you start coming down again the next world is called the Asura. And those are the wrathful spirits, the personification of storm and all the anger and violence of nature.

Next down is animals, coming between the asura and the purgatory is again. Now all these needn't be taken literally they are different modellers of the human mind. We are in the narrow world when we are frustrated and in torment when we are merely chronically frustrated, we are in the pressure world when we are in the state of economically even mindedness, we are in the human world. When we are deliriously happy, we are in the Deva world. When we are furious, we are in the Asura world and when we are done we are in the animal world. So these are all model it is. And it will be said now. This is terribly important to understand Buddhism. Because the better you get the. The more you go up to the Deva world the worse you get the more you go down to the knockout world but everything that goes up has to come down.

So you can't improve yourself, indefinitely. If you improve yourself beyond a certain limit you simply start to get worse, like when you make a knife to sharp, it begins to wear away. So the Buddha-hood, or liberation, enlightenment, is no place on the wheel. Unless it might be the center. By ascending by becoming better in tie yourself to the wheel by gold chains, by retrogressing and becoming worse you tie yourself to the wheel with iron chains. But the Buddha is one who gets rid of the chains altogether. And so this will explain why Buddhism, unlike Judaism and unlike Christianity, is not very very frantically concerned with being good. It is concerned with being wise. It is concerned with being compassionate. A little different from being good. With having tremendous sympathy and understanding and respect for all the ignorant people who don't know that they're it, but who are playing the very far out game of being you and I.

And so this is why every Hindu greets his brother not by shaking hands but by putting his hands together and bowing. This is why the Japanese bow to each other basically. This is why Buddhist rituals are full of the bowing gesture. Because you are honoring the self playing the roles of all the people around you and all the more honor is due, when the self has forgotten what it's doing. And is therefore in a very mature way.

Now, that is a basic Hindu view of the world. That's the cosmology which goes along with Buddhism. According to taste, temperament, tradition, popular belief and so on, there is this additional idea that when the the Lord, the Self, pretends that it's each of us it first of all pretends that it is something called the jivatman. The Atman, the self, pretends to be an individual so called a jivatman. And the jivatman reincarnates through a whole series of bodies. Life after life after life, and according to what is called karma. Karma it literally means doing. The law of doing whereby acts occur in a series. And they are linked with each other in an unbreakable chain. So everybody's Karma is the life course that he will work out through maybe innumerable lifetimes. I'm not going into that because a lot of Buddhists don't believe that. You will find that the Zen people, for example, are quite divided on this. They will say no we don't believe literally in reincarnation. That after your funeral you know you will suddenly become somebody different living somewhere else. They will say reincarnation means this. That if you, sitting here now, are really convinced

that you are the same person that walked in at the door half an hour ago, you're being reincarnated. If you're liberated, you'll understand that you're not. The past doesn't exist. The future doesn't exist. There is only the present, and that's the only real you that there is. The Zen master Dogen put it this way. He said, 'Spring does not become summer. First there is summer. Then there is spring. Each season stays in its own place.' And so in the same way, the you of yesterday does not become the you of today. T S. Eliot has the same idea in his poem The Four Quartets, where says 'When you settle down on the train to read your newspaper, you are not the same person who a little while ago left the platform.' If you think you are, you are linking your moment up in a chain, and this is what binds you, to the wheel of birth and death. But when you know that every moment at which you are is the only moment... This comes into Zen, a Master will say to somebody, 'Get up and walk across the room.' And he comes back and says 'Where are your footprints?' So where are you? Who are you? When we are asked who you are, we usually give a sort of recitation of a history. 'Well I'm so and so, I was given this name by my parents, I went to such and such a college, I've done these things in my profession, and I produce a little biography. Buddha says forget it, that's not you. That's some story. That's all gone, that's all past. I want to see the real you you are now. But nobody knows who that is, you see, because we don't know ourselves except through listening to our records, and consulting our memories. But then there's a real you and that again leads us back to this question. Who are you, that is the real you? Which will see how they play with this in Zen by the koans to get you to come out of your shell and find out who you really are.

Well now, whereas in India this worldview is tied up with a whole culture, involving every circumstance of everyday life. Hinduism is not a religion in the same sense that say being in a Episcopalian, or even a Roman Catholic. Hinduism is not a religion. It is a culture. In this respect it's more like Judaism than Christianity. Because a person is still recognisable as a Jew even though they don't go to synagogue. Because as the certain cultural things that Jewish people who come of a line of Jewish parents people, who have been practicing Jews, they still continue certain ways of doing things; certain mannerisms certain attitudes and so, they are cultural Jews instead of religious Jews. Now Hinduism is the same sort of thing it is a religion-

culture. And so it involves living in India really to be a Hindu. Because of the differences of climate, the differences of Arts and Crafts, technology, you can't be a Hindu in the full sense, in Japan or in the United States.

So what is Buddhism? Buddhism is Hinduism stripped for export. Now the Buddha, was a reformer you might say. In the the highest sense of a reformer someone who wants to go to the original form. Or to reform it for the needs of a certain time. The word Buddha is a title, not a proper name, same way as Christ means the annointed, and it's not the surname of Jesus. So Buddha is not the surname of Guatama. It means the one who is awakened. From the root in Sanskrit Budha, B.U. D.H, to know. The man who woke up, who discovered who he really was. Now the thing that where in that crucial point where in Buddhism differs from Hinduism, is taht it doesn't say who you are. It has no idea, no concept, and I emphasize the word Idea and Concept. It has no idea and no concept of God, because Buddhism is not interested in concepts, it's interested in direct experience and direct experience only.

So from the Buddhist standpoint, all concepts are wrong. Just in the same way that nothing is really what you say that. This—is this a stool? It isn't now, it's a waste basket. It's now a drum. What is that thing? See? It is what it does, see? Anything you can use it for is what it is. So if you have a rigid idea that it's a stool and you can only sit on it and you kind of stuck. But if it's all these other things as well then you suddenly see that anything can be everything. So, in the same way, Buddhism does not define and say what you really are is something because it would say that if you believe that you got stuck with an idea and you're clinging onto it for spiritual security. So a lot of people say 'Well I like to have a religion because it gives me something to hold onto.' Buddhists would say 'Ah, cut that stuff.' It so long as you hold on to something you don't have religion. You only you only really there when you let go of everything. And you don't depend on any fixed idea any belief for your sanity or happiness. So you would think Buddhism is very destructive, because it breaks down—it doesn't believe in God, it doesn't believe in an immortal soul, it doesn't believe in. Doesn't seek any solace in any idea of life after death. It absolutely faces, the fact of the transiency of life, there's nothing you can hold on to so man let go. Because there's no wonder hold on to anything anyway.

So Buddhism is the discipline of doing that. But if you do that, you see, you'll discover something much better than anybody else who has a belief. Because you've got the real thing, and you can't say what it is. They say in Zen that if you were enlightened in Buddhism we were like a dumb man who has had a wonderful dream. That is to say when you had a wonderful dream you want to tell everybody what it is but you can't let your dumb if you can't speak. So that the real thing in Buddhism which they call nirvana which is a sort of the equivalent to moksha, means blow out. Here. You know, a sigh of relief. Because if you hold your breath, you lose. To hold on to yourself you hold on to life or breath is the spirit you hold on to God Rock of Ages cliff and me are let make going on do you. It's all dead, becomes just a rock, just an idle. But let go, breathe out, and you get your breath back, that's Nirvana. So the Buddhist idea, is in doctrine the highest negativism. The characterize the ultimate reality as Sunya, you know, which means emptiness. In Japanese Ku, which is the character you use for the sky or the air when you get an air mail. You know to write home it will the second character is cool the air which means emptiness and they use this to translate should not or emptiness. The fundamental nature of reality, the sky. But sky you see is not negative emptiness, the sky contains all of us. It's full of everything going on but you can't put a nail in the sky and pin it down.

So in the same way Buddhism is saying, you don't need any gizmos to be in the know. You don't need a religion. We don't need any even Buddhist statues you don't need any temples. You don't need any Buddhist bond years of the rose there isn't all that jazz. But when you get to the point that you know you don't need any of those things that you don't need a religion at all, then it's fun to have one. Then as it were, you can be trusted to use rosaries and ring bells and clappers and chant sutras and that sort of thing. But those things won't help you a bit they'll just tie you up in knots, if you use them as methods of catching hold of something. So every teacher of Buddhism is a debunker. But he does it not to be a smart Alec and to show how clever he is, but out of compassion. Just as when a surgeon chops off a bad growth or dentist pulls out a rotten tooth so the Buddhist guru or surgeon is getting rid of your crazy ideas for you. Which you use to cling on to life and make it dead.

Now, there are two kinds of Buddhism. They're called Mahayana; Maha and Sanskrit word for great M-A-HA, Yana means a vehicle or conveyance. And there is Hinayana, means the little vehicle in Sanskrit H I N A means little. Only That's a term invented by the Mahayanas. For the other people and the other people don't like it they like to call themselves Therevada, T.H.E.R.A V.A.D.A, which means bad or the way para of the elders. Now, Theravada Buddhism you will find in Salon. Thailand Cambodia and generally South Asia. Mahayana, you find in it originated in northern India. And you find it in Tibet, China, Mongolia, Japan. And to some extent in Indonesia.

The Mahayana is what we're finding here. All the sects of Japanese Buddhism are Mahayana. And what's the great difference between these two schools. The Theravada is very strict. It's a way for monks essentially, rather than laymen. And it is, you see there are many ways of living Buddhism. It will take me some time to show you this. The Theravada Buddhists are trying to live without desires. To have no need for wives or girls or husbands or boyfriends. Not to kill anything at all. To live the strictest vegetarian way and to strain your water so that you even don't eat any insects, little insects with it. And to this very strict way, and meditate all the time and eventually attain Nirvana which will involve your total disappearance from the manifested world.

Mahayana feeling is that that is a dualistic point of view. You don't need to get away from this world to experience Nirvana, because Nirvana is what there is. It's here, it's now. So the ideal person of Mahayana is called a bodhisattva This is originally meant somebody on the way to becoming a Buddha but in my younger it has a different meaning. It means somebody who has become a Buddha, but has gone back into the world. Out of it in the spirit of compassion. To help all other beings to become awakened. Well now, that's an endless task, it's like filling a well with snow, you know, put snow into a well, it never fills up.

So when it does Zen monastery, they said their homage to the Buddha the Dharma, that say the Buddha's doctrine, or method and the Sangha, the order of followers of the Buddha, and they take five hours. And one of them is however innumerable sent in beings are I vow to liberate them all. Well

so you see there is no end to that. Never Comes a time when all sentient beings are liberated. But actually from the standpoint of one who is a Buddha, he sees everybody as liberated. In other words, if I were to be a Buddha, I wouldn't say 'Now look everybody I'm a Buddha and I'm more experience than you and I know more than you and you will meet respect on that account.' On the other hand, I wouldn't I would see you all. As being exactly right where you are. All of your Buddhas, and even those of you who don't know it, it would be right for you not to know it at this moment.

In talking about Buddhism in past seminars, I explain that it's absolutely fundamental to an understanding of Buddhism to recognise that its whole method of teaching is dialectic. That is to say, it consists of a dialogue between a teacher and a student. And the method of this dialogue is called Upaya. That is to say skillful means, used by the teacher to bring about the enlightenment of the student. The word Upaya, meaning expert pedagogy in teaching, but meaning deceit when used in a political context. And since Buddhism is a dialogue, what you ordinarily understand as the teachings of Buddhism, are not the teachings of Buddhism, they are simply the opening gambit or the opening process of this dialogue. And the point being, that Buddhism is not a teaching, its essence consists in a certain kind of experience. In a transformation of consciousness which is called awakening or enlightenment, which involves our seeing through our transcending the Hoax of being a separate ego.

And so, a Buddhist does not have the same tendency that a Christian has to want to find out what his faith is by going back to the most original sources. There has always been a tendency in Christianity to ask what did Jesus really teach? What is the pure New Testament, uncorrupted by theologians and by scribes who inserted things into the mouth of the master? It does not occur to Buddhists to have this attitude. Because of this dialectic pattern. You see, when you have an acorn, if it's a lively acorn, it grows into an oak. And that's the way it should be, in other words, it should develop into something. And so, Buddhism, as it has developed since the days of the Buddha, has gone a long way. It has become sometimes more complex, sometimes more simple, but it has changed radically because the seed which the Buddha planted was alive.

Now for example, when we ask what are the Buddhist scriptures, you can get two answers to that question. In the southern school, there is a set of scriptures which are written in the Pali language, divided into three sections called the Tipitaka. Which means the three baskets. Because these palm leaf manuscripts on which the sutras were eventually written down were of course carried around in baskets, and three baskets of these palm leaf manuscript volumes comprise the Buddhist scriptures. But you must remember that in the evolution of the scriptures, of these scriptures, that the Buddha wrote nothing. Nor did his immediate disciples. That's a very important thing to remember, that all Indian scriptures were for many centuries handed down orally.

And so we have no clear guide as to their dates. Because when you hand down an oral tradition, you are not always likely to preserve certain historical landmarks. Supposing we're talking about a certain king, the name of this king will mark a historical point. But in an oral tradition, the name of the king is likely to be changed every time the story is told, to correspond to the king then reigning. So, in other words, things that do change, that have a historical rhythm, like a succession of kings they will be changed in handing down the oral tradition. But things that do not change, that is to say the essential principle of the doctrine, they won't be altered at all. So you must remember that the Buddhist scriptures were for some hundreds of years handed down orally before they were ever committed to writing and that accounts for their monotonous form. That is why everything is numbered, why there are four noble truths, eight steps of the Eightfold Path, ten fetters, five skandhas, four brahma viharas, or meditation states, and so on and so forth. Everything is put in numerical lists. So as to be memorized easily. And so there are formulae which are constantly repeated, and this is supposed to aid the memory.

Now then, it is obvious that those scriptures of the Pali canon, when you really sit down and read them, you know that what has happened here is that partly they have a certain monotony due to mnemonic aids. But also that in the course of time before they were written down, many monks spent wet afternoons adding to them, and adding things in such a style that no inspired person could ever have said them. And they made commentaries upon commentaries upon commentaries, and lots of them had no sense of

humor. I always love the passage where the Buddha is giving instructions on the art of meditation, and he's describing a number of things on which one could concentrate. And there's a commentator making little notes on this, and so when he's made his list of things on which you could concentrate, like a square drawn on the ground or the tip of your nose or a leaf or a stone or anything, and then he says or on anything and the commentator puts footnote but not any wicked thing. I mean that's that's professional clergy for you. The world over.

So, this sort of thing has obviously happened. But you must remember that this is not this accumulation, this attribution of one's own writings to the Buddha, is not done in a dishonest way. It would be dishonest today with our standards of literary historicity and correctness. It would be very wrong of me to forge a document and pretend that it was written by some very venerable person, say by Dr Suzuki or by Goethe. But, centuries ago, both in the West and in the east it was considered quite immoral to publish any book of wisdom under your own name. Because you personally were not entitled to the possession of this knowledge. And that is why you always put on any book of wisdom the name of the real author. That is to say, the person who inspired you. So in this way it is highly doubtful if the book of the wisdom of Solomon and this is not an adult for but it's perfectly certain that Solomon never wrote it. But that it was attributed to Solomon because Solomon was an archetype of the wise man. So, in the same way, when for centuries various Buddhist monks and scholars wrote all kinds of sutras, scriptures, and ascribed them to the Buddha, they were being properly modest. They were saying these doctrines are not my doctrines, they are the doctrines of— that proceed from the Buddha in me, and therefore they should be ascribed to Buddha. And so over and above the Pali canon, there is an enormous corpus of scriptures. Written originally in Sanskrit. And subsequently translated into Chinese and Tibetan. We have very inadequate manuscripts of the original Sanskrit, but we have very complete Chinese and Tibetan translations, and so it is primarily from Chinese and Tibetans sources that we have the Mahayana canon of the scriptures over and above the Theravada canon which is written in the Pali language Pali is a softened form of Sanskrit, whereas in Sanskrit one says Nirvana, in Pali one says nibanna. Sanskrit says karma, Pali says kamma. Sanskrit says the Dharma,

Pali says dhamma. Very, very similar language, but it's softer in its speech, articulation.

Now it's a general feeling among scholars of the West, that the Pali scriptures are closer to the authentic teachings of the Buddha than the Sanskrit ones. And so with our Christian background and approach to scriptures in general, the West has built up a very strong, you might say prejudice in favor of the authenticity of the Theravada tradition, as against the Mahayana tradition. Whereas the Mahayanas put it this way. They say that their most, they have a hierarchy of scriptures. One for very simple minded people. The next, they have about four grades. Going progressively to the scriptures for the most intelligent people, and they say that the Buddha preached that to his intimate disciples first. And then slowly, as he reached out from the most intimate group to others he came down to what is now the Pali canon. As the scriptures for the biggest dunderheads. But that, the ones that he preached first were not revealed until long, long after his death.

So they have no difficulty in making a consistent story about the fact that the scriptures in Sanskrit represent a level of the historical evolution of Buddhist ideas that from our point of view could not possibly have been attained in the Buddha's lifetime. But you see, they say though that learned the latest revealed was actually the first taught to the in-group.

Well, you've got to make allowances for these differences in points of view and not entirely project Western standards of historical and documentary criticism onto Buddhist scriptures because as I said, it is in the essence of Buddhism to be a developing process, because it is a dialogue. So then, you can see the initial steps of the dialogue in our earliest or presumed earliest records of Buddhism. In the four noble truths, where you have it put out that the problem which Buddhism faces is suffering. This word dukkha, which we translate suffering is the opposite of sukha. Sukha means what is sweet and delightful. Dukkha means the opposite, what is bitter and frustrating.

And Mahayans always explain that the Buddha always taught by a dialectical method. That is to say, when people were trying to make the goal of life the pursuit of sukka, that is to say the pursuit of happiness, he

counteracted this wrong view, by teaching that life is essentially miserable. When people thought for example that there is a permanent and eternal self in each one of us, and clung to that self, the Buddha, in order to counteract this one sided view taught the other extreme doctrine that there is no fixed self in us, no ego. But a Mahayanist would always say the truth is the Middle Way. Neither Suddha nor Dukkha, or neither Atman nor Anatman, self nor non-self. The whole point is like this. Once when R.H. Blythe was asked by some students do you believe in God? He answered 'If you do, I don't. If you don't, I do.' And so in the much the same way all Buddhist Pedagogics teaching is specifically addressed not to people in general, but to the individual who brings a problem. And wherever he seems to be over emphasizing things in one way the teacher overemphasizes in the opposite way so as to arrive at the Middle Way.

So then, with this emphasis on life is suffering, it's simply saying, this is the problem we're dealing with. We hurt. We human beings feel pretty unfairly treated, because we are born into a world so arranged that the price that we pay for enjoying it—that is to say, for having sensitive bodies, is that these bodies are at the same time, because they're sensitive, capable of the most excruciating agonies. And isn't that a nasty trick to play on us. What are we going to do about it? This is the problem. So then when the Buddha says the cause of suffering is desire. Trishna is our word thirst. And may perhaps be translated desire in a very general sense or perhaps better craving, clinging, grasping, something like that. He is saying now I'm going to make the suggestion. You suffer because you desire.

Now supposing then you try not to desire. And see if by not desiring you can cease from suffering. Or you can put the same thing in another way. You can say to a person it's all in your mind. There is nothing either good or ill, but thinking makes it so, and therefore if you can control your mind, you have nothing else that you need control. For example, you don't need to control the rain. If you can control your mind, if you get wet it's only your mind that makes you think it's uncomfortable to be where a person who's got good mental discipline can be perfectly happy wandering around in the rain. You don't need a fire if you've got good mind control. Because if you've got ordinary bad mind control, when it gets cold, you start shivering. That's because you're putting up a resistance to the cold, you're fighting it.

But don't fight it, relax to recover. And in other words this is a matter of mental attitude and then you'll be fine. Always control your mind. This is another way of approaching, you see.

Now then, as soon as the student begins to experiment with these things he finds out that it's not so easy as it sounds. Not only is it very difficult not to desire not only is it very difficult to control your mind but the something phony about the whole business. And this is what you're intended to discover. That namely, when you try to eliminate desire in order to escape from suffering, you desire to escape from suffering. You are desiring not to desire. In other words, I'm not limited playing with logic. I'm saying that, a person who is escaping from reality, will always feel the terror of it it. It will be like the Hound of Heaven that pursues him. And he's escaping, in a way, even when he's trying not to escape. And it was this point to see that this method of teaching was suppose to educate from you, to draw out from you, not by saying to anybody. All this in the first place but by making the experiment not to design all the experiment to control your mind thoroughly. This is the first step, you do understand this, you must go through that, or some equivalent of it, so as to come to the point where you see who are involved in a vicious circle. That in trying to control your mind, the motivation, the reason for which you were doing, is still clinging and grasping is still self-protection. You still lack of trust. And love.

So, when this is understood the student returns to the teacher and says look this is my difficulty I cannot. Eliminate desire, because that itself, my effort to do so is itself desire I cannot eliminate selfishness, because my reasons for wanting to be unselfish are selfish. As one of the Chinese Buddhist classics put it, when the wrong man uses the right means, the right means work in the wrong way. Now the right means are all the traditional disciplines. And you're going to use them so you're going to practice Zazen or whatever and make yourself into a Buddha but you see if you're not a Buddha in the first place you can't become one because you'll be the wrong man. And using the right means but because you're using them for a selfish intent or a fearful intent you're afraid of suffering and you don't like it and you want to get out of it you want to escape all these you see other motivations which frustrate the right means. So one is meant to find that out.

And so then, in the course of time when all this was totally explored by the Buddha's disciples, there developed a very evolved form of this whole technique of dialectic, which was called Madhyamika. M A D H Y A M I K A. It means the middle way, but it was a form of Buddhist practice and instruction developed by Nagarjuna. N A G A R J U N A, who lived approximately in 200 AD. Nargajuna's method, is simply an extension and drawing to a logical conclusions of the method of dialogue that already existed except that Nagarjuna took it to a to an extreme. And his method is simply this: To undermine, to cast doubts on, any proposition to which his student will cling. To destroy all intellectual formulations, and all concepts of the nature of reality or the nature of the self whatsoever. Now you might think that that was simply a parlor game, a little intellectual exercise, but if you engaged in it you would find it was absolutely terrifying. And you would feel yourself brought very close to the verge of madness. Because a skillful teacher in this method. Reduces you to a shuddering state of total insecurity. I have watched this being done among people you would consider perfectly ordinary normal Westerners who thought they were getting involved in just a nice abstract intellectual discussion. But then finally the teacher as the process goes on, discovers in the course of the discussion what are the fundamental premises to which every one of his students is clinging. What is the foundation of sanity? What do you base your life on? And when he has found out what that is for each student, he destroys it. He shows you that you can't found a way of life on that. That it leads you into all sorts of inconsistencies and foolishness. And the student turns back to the teachers as well it's all very well for you to pull out all the carpets from under my feet. What would you propose instead? And the teacher says I don't propose anything. He's no fool. He doesn't put up something to be knocked down. But you see, here are you.. And you if you don't put up something to be knocked down, then you can play ball with the teacher. And you may say, I don't need to, then on the other hand the something nagging you inside telling you you do. And so you go and play ball with him and he keeps knocking it down whatever you propose whatever you cling to. And this exercise produces in the individual, a real traumatic state. People get acute anxiety. And you wouldn't think so because it's just seemed as if it were nothing more than a discussion on a very intellectual and abstract level. But when it really gets down to it and you find that you don't have a single concept you can really trust, it's the

heebie-jeebies. But it is, you are preserved from insanity. By the discipline. By the atmosphere set up by the teacher and by the fact that he seems perfectly happy. Without anything in the way of a concept to cling on to, and student looks at him and says he seems to be all right maybe. Maybe I can be all right too. Know this gives a certain confidence that feeling that all is not man because the teacher in his own way is perfectly normal.

The Middle Way

I want to start by reemphasizing the point that what are called the religions of the east, the ones we're discussing Hinduism, Buddhism and Chinese Taoism, they don't involve that you believe in anything specific. And they don't involve any idea obedience to commandments from above. And they don't involve any conformity to a specific ritual, although they do have rituals, but their rituals vary from country to country and from time to time. Their objective is always, not ideas, not doctrines, but a method, a method for the transformation of consciousness. That is to say, for a transformation of your sensation of who you are, and I emphasize the word sensation because it's the strongest word we have, for feeling directly. When you put your hand on the corner of a table, you have a very definite feeling. And when you are aware of existing, you also have a definite feeling. But in the view of these methods or disciplines, the ordinary person's definite feeling of the way he exists is a hallucination. To feel yourself as a separate ego. A source of action and awareness that is entirely separate and independent from the rest of the world, somehow locked up inside a bag of skin, is seen as a hallucination. That you are not a stranger in the earth, that comes into this world either as a result of a natural fluke or being a sort of spirit that comes from somewhere else altogether.

But that you in your fundamental existence, you are the total energy that constitutes this universe. Playing that it's you. Playing that it's this particular organism, and even playing that it's this particular person. Because the fundamental game of the world is a game of hide and seek. That is to say that the colossal reality, the energy that is everything, that is a unitary energy, that is one, plays at being many. At manifesting itself in all these particulars, that we call you and you and you and you and you and you and you and you and this and that and all around us. And it's

fundamentally a game. And you can say that this goes really for all the systems that I'm talking about. It's the basis of Hinduism of Buddhism and of Taoism, this intuition.

Now today we're going to talk about Buddhism. Buddhism is an offshoot of Hinduism. You could in a way call it a reform of Hinduism, or Hinduism stripped for export. It originates in northern India, close to the area that is now Nepal, shortly after 600 Hundred B.C. there was a young prince by the name of Guatama Siddhartha, who became the man we call the Buddha/ Now the word Buddha is not a proper name, it's a title. And it's based on the Sanskrit root Budh. B.U. D.H.. Which means to be awake. And so you could say the Buddha is the man who woke up. From the dream, of life as we ordinarily take it to be. And found out. Who he was, who he is. It's curious, that this title was not something new. There was already in the whole complex of Hinduism the idea of Buddhas. Of Awakened people. And curiously, they are ranked higher than Gods. Because in the view of Hinduism even the gods or the Angels the Devas, are still-bound. On the wheel of the the sort of squirrel cage of going round and round and round in the pursuit of success. And the idea is that if you pursue something that you can call success, pleasure good, virtue which it originally of course means strength, magical power. All these positive things. You are under illusion because the positive cannot exist without the negative. To be, you only know what to be is by contrast with not to be, so is if we say now there is. A coin in the left hand, there is no coin in the right. And from this you get the idea of to be and not to be. And you can't have the one without the other, so if you tried to pursue, to gain, the positive. And to deny get rid of the negative, it's as if you were trying to arrange everything in this room so that it was all up. And nothing was down. You can't do it, you set yourself an absolutely insoluble problem. Because the basis of life is spectrum. Consider the spectrum of colors. When you think of a spectrum in what form do you think of it most people think of it as a ribbon. With red at one end and purple at the other. But the spectrum is actually a circle. Because purple is the mixture. Of red and blue. It goes right round. And so in this way, all sensation, all feeling, all experience whatsoever, is moving through spectra. You don't only have the spectrum of color you have a spectrum of sound. You have various complex spectra of texture, of smell, of taste. And you are constantly operating through all the possible variations of

experience. And it implies that you can't know one end of the spectrum without also knowing the other. So if you wanted, say your favorite color is red. And you wanted only red. And you had to exclude therefore blue and purple. Without blue and purple, you can't have red. Behind of course, all the various colors in the spectrum is the white light. And behind everything that we experience all our various sensations of sound, of color, of shape, of touch, there's the white light. And I'm using the phrase the white light, rather symbolically I don't mean it literally. But there is common to all sensations what you might call the basic sense. And if you explore back into your sensations and reduce them all to the basic sense you're on your way. To reality. To what underlies everything, to what is the ground of being, the basic energy. And to the extent that you realize this and know that you are it. You transcend, you overcome, you surpass the illusion. That you are simply. John Doe. Mary Smith. Or what have you.

So then, the Buddha, as the man who woke up, is regarded as one Buddha, among a potentiality of myriads of Buddhas. Everybody can be a Buddha, everybody has in himself the capacity to wake up from the illusion. Of being simply this separate individual. The Buddha made his doctrine very easy to understand, because in those days there wasn't very much writing being done and people committed things to memory, and so he put his doctrine or method, in various formulas, which were very easy to remember, and I'm going to explain it in those terms so that you can remember it just as well. He of course practiced the various disciplines that were offered in the Hinduism of his time. But he found in a certain way that they had become unsatisfactory. Because they had over emphasized asceticism. Had over emphasized, putting up with as much pain as you can. There was a feeling, you see, that if the problem of life is pain. Let us suffer. And this is the root of the ascetics you see, who lie on beds of nails, who hold a hand up forever and ever and ever, who eat only one banana a day who renounce sex, who do all these weird things, because they feel that if they head right into pain. And don't become afraid of it but suffer as much pain as possible, they will by this method overcome the problem of pain. And they will set themselves free from anxiety. There's a certain sense in that, as you can obviously see. Supposing for example, you have absolutely no fear of pain. You have no anxieties, you have no hang ups.

How strong you would be. Nobody could stop you. You would have ultimate courage.

But the Buddha was very subtle, he is really the first historical psychologist. The great psychologist, psychotherapist, he is very subtle, because he saw, that a person who is fighting pain. Who is trying to get rid of pain, is still really fundamentally afraid of it. And therefore the way of asceticism is not right, equally the way of hedonism, of seeking pleasure is not right.

So the Buddhist doctrine is called the Middle Way. Which is neither ascetic nor hedonistic. So it summed up in what are called the four Noble Truths. And the first is called Dukha. Dukha, means suffering in a very generalized sense. You could call it chronic frustration. And it is saying that life as lived by most people is dukha. Is an attempt in other words to solve insoluble problems. Try to draw a square circle you can't because the problem itself is meaningless. Try to arrange the things in this room so that they're all up and none of them down. It is meaningless, such a problem cannot ever be solved. So try to have light without dark or dark without light. It can never be solved. So the attempt to solve problems that are basically insoluble and to work at it through your whole life that is dukha.

Now he went on to analyze this that there are what we call three signs of being. The first is Dukha itself, frustration. The second is Anitya, and this means; the letter A in Sanskrit at the beginning of a word is often the equivalent of our 'non' So nitya means permanent, anitya means impermanent, that every manifestation of life is impermanent. And therefore our quest to make things permanent, to straighten everything out, to get it fixed, is an impossible and insoluble problem and therefore we experience nuclear look or this sense of fundamental pain and frustration as a result of trying to make things permanent. And the third sign of being is called an anatman. Now you know from my talk on Hinduism that the word atman means self. Anatman means therefore non-self. That there is in you no real ego.

Now I've explained that already I've explained in talking about Hinduism that the idea of the ego. Is a social institution. It has no physical reality. It is simply the ego is your symbol of yourself. Just as the word water is a noise which symbolizes a certain liquid reality, so the idea of the ego, the role you

play, who you are is not the same as your living organism. Your ego has absolutely nothing to do with the way you color your eyes, shape your body, circulate your blood. That's the real you. But it's certainly not your ego. Because you don't even know how it's done. From the standpoint of your conscious attention. So the idea of anatman is firstly that the ego isn't real, there isn't one. Now then, this then as the first truth. There is the situation that we have of frustration because we are fighting, the changingness of things. And because we don't realize that the ego the I is unreal. The second of the four noble truths is then called Trishna. Trishna is a Sanskrit word again and is the root of our word thirst. And it's usually translated desire. But it is better translated clinging, grabbing. Or there's an excellent modern American Slang a word, hang-up. That is exactly what Trishna is, the hang-up. Trishna now is clutching. As for example what we call smother love. When a mother is so afraid that her children may get into trouble. That she protects them excessively and as a result of this, prevents them from growing. Or when when lovers cling to each other excessively, and have to sign documents that they will curse and swear to love each other always, they are in a state of Trishna. And this is the same thing as holding on to yourself so tightly that you strangle yourself.

Now or so the second truth then about Krishna is that the cause of Dukha is Trishna. Clinging is what makes suffering. If you don't recognize that this whole world is a phantasmagoria. And in amazing illusion. A weaving of smoke. And you try to hold onto it you see, then you start suffering, seriously suffering. Trishna is in turn based upon avidya. The same negative. Vidya. From the root vid means knowledge as in the Latin video and the English vision. Therefore is ignorance. Good gnosis. Means of course, to know, knowledge is the same thing as good Gnosis in Greek. To know so this is not to know, to ignore. To overlook.

And I explained in the first talk in this series how we ignore all kinds of things because we notice only what we think noteworthy. And therefore our vision of everything is highly selective, we pick out certain things, and say that's what's there, just as we select and notice the figure rather than the background, sometimes I draw this on the blackboard. Now ask the question, What have I drawn? What would you say? What have I drawn? The circle and the other suggestions Oh. Yeah you're getting the point. I've

drawn a wall with a hole in it, you see, but ordinarily. [laughs] You've been reading my books.

So but ordinarily people see the ball the circle the ring or whatever and never think of the background. Because they ignore the background. Just as one thinks that you can have pleasure without pain. You want pleasure, the figure, and don't realize that pain is the background. So avidya is this state of restricted consciousness, restricted attention. That moves through life unaware of the fact that to be implies not to be. And vice versa.

So now the third noble truth is called Nirvana. This word means blow out. Nir is a negative word again like A. Vanna is blowing. So it's a kind of out-blowing. Now in breathing you know that breath is life. The Greek word, you may pronounce it pneuma or pneuma, is the same as spirit. And Spirit means breath in the book of Genesis when God had made the clay figurine that was later to be Adam he breathed the breath of life into its nostrils. And it became alive, because life is breath. But now, if you hold your breath, you lose it, he that would save his life will lose it. So Breathe in, Breathe in, Breathe In, get as much air as you can and Trishna cling. When you lose it.

So Nirvana means breathe out. Phew, what a relief that was. The sigh of relief, let it go. Because it will come back to you if you let it go. But if you don't let it go, you'll just suffocate. So a person in the state of nirvana is what we might call a blown out person. Like blow your mind. Let go, don't cling, and then you're in the state of nirvana. And I reemphasize the point. This is not I'm not preaching see not saying this is what you ought to do and simply pointing out a state of affairs that is so. There's no moralism in this whatsoever, it's simply pointing out like if you put your hand into the fire you'll get burned. You can get burned if you want to. That's OK but if you know the so happens that you don't want to get burned. And you don't put your hand in the fire. So in the same way if you don't want to be in a state of anxiety all the time. And again I emphasize if you like to be anxious, it's perfectly alright. See Buddhism never hurries anyone on, they say you've got all eternity through which to live in various forms. And therefore you don't have just one life in which you've got to avoid eternal damnation. You can go running around the wheel in the rat race and play

that game just as long as you want to so long as you think it's fun. But if the comes a time when you don't think it's fun, you don't have to do it.

So I wouldn't say to anyone who disagrees with me and who says, 'Well I think we ought to engage the forces of evil in battle and put this world to right' and so on and so forth and arrange everything in this world so that it's all up. Try it, please, it's perfectly OK to go on doing that.

But if you see that it's futile, then you can let go. Don't try to cling. Relax.

And if you do that, you're in the state of nirvana. And you become a Buddha. And of course it means that you become a rather astonishing person. You may of course be subtle about it and make like you're a very ordinary person. So that you don't, get people mixed up. And so in Buddhism the Buddha explained that his doctrine, his method, was a raft. It's sometimes called a yana, the word y-a-n-a, yana, means a vehicle a conveyance. And when you cross a river on a raft, and you get to the other shore, you don't pick up the raft and carried on your back you leave it behind. But people who are what I would call hooked on religion, are always on the raft. They are going back and forth, back and forth, back and forth on the raft, so that clergyman tends to turn into a ferryman who is always on the raft and never gets over to the other shore himself.

Now something to be said for that because how we going to get the raft back to the first shore to bring over the other people see somebody has to volunteer to take the back journey. But he must be awfully careful to realise that the real objective is to get the people across and set them free. If you dedicate yourself to ferrying people across. Don't ask them to come back on the raft with you. Because you get overcrowded and people will think that the raft is the goal rather than the other shore. So when I find this in in actual practice that when clergyman. Do not ever ask for money, and it's all right, you know like a doctor who simply charges a fee says, 'You come to me you pay me so much.' But the clergyman says he doesn't say pay me so much he says 'We would like your pledge your voluntary contribution.' You see, then nobody knows what to give you.

As the idea of the rot now then the fourth noble truth is called Marga. This word means 'path'. And. The way of Buddhism is often called the Noble Eightfold Path. Because there are eight. Phases I won't say steps because

they're not sequential. And samyak is a very curious phrase. [It] doesn't mean right in our sense of correct some is the same really as our word sum total complete. All inclusive. We might say we might use the word integrated as when we say a person has integrity. That every person has integrity we mean is all of a piece. He's not divided against himself. So in this sense of Samyak. Dirshi. This is related to the word. Darshan. Which means a point of view, or viewing when you go to visit a great guru or teacher you have that you look at [him]. And you offer your reverence to. Many senses of it but it means simply 'to view' Look at the view. So the summing up Darshan is the complete view. For example let's take the constellation called the Big Dipper. We look at it from a fairly restricted zone in space. And it always seems whatever the season of the year, because we're so far away from it that the stars in the Big Dipper in the same position. But imagine looking at it from somewhere else in space altogether and those stars would not look like a Dipper. They would be in another position.

Now then, what is the true position of those stars? Don't you see, there isn't one? Because wherever you look for position of hers. You could say that the true situation of those stars is how they are looked at from all points of view all possible points of view, inside the constellation looking outwards, outside the constellation looking inwards, from everywhere and everywhere. But you see, there is no such thing as the truth. And the world, in other words, is not existing independently of those who witness it. Because the world is precisely the relationship between the world and its witnesses. And so if there are no eyes, in this world the sun doesn't make any light. Nor do the stars.

So what is? is a relationship. You can, for example, prop up two sticks by leaning them against each other and they will stand. But only by depending on each other. Take one away and the other falls. So, in Buddhism it is taught that everything in this universe depends on everything else. That we have a kind of a huge network and this is called the doctrine of mutual interdependence. All of it hangs on you. And you can on all of it. Just as the two sticks support each other. And this is conveyed in a symbol which is called Indra's net. Imagine a multidimensional spider's web. In the early morning, covered with dew drops. And every drop contains the reflection of

all the other do drops. And in each reflected you drop the reflections of all the other do drops in that reflection and so at infinite. That is the Buddhist conception of the of the universe in an image. The Japanese call that jijimuge. Ji. Means a thing event. A happening. So. Between happening and happening. There is no gap. In separation. Jijimuge.

Now so the first phase of the Eightfold Path has to do with one's view understanding of the world. The second phase has to do with action. How you act. Buddhist idea of ethics is based on expediency. If you are engaged in the way of liberation. And you want to clarify your consciousness. Doing that is inconsistent with certain kinds of action. So every Buddhist makes five vows. Five precepts. And you may perhaps have heard the Buddhist formula of taking what is called pancha sila [sic] five precepts. And they take what are called Sana the three refuges and the five precepts the refuges are the Buddha. The Dharma, the doctrine and the Sangha, the fellowship of all those who are on the way. So, the priest, the bhikku, the Buddhist monk. And the laypeople will chant the formula [sings] Those are the three refuges the border the Dharma and the Sangha. Then they take the five precepts. [sings] So they take these five precepts but are they part of. I undertake the precept to abstain from taking life. Adinadana. I undertake the precept to abstain from taking what is not given. Come as a mature heart. I undertake the precept to abstain from exploiting the passions. Of other I undertake the precept to abstain from falsifying speech. So that I marry a magical mother Tana I undertake the precept to abstain from being intoxicated by Sora, Mariya and much of a mother tongue or whatever they were.[laughs] I presume tardy which is alcohol. I don't know I don't know what else it was nobody does know. Because you see if you start killing people. Or taking life you're in trouble you set up an opposition and you've got to become involved in taking care of it. If you start stealing you worry people you upset people's orientation in life because if you suddenly come into the back home for dinner and find somebody stolen your table, where you going to serve dinner? If you exploited your passions it means that when you are when you feel bored, and somehow that life is a little bit empty, you say well our what are we going to do this evening let's go and get stuffed. The A lot of people who suffer from the the city are trying to simply fill their empty psyche by stuffing themselves with food was the wrong cure.

So, likewise Musavada, if you start telling lies to everybody you know what happens when you start telling lies you have to tell extra lies to cover up the first one and you get into the most hopelessness understanding, speech collapses. And of course, the intoxication is the same problem as the exploitation of the passions. So there's a purely kind of, practical, expedient utilitarian approach to morals. There's another side to this, which doesn't enter into the into the precepts, which I will explain later.

So, that's the third phase of the Eightfold Path, then, now the second phase then, the third thing is has to do with your mind, with your state of consciousness. And this has to do with what we would ordinarily call meditation. There are the two final, the seventh and eighth aspects. Of the part. I called Samyak Samadhi and Samyak Sriti. Sriti means recollection. That's the best English word for it. Now do you understand the word recollect. Is to gather together what has been scattered. What is the opposite of remember. Obviously dismember. What has been chopped up. And scattered becomes really remembered. So in the Christian scheme do this in remembrance of me. You see the Christ has been sacrificed. Chopped up. But the mass is celebrated in remembrance. One of the old litigious says the wheat which has been scattered all over the hills, and grows up, is gathered again into the bread. Remembered. Go back to your Hindu basis. The world is regarded as the Dismemberment of the Self, the Brahman, the Godhead. The one is dismembered into the many. So remembrance, is realizing again that each single member of the many is really the one. So that's recollection. You can think of it too in another way and it's really the same way if you think it through I'm going to leave you with a few puzzles. So that you can think them through and I want to explain. That Another way is to be recollected. Is to be completely here and now, are you here and now? Are you really here? There was a wise old boy who used to give lectures on these things, and he would get up and not say a word and he would just look at the audience. And he'd examine every person individually. And they're all start feeling uncomfortable. He wouldn't say anything, he'd look at them all. And then he had sudden he'd yell 'Wake up!' You're all asleep. And if you don't wake up I won't give you any lecture. Are you here recollected. See most people aren't there bothering about yesterday and wanting what they're going to do tomorrow. And I and all here that's a definition of sanity, to be all there.

So to be recollected, is to be completely alert. Available for the present. Because that's the only place that you are ever going to be in. Yesterday doesn't exist, tomorrow never comes. There is only today. A great Sanskrit sort of invocation says 'Look to this day, for it is life. In its brief because lie all the realities of our existence. Yesterday is but a memory. Tomorrow is only a vision. Look well then to this day. Such is the salutation of the dawn.'

So Smriti means then, recollected this in the sense of being all here. In the sense that this is the only only where there is. Then beyond that comes Samadhi. Again, notice the presence of this word S.A.M. Sam. Somebody who is. Integrated consciousness in which there is no further separation between the know and the know the subject and the object. You are what you know. Now we think, in the ordinary way, that we are the witnesses of a constantly changing panorama of experience. From which we as the knowers of this in a way stand aside. And watch it. We think of our minds as a kind of tablet upon which experience writes a record and the tablet is always there. Although the experience goes by. And eventually the experience by writing so much on the tablet wears it out. It's all scratched away and you die.

But actually, if you will investigate this and you have to experiment on this because I cannot explain it to you in words you can only find it out for yourself, there is no difference between the knower and the known. When you say, I see a sight. I feel a feeling you are using redundant language. I see implies the sight, I feel implies the feeling. Do you hear sounds? That you just hear or you can say there are sounds. Either one will do. So you will find, if you thoroughly investigate the process of experiencing, that the experiencing is the same as the experiencer. And this is the state of samadhi. I put it originally in this form, that the organism and the environment are a single behavioral process. So likewise is the knower and the known. So you as someone who is aware, and all that you are aware of, is one process. That is the state of samadhi. And you get to that state, by the practice of meditation. Everybody Buddha figure practically is seen in the sitting posture of meditation. Which is sitting down quietly, and being aware of all that goes on without comment. Without thinking about it. And when you stop categorising, verbalizing, talking to yourself, inside your

head, naturally, the separations between for example no unknown self and other simply vanish. Can you point to the difference between my five fingers? Where will you put your finger if you want to point to the difference? You see the idea of difference is an abstraction. It just isn't there. In the physical world. Of course, that's not saying that the fingers are joined like ducks claws with the web. But that it's just that. They're not the same, that's an idea, they're not different, that's an idea. And these ideas. That just aren't here see. You can't point to it, can't put your finger on it. Get down to the state of affairs where you see the world free from concepts. That's what but it's mean by void, and they say the world is basically, they use the phrase Sunya. That has a meaning of like empty, void, everything is sunya. This has certainly also the meaning of of a nature of transience gotten basically it means you can't catch the world in a conceptual net. Just if you try to catch water in a net it all slips through. If you try to tie up water in a paper package or grab it in your hands it all flows through.

So, sunya doesn't really mean that the world itself, that the energy of the world is nothing at all. It means that no concept of it is valid. You cannot make any one idea or belief or doctrine or system or theory tie the thing up. So, if you go through this, and you get completely blown out. And released in or in the state of nirvana. For no reason that anybody can explain it in just as for example as I pointed out when you see that you can't change yourself you can't lift yourself up by our own bootstraps you then get a new access of psychic energy. So in exactly the same way when you get to the state of Nirvana, there wells up from within you what the Buddhists call Corona or compassion. The sense that you aren't different from everybody else, everybody else's is suffering is you are suffering. And so this tremendous sense of solidarity with all other beings arising. So that he who reaches Nirvana, doesn't as it were, withdraw into a sort of isolated piece, but is always coming back into the world into the difficulties into the problems of life. In compassion for everyone else. You can't be saved alone. Because you're not alone.

[You've been listening to following the middle way with Alan Watts from the Alan Watts radio series number six on Buddhism. For information on how to obtain the radio series on cassette tape call one eight hundred nine hundred nine to eight seven or you can write to the electronic University.

Two three zero nine San in Selma California nine four nine seven nine when you call or write please indicate the name of your local station that you've heard the program following the middle way from the Alan Watts radio series number six.]

Buddhism as Dialogue

Now I hope you remember that this morning, I was trying in the brief space of fifteen minutes, to give you a basic introduction to Mahayana Buddhism. The kind of Buddhism that is found in China and Japan, and the kind of Buddhism of which Zen Buddhism in particular is a subsect. And, we are rather particularly concerned with Zen, since it has had such a fundamental influence in the shaping of Japanese culture and the arts of Japan. And since we are in the course of this informal tour going to be visiting a good deal of Zen monasteries and seeing a great deal of Zen formed works of art, architecture, and so on.

So I want to lead now tonight from Buddhism in general or Mahayana Buddhism in general to Zen in particular. Now, Zen plays a little game with you. Whenever anybody like myself or Dr Suzuki talks about Zen, all the other people say because they talk about it they don't understand it. Those in the words of Lao Tzu, who know do not say those who say do not know, and yet he said that. You wrote a book of several, 80 chapters or so, to explain. The Tao, and the debt its power and. Nobody can help themselves they've got to talk human beings are a bunch of chatterboxes and when we've got something in our minds that we want to talk about we talk. Now poetry, though, is the great language, because poetry is the art of saying what can't be said. Every poet knows this. They're trying to describe the indescribable, and every poet also knows that nothing is describable. Whether you take a some sort of ineffable mystical experience at one extreme or whether you take an ordinary rusty nail at the other. Nothing is really describable. In the words of the famous count Korzybski, 'Whatever you say something is, it isn't.' We used to have a professor at Northwestern would produce a match booklet in front of his class and would say to them what is it. And they would say matchbook it he'd say No no no matchbook it is a noise is this a noise what is it. And so to answer this he'd throw it at them. That's what it is. So in this way, you see nothing can really be

described, and yet on the other hand we all know perfectly mean well what we mean when we talk. If you know, if you shared an experience with somebody else, then of course you can talk about it we can all talk about fire and air and water and wood because we know what it is, and there's no mystery. And so, in the same way, when it comes to discussing something so esoteric as Zen it can be discussed only. Then people play games with each other they play little tricks they test each other out by saying to somebody I remember when I met Paul Reps for. The first time who wrote that lovely book Zen Flesh and Zen bones, and he said to me 'Well,' he said, 'You've written quite a number of books by now you must think you're pretty fancy.' I said I haven't said a word. So this is theft is then game. And people sort of feel each other out. There's a poem which says when two Zen masters meet each other on the road they need no introduction. Thieves recognise one another instantaneously.

So now, having got that out of my chest it's to say then if I were to give you a really proper and it really hadn't truly educative talk about Zen I would gather around here and sit here and silence for five minutes and leave. And in a way this would be a much more direct exposition of it than what I'm going to do instead would talk about it only I have a feeling that you would feel that you were disappointed and somewhat cheated by this kind of behavior, if I just left and five minute silence. So then, this word Zen is Japanese way of pronouncing the Chinese word Chan, which in turn is the Chinese way of pronouncing the Sanskrit word Jana. And Jana is a very difficult word to translate into English if not impossible. It's been called meditation. Meditation in English generally means sitting quietly and thinking about something, and that's not what Zen is. Contemplation might come a little nearer if you use the word in a very technical sense the sense that it was used or a still is used among catholic mystics. Perhaps that's something a bit like Zen. But again contemplation, as we normally use the word, has a sense of inactivity. The sense of not doing anything, of being completely still and passive. Whereas Zen is something I acted.

So we really don't have an English word for Jana, Chan, Zen. But I would say that we do know what it is. Because we do all sorts of things every day of our lives in this spirit. When for example, you drive a car. Most Americans, at any rate, drive car since they were teenagers. And are very

expert drivers. And when they drive a car, they don't think about it. They're one with the car. Or when a rider of a horse is one being with a horse, when you watch a good cowboy or cavalry rider, he's glued to the horse. He's like a centaur almost, as the horse moves, he moves, which is in control is the horse riding the man or the man riding the horse you practically don't know the same way when you have an excellent dancing partner who leads who follows it seems as if you are one body, and you move together. That is Zen that is Jana,. And so, in the in that in a wider sense, when a person doesn't react to life, on the one hand, or try to dominate it on the other. But when the internal world or runs an organism and the external world of other people and other things move together as if they were and indeed are one and the same motion. That is Zen.

So you could say in a very very simple way, that the real concern of Zen is to realize, not merely to think, but to know in your bones. That the inside world inside your skin and the outside world outside your skin going out as far as anything can go into galaxies beyond galaxies, is all one world. And all one being, one self, and you're it. And once you know that, then you have completely abolished all the problems that arise as a result of feeling that you're a stranger in the world, that you're set down in the middle of a hostile and alien domain of nature or people. Who are not you. This whole sense of estrangement, foreignness, to the world is overcome in Zen.

Now let me illustrate this a little before we go into Zen in any kind of technical way, by a few rather superficial but nevertheless significant facts out of Japanese culture and the place of Zen in Japanese culture. Japanese culture is as you may have noticed, was as you may have noticed extraordinarily ritualistic. There is a right way of doing everything. A good form, a proper style, and nowhere is this more apparent, than in such practices as the tea ceremony or arranging flowers, or knowing how to dress. Or knowing how to organize a formal dinner. The punctiliousness. The skill, of these people in doing these things is quite remarkable. But in the same measure as they are very skillful at doing these things, they're very worried about it. The whole question, for example, of bringing presents to somebody else. Have they given us more than we've given them? Did we remember this occasion? Did we remember that occasion? These weigh very heavily on the Japanese soul. The debt which you owe to your parents.

The debt which you owe to your country and to your Emperor.
Immeasurable, infinite debt, never can be paid. All these way very heavily.

And therefore in Japan, until the sort of break away of modern youth, with its westernized ideals, this is a very nervous culture. Concerned about whether one is playing the ritual correctly. A culture like that needs an outlet, needs a safety valve, needs a way out of this thing. And Zen provides just that. And so, by contrast, when you meet a Japanese, who is not thoroughly trained in Zen, he is a different kind of personality altogether from ordinary Japanese. He is in manners. Not all. Studiedly courteous. Nor is he Brusque. But he is simply at ease. He gives you his whole attention so long as you give him your whole attention. If you start wandering and frittering, he's got work to do, and he promptly leaves.

But so long as you are wanting to talk to him, he is there for you and for nobody else. And he sits down, and he really sits, you know, he doesn't worry about whether he ought to be somewhere else. And so unable to sit with complete serenity in one place you know, if you have half an idea that you ought to be worrying about them going out in the garden all that you ought to be cooking dinner, or you want to be done in your office or something you can't sit where you are. You're not really there, you are a kind of gas balloon that keeps wanting to wander off. That these people when you see as you meet people connected with Zen even they are sometimes the most. Neophyte novice of a priest has as this atmosphere of knowing how to live in the present. And not to be fidgety and giggly and worrying about whether he's done the right thing. Or that's very much zen style, even though at the same time the Zen people do have a very exacting and demanding discipline, the function of this discipline is rather curious, it's to enable you to be comfortable. It's an aid to enable you for example to sleep on a concrete sidewalk on a cold wet night. And enjoy it. To relax completely under any situation of hardship. You see ordinarily when you sit on a. You're out in the cold, you start shivering, why? Because you're resisting the code you are tightening your muscles against the cold and you get the staggers. But you are taught if you would learn Zen discipline not to do that. Take it easy go with the cold, relax. And all those monks in those monasteries here there, it's cold as hell in winter. And they simply sit there most of the time and there we would be frozen to death and miserable and

have influenza on the great Siberian itch, but they simply relax, and learn how to take the cold.

So there's nothing about Zen discipline which is masochistic. It isn't to beat your body because your body is bad and the creation of the devil or something has nothing to do with that it is how to be comfortable under all circumstances. But that again, is something rather incidental to the main question of Zen. As I said, the Zen people as you meet them, and as you get to know their style or personality, are at ease in a culture that is not at ease. In a culture that is chronically concerned with protocol. And is it just right, that is indeed a terribly self-conscious culture. Where everybody is always watching themselves. And having therefore second thoughts about everything. And so, the discipline of Zen is to enable you to act without watching yourself. We would say unselfconsciously. The Japanese are as terrified of this as we are. They think, and we think, if I don't watch myself, I'll make a mistake. If I don't hold a club over myself hour cease to be civilized and become a barbarian. If I don't discipline myself with all sorts of [grunts] down on that is passions of yours you will become like the monk of Siberia who burst from his cell and devour the fathers Superior. So this basic mistrust and so on in one's own spontaneity makes it, makes us wonder that if they Zen people are really spontaneous. And they don't plan and premeditate and all clubs over themselves well they become very very dangerous people socially when they go out and rape their mothers and daughters and murder their grandmothers to inherit their fortunes and so on and so forth. And Zen people just don't do that. And yet, they are perfectly spontaneous.

So then, let me try then and indicate. How this discipline called Zen actually works. This will involve a little bit of letting the cat out of the bag. But it can't be helped. Let's go back to what I told you was fundamental to Buddhism. Buddhism is unlike other religions, in that it does not tell you anything. It doesn't require you to believe in anything. Buddhism is a dialogue. And what are called the teachings of Buddhism, are nothing more than the opening phrases or opening exchanges in the dialogue. Buddhism is a dialogue between a Buddha. And an ordinary man or rather someone who insists on defining himself as an ordinary man. And thereby creates a problem. I quoted you this morning hour saying, that anybody who goes to

a psychiatrist ought to have his head examined. And in exactly the same way, in this culture, anybody who goes to go to a spiritual teacher or a Zen master or whatever, ought to have his head examined. Or as the old Chinese master Tokuzan put it. If you ask any question you get thirty blows, with my stick if you don't ask any question you get that it closed as the saying another words, what the hell are you doing around here. Defining yourself as a student and defining me as a teacher.

In other words you have to raise the problem. And in the way of training it was then this is very clearly emphasized if you go to a zen teacher, and you approach him in the traditional way, the first thing he will do is to say, 'I haven't anything to teach. Go away.' Well you say what are these people doing around here and they used to. Say 'Well they're working with me but unfortunately we are very poor these days we don't have enough rice really to go around and make ends meet and we can't take on anybody else in this community.' So you have to insist to be taken in. Every postulant for Zen training assumes immediately that the teacher has given him the brush off in order to test his sincerity. In other words, if you really want this thing. You've got to work for it.

That isn't the real point. The point is that you've got to make such a fuss to get in, that you cannot withdraw gracefully after having made such a fuss to get in. Because you put yourself on the spot and you define yourself as somebody needing help or somebody with a problem who needs a master in order to be helped out of the problem. So then, when you've done this in the old days of course and it's still the formal rule among the Zen monasteries here, that when you're a postulant and you want to come in, you have to sit outside at the gate for a week or maybe only five days, in a position of supplication with your head bowed down on the steps. And they let you in at night because they must give a hospitality to any wandering monk but you. I expect not to go to sleep any of those five nights but the sit there in meditation. And they give you food. But are you sit and you sit and you sit there and you make a damn fool of yourself. Saying, 'I insist on getting into this thing. I insist on learning I want to know what the secret of this master here is.' And he stole it from the star that he doesn't have a secret of that he doesn't eat anything. But you insist that he does. See, that is the situation of everybody who feels that life is a problem to be solved. Whether you want

psychoanalysis, whether you want integration, whether you want salvation, whether you want Buddhahood, whatever it is you define yourself as wanting. You created the problem.

What is the real problem that everybody brings to these teachers? What is it all about. It's basically this isn't it, teacher, I want to get one-up on the universe. I feel a stranger in this world. I feel that it's a problem and that having a body means that I am subject to disease and change and death. Having emotions and passions means that I am tormented. By feelings which I can't help having and yet it's not reasonable to act on those feelings without creating trouble. I feel trapped by this world and so I want to get the better of it and is there some wise man around who is a master of the. Life and who can teach me to cope with all this.

So that's what everybody's looking for in a teacher. The man who is the Savior and who can show you how to cope with. The Zen teacher says, 'I don't have any answers.' Nobody believes that. Because he seems to be so competent when you look at him. You can't believe that he has no answers. And yet that's the consistent teaching of Zen. That it has nothing to say, and nothing to teach. The great Chinese master of the Ton Dynasty called Lindi in Chinese or Rinzai in Japanese said Zen is like using a yellow leaf to stop a child crying. A child is crying for gold, and the father takes an autumn leaf with yellow and says Gold.

Or he said it's like using an empty fist to deceive a child. See, you've got a closed fist and you say to the child that I got here. And the child says 'Let me see.' You put your fist behind your back. And the child to come to more and more excited to know what the devil's in that feels and fights and fights and fights and finally is apparently in tears. And then suddenly you finally open the system is nothing inside. So in exactly the same way, a person who is under the impression that there is something that we ought to get, see all this is dressed up in a big way, to be a Buddha, to know the answer, to finally solve the problem to get the message to get the word or however you put it. In other words to be in control, of your fate and of the world. Would you like it? If you could have it. And so all these powers are projected upon the Zen master. He is a Buddha, he is a master of life. And if he is, the reason why this is that he has discovered the unreality of the whole

problem.

And so, all these powers are projected upon the Zen Master. He is a Buddha, he is a master of life. And if he is, the reason why is this, that he has discovered the unreality of the whole problem. There is not life on the one hand, and you on the other. It's all the same. But you see you can't tell people that. And just by telling get them to see it.

Just in exactly this way you are people who know that the earth is flat. Can't be reasoned with. People who believe that the Bible is the literal word of God, absolutely impossible to reason with them at all because they know it is. So in the same way, we tend to know that we are all separate poor little me, and that we are in need of salvation or something. And we know this is so and so somebody says well you're not really that you know that that feeling of separateness is an illusion. Well that all very nice in theory but I don't feel it. So what will you do? What will you do with a person who is convinced that the earth is flat? No way of reasoning with him. If it's for some reason important that he discovered that the earth is round, you got to play a game with him, you want to play a trick on him you tell him great the earth is flat, let's go and look over the edge when that be fun. Because, if we're going to look over the edge of the earth we must be very very careful that we don't go around in circles or we'll never get to the edge. So we've got to go along consistently along a certain line of latitude westwards. And then we're going to come to the edge of the earth, just so long as we're consistent. In other words, in order to convince a flat surface that the world is round, you've got to make him act consistently on his own proposition, and go consistently westwards to find the edge of the world. Now, at last when he by going consistently westwards he comes back to the place where he started, he's been convinced that the Earth is at least cylindrical, and he may believe you. Then take it on faith that if he goes along the line of longitude, the same thing will happen. But you see what you did was to make him persist in his folly.

Now that's the whole method of Zen. To make people become perfect egotists. And so explode the illusion of the separate ego. So what happens? In effect then, in the, in the discipline of Zen ou finally, when you convince the master that you are stupid enough to be accepted as a student. Because you persisted and because you've defined yourself as someone having the

proper. He is want you well in advance that he has nothing to teach. But he says now I will ask you a question. There are many ways of asking this question, but they all boil down to one common theme, and that is Who are you? You say you have a problem. You say you'd like to get out of the sufferings of life, you say you would like to get one up on the universe. I want to know who's asking this question, show me you. And only they put it in such ways as. Before your father and mother conceived you, what was your original nature? Questions like that. And they'll say now, look I want I want to be shown I don't want a lot of ideas about who you are I don't want to know who you are in terms of a social role. You know, that you have such degrees or you have such professional qualifications and such a name and such a family, all that's the past, I want to see you genuinely now. It's like saying to a person, 'now don't be self-conscious, see I want you right this minute to be completely sincere. C'mon now.'

Well nothing is better calculated to make a person incapable of sincerity. As when relatives come and uncles and the little child and they want to review this child and see it and the parents say to the child, 'darling come on down play for us.' And the poor child is completely nonplussed. Doesn't know what to do. Because you cannot play on demand. Now what is the Zen teacher doing in saying to a person. You must answer this question by coming before me in in fact a rather formal situation where you use the kind of context in which is and master interviews his students is very formal. And there he sits, sort of enthroned tiger, he is definitely in this culture a sense a a of parity figure. And so he is the last kind of person you can respond with. Because you feel that he knows you through and through. And that you know ever read that story of one Clive about a man another fight with a bear, and the bear is a mind reader and always knows what movie is going to make. It so that the man can never conquer the bear unless he makes a move which he doesn't think about first. How would you do that? And then you get the same feeling with relationship to a Zen master. You feel that he is absolutely aware of everything phony about you. That he reads you like a book, but that you can't find a way of being not phony. Think about this a little.

You see it's, we can arrange a group session and this is a little game that's being played by lots of people it's a kind of psychotherapy we can arrange a

group session, in which the gimmick is this. That when anybody says anything or does anything. The group or some section of the troop of the group challenges its sincerity. And says 'Why you coming on so strong? Are you trying to dominate us?' And you see anything that you do can be interpreted in that way. Because the moment a group of people becomes, starts making comments on its own behavior, it is setting up a situation in the group which is analogous, say in a T.V. studio, to turning the camera on the monitor.

So, when we start, thinking about thinking. Being aware of being aware, this is what is called in the Japanese, the observing self. I watch myself all the time, you see, a hopeless mess. But this is the price that human beings pay for having become self-conscious. Anxiety and killed. Anxiety because, am I sure that I thought this out sufficiently carefully. When I left the house did I turn off the gas stove? And incidentally I remember turning it off but can I trust my memory. Don't think about memory now I wonder if I can trust it maybe I better go back and look I went back and I looked at it I really see and thinking about my sight, and whether whether this is quite authentic, did I did I look properly, because you know how the unconscious can alter your senses so I better go look again see as soon now I've got into a sort of vicious circle where I'll never get away from the house. Yes. And this you all this sort of getting mixed up is the penalty we pay for the advantageous gift of being able to know that we know. 'There was a young man who said though it seems that I know, that I know what I would like to see is the I that knows me when I know that I know that I know.'

And so this is the Zen trick. It's to put you into this situation in a very crucial way. To think about thinking about thinking about thinking about, or just the same thing. To make a very strong effort not to think. That's Zazen. Sit, let your senses operate and be responsive to whatever that may be around but don't think about it. But now this is already thinking, I'm thinking about not thinking. How will I stop thinking about not thinking? So there you are! See, you're all caught up it's like somebody came to you and they put tar on one hand, molasses feathers in the other that the to dance to gether rub them around said, 'Now pick up the feathers.'

So you see what happens the teacher is well aware that he's played this trick on you. And he's going to see what will happen if you act and he's got to help you to act consistently on this foolishness. Now, you see what he's done, is he simply made a special case of what society does to us all any how. And this is true of most cultures, the high cultures of the world, whether they're of the East or whether they're of the West, play a game on every new member they don't know they're playing this game because their forefathers played it on them and they're still it's hopeless victim.

The game is called the double-bind. And the formula under which, under whose auspices, everybody comes into this world is as follows. You are required to do something which will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily. You must love me. You must go to sleep. You must be natural. You must be. Listened to that you must be free. Now what happens you see, society, the community into which every child enters, defines the child. We know who we are, as other people react to us. So the other people say to us, you're an independent agent. Your responsible. You're a freely acting individual. But this is a commandment. And we obey it because we can't help it. Child has no way of criticizing us. Or of seeing the something phony about it. So the child, has to be free because he is commanded to be so by the community. Now then, the community sets itself a problem. Having defined the child as an independent agent, and how they got the child to believe that he is an independent depended agent because he isn't. In other words, he wouldn't believe this if he were independent. It then has trouble getting him to behave as the community wants him to behave.

So they feel that the something ornery about all children they're born in Original Sin, they're a fractious and so on of course they are because they've been defined in a self-contradictory way. So when the community says to a person you must be free. Or when we are in a family relationship in which the members of the family are saying to each other you must love me it's your duty to love me. What a bunch of rot. Supposing your one day you get up and you say to your wife, 'Darling, do you really love me?' And she replies 'Well I'm trying my very best to do so.' Is that the answer you wanted? No! You wanted out of say darling I can't help loving you I love you so much I could reach you. You don't want to try to love you but yet that is what you put on people. In almost any marriage ceremony, that you

shall laugh that's both shout above the law by God shout love thy neighbor as thyself. This is a double bind. And anybody who lives under the dominance of a double bind, lives in a state of chronic frustration. Because he is devoting his whole life to solving a meaningless, nonsensical problem. Let's take the double bind that is the deepest of all, you must go on living. Now living is a spontaneous process. And to say to it, you must happen, is exactly the same thing as saying to any kind of creative artist. You must come through with the goods. Tonight you must give the super performance and above all you must be unselfconscious.

Well, this is being done to us all the time, and the object of the Zen discipline is that instead of doing this to people and consciously as parents do it and as teachers do it to children and as the children's peers do it to their own peer members. In Zen, the double bind is put on you deliberately knowing how stupid it is. The teacher is well aware of everything he is doing, and the tricks he's playing on you, because he has behind it all the compassionate intent of getting you into such a fierce double bind that you will see how stupid it is.

So then, what happens is this. He gives you the double bind. Be genuine. I want to see you do something that is the real you. I had a friend who was studying Zen and he was given some koan like this to work on. And when he was one day going for his interview, he walked through the garden that connected the Soto, or the monks study quarters with the master's place, and there was a big bull frog, bull frogs in this country are rather tame, people don't eat them. And so he swept up the bull frog and dropped it into the sleeve of his kimono. And when he got in front of the teacher to answer the koan, that is to say to do spontaneously produce his genuine self he produced the bull frog. And the teacher looked at it and shook his head and said 'Too intellectual.' Or, as you might say, too contrived, too studied. That's not yet YOU. Now do you see the bind in this? It's like being told that everything is all right at this moment so long as you don't think of a green elephant. So try not to think of a green elephant. Now as he works at this, as he tries to produce the genuine you the teacher really strings him out on this and makes him work and work and work over a period of many months, until he comes to the point of seeing this. There is nothing you can do to be genuine. The more you do the phonier you know you are. But at

the opposite extreme there is nothing you can not do. That is to say you cannot give up trying to be again. You can't relax you know and be completely passive. And say well let's forget about it. Let's think about practical. Matters and forget all these spiritual concerns the moment you do that your abandonment of trying is itself an insidious form of trying. For example or there's a very interesting Hindu teacher by the name of Krishnamurti that many of you may know about. And he tells people you know that all their religious inquiry or their yoga practices their reading religious books and so on is nothing but a form of perpetuating one's egocentricity but on a very refined and highbrow level. So he gets a kind of disciple who studiously avoids reading any kind of philosophical edifying book they're reduced to reading mystery stories. And they become devoted non-disciples. See what a clever bind that is it's the same as theirs in technique. You can't, in other words, let go, of you we've seen is a My point was at the beginning we saw that. The way of Buddhism is to let go of yourself. To see that you live in a universe in which in which nothing can be grasped. Therefore stop grasping.

So here's the problem. I come and say to the teacher teach me not to grasp. You say 'Why do you want to know?' And he's rich shows you that the reason why you want to stop grasping is that it's a new form of grasping you feel that you will beat the game by being unattached. It's horrible to grieve when somebody you love dies and the reviving on attached to that I can avoid grief. Pretty cold isn't it? Maybe you see, by not having an ego. When life comes and bangs on me. If there's nobody there, it'll be all right. So that's why I want non-ego state. That's phony. All this is a new way of safeguarding and protecting the ego. So this is the way in which Buddhism is a dialogue. So you see, if you go back to fundamental primitive Buddhims, people say to the Buddha, I want to escape from suffering. Perfectly honest statement. All right. I realise that suffering is caused by desire. Trying not to desire. So the student goes away and tries to eliminate desires by controlling his mind and practicing yoga. Comes back to the teacher and says a pretty difficult but I have managed at least to get rid of some desire. Teacher says to him, but you're still desiring to get rid of desire. What about that one? And then the student sees. That if he tries to stop desiring, but then he's got to stop desiring to get rid of not desiring to

desire. And suddenly he finds himself once more with molasses in one hand, and feathers in another. Absolutely tied up in a vicious circle.

So he realizes, there is nothing I can do about it, and there's nothing I can not do about it. And this predicament in Zen is called in mosquito trying to bite an iron bull. A position of such psychic extremity, that nothing can be done about it. Now the point here is, what does this situation mean? When you find yourself in that kind of a trap, what's the meaning of the trap? Why that's very simple. If there's nothing you can do, and also nothing you cannot do about a given situation. It means that you are phony. And in other words, what we call a separate ego. Isn't there. Cos it can't do anything because it is not an agent and by virtue of the fact that it can't do anything equally It can't not do anything. It's completely phony. So what has happened is to expose the fiction of there being a separate ego, either to force its actions upon the world, or to have the actions of the world forced upon it as a puppet this thing just doesn't exist. Except as a figment of the imagination. Or except as a game rule. Let's pretend everybody is responsible, is independent is separate. Sure, that's a great game. But it's a game. And so, the whole object of this is then dialogue between the teacher and the student is to carry that game of being the separate ego to its logical conclusion, to its *reductio ad absurdum*. So that as Blake said 'the fool who persists in his folly will become wise.'

Religion of No Religion

I was discussing last night, the Bodhisattva doctrine in Mahayana Buddhism, and comparing it, or relating it to, the two great tendencies in Indian spirituality. Anti worldliness, or other worldliness. Affirmation and showing how, the idea that the highest kind of a Buddha is in a certain way a non-Buddha. The highest kind of a Buddha is like an ordinary person. And this comes out very very much in various tendencies in Zen. Where, for example, all the painting, peculiarly characteristic of Zen Buddhism in the Chinese and Japanese tradition, is as it were secular. It has a peculiarly non-religious atmosphere. That is to say, that the painting of ShinGon sect and ten dissect as you saw it in the museum today was a religious painting you could tell at once that the subject matter of these paintings is religious. But with Zen painting, the way of dealing with philosophical or spiritual

themes is secular. So that, when an artist like Sendai and the. Being in the seventeenth century Japan paints the Buddha. There is something slightly humorous about the Buddha. He wears his halo over one ear. There is an informality, slight raffishness. And this comes from China, from those great song artists like the young. Who painted the six patriarch of Zen chopping bamboos. Looking like the most extraordinarily unkempt country oaf. So, also, the greatest Zen painting, has as its subject matter not really religious themes at all. It uses pine branches, rocks them bills grasses everything of that kind and you would never know that these things were icons. Likewise also, in poetry, which we will go into more extensively in the future. The superb expression of Zen poetry, is derived from the Chinese poet. Hokoji, who says 'Wondrous action, supernatural power. Drawing water, carrying fuel.'

Now that's, that poem is a little bit too religious for Zen taste. And so. Preferable to that is Basho's famous poem. 'The old pond. Frog jumps in plop.' Plop is the only possible English translation for the Japanese Misono Oto, which means literally the waters sound. Pop. But that poem you see is a very high styles and. Because it has nothing in it about religion. There is a poem on the edge which also was written by Basho, which says, when the lightning flashes how admirable he who does not think life is fleeting. And you see, the flash of the lightning is a Buddhist cliché for the transiency of the world. Your life goes by, and it disappears as fast as a flash of lightning. That becomes a cliché. So, all religion, all religious comments about life eventually become clichés. Religion always, is falling apart, and becoming a certain kind of going through the motions, a kind of imitation of attitudes as if one would say we've got a book called The Imitation of Christ. It's a terrible book. Because everybody who imitates Christ is a kind of a fake Jesus.

So in the same way, there's all kinds of imitation Buddhas. Not just sitting on altars made of wood gilded, but just sitting around in monasteries. So, one might say then that the highest kind of religious or spiritual attainment has no, no sign about it that it is religious or that it is spiritual. And so as a metaphor for this there was used in Buddhism from the very beginning, the idea of the tracks of birds in the sky. They don't leave any tracks. And so the way of the enlightened man, is like the track of a bird in the sky. And as

one poem, a Chinese poem says, entering the forest he does not disturb a blade of grass. Entering the water, he does not make a ripple. In other words, there is no sign about him to indicate that he is self consciously religious. And this goes too for the fact that his not having any religious sign, is also not something contrived. It isn't like Protestant simplicity. You know all those Catholics with their rituals and how dreadful and insincere that is, the real reason you know why Protestant think Catholic ritual is insincere? You know? It's expensive. Protestantism started in the burger cities of Europe. Places like. Freiburg, Hamburg, you know. And Geneva. Because, the merchant class, who were the foundation of the Bourgeoisie got annoyed because every time. A saint's day came around all their employees got a day off because it was a holiday and they had to attend mass. You know so many of these nuisance holidays. And all these contributions that were assessed by the church. Buying your way out of Purgatory and thing masses for the dead, and so on it's of what they found is not very you cannot handle the priests were getting the money instead of the matching. And so they decried as unbiblical and the religious and wasteful all the finery of the Catholic religion and wanted something plain and simple.

So it became, in course of time, a sign of being really religious. To avoid rituals and to avoid colorful clothing and splendor in churches and to be as ordinary as possible. But that is not yet their real religion of me giving no sign of having a religion because this simplicity and absence of ritual itself becomes a sign. A way of advertising how spiritual you are. So, the completely Bodhisattva type of person doesn't leave any track, either by being religious overtly, or by being non-religious overtly. How will you be neither religious nor non-religious? See that's the great test how do you avoid that trap? Of being one or the other. It's like I you a theist Are you an atheist. You see the theist is caught by God. And the idea of God The belief in God but the atheist is equally caught. Because an atheist is very often an atheist because he cannot stand the idea that God is watching him all the time. That there is this constant all-seeing Eye, prying on your most private life. And that there is this is you know how were you when you were a child in school and you're writing something or doing arithmetic and the teacher walks around the class and looks over your shoulder. Nobody wants to be watched like that, even someone who's good at writing or arithmetic,

doesn't want somebody looking over their shoulder while they're doing it it puts you off it bugs you.

So the idea of the Lord God who is watching us all the time he was judging everything that we do puts people off and they can't stand it so better be an atheist to get rid of teacher. So better be an atheist, you see the man who advertises his disbelief in God, is a very pious person. Nobody believes in God like an atheist. There is no God, and I am his prophet. So then, the true Bodhisattva state is very difficult to pin down as being either, neither supremely religious nor blatantly secular. And people who think that the height of Buddhism, or the height of Zen, is to be perfectly ordinary have still missed the point. That the atheist has missed the point. But, for this reason then, there is an element in the art, the painting the poetry, et cetera, which has been inspired by this kind of Buddhism. This kind of art where the subject matter is non-religious Nevertheless, there is something about the way in which this non-religious subject matter is handled that stops you. And you know there's something strange about it, this is how I first became interested in oriental philosophy and all that kind of thing. I had an absolute fascination for Chinese and Japanese painting. The secular painting, the landscapes, the treatment of flowers and grasses and bamboos. There was something about it that struck me as astonishing. Even though the subject matter was extremely ordinary. And I had just as a child practically I had to find out. What was this strange element in those bamboo. And those grasses. I was being of course taught by those painters to see grass. But there was something in there that one could never pin down, never put your finger on. And that was this thing that I will call the religion of no religion. The Supreme attainment of being a Buddha who can't be detected. Who, in this sense then, leaves no trace.

You remember some of you have seen those ten paintings, called the ten stages of spiritual ox herding. And the author, there are two sets of these paintings there's a heterodox one on and off a ducks one. The heterodox one, has the, as the man catches the ox, it gets progressively whiter, until in the end it disappears altogether and the last picture is an empty circle. But the author ducks set of paintings. Doesn't end with the empty circle that he and his circle arises to from the end. Three from the end. It is followed by two others. After the man has attained the state of emptiness, the state, in

other words, of complete iconoclasm, the state of no attachment to any spiritual or psychological or moral crutch, there are two more steps and one is called returning to the origin. Which is represented by a tree beside a stream. And the final one, called entering the city with hands hanging down. That means hands, giving a hand out, as it were, of the giving bounty. And it shows a picture of the fat water to tie. Or in Japanese known as Hote. Who has an enormous belly big years who carries around a colossal bag. And what do you think this bag has in it? Trash. Wonderful trash, everything the children love. Things that everybody else has thrown away and thought of as valid as this bum collects and gives it away to children. And so it says here. That he goes on his way without following the steps of the ancient sages. His door is closed. His case that sort of his house and no glimpses of his interior life are to be seen so in other words it's unlike when you erect a building while you're building it you have all kinds of scaffolding up. That shows you that building is going on, but when the building is complete, the scaffolding is taken down. To open a door as they say in Zen You may need to pick up a brick to knock at the door but when the door is open you don't carry the brick inside to cross a river you need a boat but when you reach the other side you don't pick up the boat and carry it. So the brick, the boat, the scaffolding, all these things represent some sort of religious technology or method. And in the end, these are all to disappear.

So that the Saint will not be found in church. Don't take what I say literally, the saint can perfectly readily go to church without being solid by church. But ordinary people when they go to church they come out stinking, of religion. There was a great Zen Master once. And one of his disciples asked him, 'How am I making progress?' He said you're all right but you have a trivial fault Well what is that he said you have too much zen. Well he said 'When you're studying Zen, don't you think it's very natural to be talking about it?' The Master said, 'When it's like an ordinary conversation it is much better.' And so another monk who is standing by listening to this exchange said to the master, 'Why do you says special it is like talking about zen?' and he replied 'Because it turns one stomach.'

So what did he mean when he said when it's like an ordinary everyday conversation it is somewhat better? When the old master Joshe was asked at

the end of the Kalpa, when everything is destroyed in fire there will be one thing remaining What is that? And Joshi replied It's windy again this morning. So, in Zen, When you are asked a question about religion, you reply in terms of the secular, when you are asked about something secular you reply in terms of religion. So what is the eternal nature of the self? It's windy again this morning. Please pass me a knife. The master hands him the knife with the blade first. Please give me the other and what would you do with the other and. See, here that could be the the disciple starts out with the ordinary please pass me the knife and suddenly he finds himself involved in a metaphysical problem. But if he starts out with a metaphysical, he's going to get involved with a knife.

So, now, to go deeply into, the religion of non religion, we have to understand the, what you might call the final ultimate attainment of Mahayana Buddhist philosophy. And this is contained in a school of thought which is called in Chinese Wa-Yin and in Japanese Kagan. Kagan is the intellectual foundation for Zen. And there was a great Chinese master by the name of Shumatzu, who was simultaneously a Zen master and the fifth patriarch of the Qua-Yin sect. Qua means flower. Yin, garland, the garland of flowers. And it's all based on a Sanskrit Sutra called Avantaksura [sic]. This is called simply The Japanese King or The Very Big Sutra. And the subject matter of the sutra, called the four Dharma worlds. And I must explain what these four worlds are so that you get the point. First of all, there is a a level of being, which we will call ji. The word ji, which is Japanese way of pronouncing the Chinese chir, is the world of things and events. What you might call the common sense world, the everyday world, that our senses normally record. This the word ji, character in Chinese has a multiplicity of meanings, because it me it can mean a thing or an event. It can also mean business. An affair, not in a love affair but something. In the way the French say laissez faire for business. Something important. You can also mean affectation. Putting something on or showing off. And so a person who is a master in Zen is called booji, which means no business, no affectation, nothing special. The poem says, on Mount Lou, there is misty rain. And the river Jun is at high tide. When you have not been there your heart is filled with longing but when you have been there and come back it was nothing special. Misty rain on Mountain Dew River Jun. But this nothing special is not a way of putting something down. To see that I could

say well it was nothing special, it didn't really amount to anything. That's one way of saying it was very ordinary. But just as it doesn't mean it was very ordinary. In the same way that the person who has no religion is really the most religious, do you do see, he's not just a common ignorant moron. He looks like one, but he isn't. And you have to know what he knows, in order to see that he isn't and to recognize him for what he is. So nothing special, booji. It did doesn't stand out, it doesn't. As we would say that doesn't stick out like a sore thumb. So the world of ji. Then means generally, the world of particulars. The world of multiplicity, the world we ordinarily feel we're involved in.

So that's the first world, the second world is called the world of ri. Now re in Chinese Li. Is as I explained to you when we were discussing the idea of the law of nature. The character means the markings in Jade. Or the grain in wood or the fiber in muscle. But in the Wa-Yin philosophy the word really means the universal, underlying all particulars, the one underlying all multiplicity. The unity of principle as distinct from ji, which is the differentiation principle. So as it were, like it's like this, when you see into the nature of this world. You start from ji. You start from noticing all the particular things, and being baffled by the multiplicity, and dealing with the multiplicity of things, but as you go into this, you discover, as you understand things...What do you mean when you understand things? It means you become aware of their relationships to each other and eventually you see the unity of the mind. And it is as if the multiplicity of the world dissolved into unity.

You start from noticing all the particular things and being baffled by the multiplicity and dealing with the multiplicity of things but as you go into this you discover as you understand things what do you mean when you understand things it means you become aware of their relationships to each other, and eventually you see the unity of the mind. And it is as if the multiplicity of the world dissolved into unity. And so here you encounter a problem. I can see the world as a unity. I can see the world as a multiplicity. But how the devil am I going to put the two visions together. If I am to be a practical success, in business, in family life, and so on, I have to observe the world of particulars. Its particulars that matter. I have to know chalk from cheese. But if I become a saint, a monk, or hermit then I care about even perhaps a poet or an artist, I will forget about the practical matters, and

contemplate the unity, the secret meaning underlying all events. Then ever all those practical people are going to say to me, you're falling down on the job, you've escaped from life, because they feel that the world of particulars is the real world, but the other guy says No your particulars are not real. You make a success of things yes but it's completely temporary. You think you're an important person that you're really contributing to human life, but actually your success in doing this sort of thing lasts for a few years, and then you fall apart like everybody else does. Where's your success now, when you're dead? What happened to the millions of dollars you made? Where are you all gone so that isn't real from the standpoint of the person who concentrates on the unity.

So then to perfect our understanding we have to go to the third of these worlds which is called the ri game will get. Now that means between ri, the unity and ji, the particulars, mu there is no gap block. That means that world of the universal and the world of particulars are not incompatible. Let's take two very different things. And see how they can be united take shape and color. Never in a million years can you, with a black pencil that can draw shapes, make red. But, if you have red, you can draw a circle. You can draw a red circle. Even though the circle shape and the red color, will never be the same. Yet red circle, they go beautifully together. So think of a circle. As ji, and red as a ri. The circle is the particular, the color is the universal they go together. So then we might say, the properly rounded out person, is both spiritual and material. Both, other worldly and worldly. This is the supreme attainment of a human being. To be both. Don't get one sided.

A person who is what you might call just a materialist ends up by being very boring. It's, you know you can live the successful life of the world. And you can own every kind of material refinement. You can have the most beautiful home, delicious food, marvelous yachts and cars and everything. But if you have no touch of mysticism it eventually is all perfectly boring. And you get tired of it. Then on the other hand there are people who are purely spiritual. And they live in a kind of dry world, where all luxury has been scrubbed away, and they are very intense people. When you are in their presence, a very spiritual person, an excessively spiritual person, you feel inclined to sit on the edge of your chair. You are not at ease, because

you know the eye of judgment is looking through you and going down into your very soul and finding that you are just a scallywag after all. They are absolutely sincere, this dreadfully honest and unselfish person. This is something which is always puzzling to people brought up in a western environment. Because great Spiritual people are often very very censorious because they, they can't be materialist in the ordinary sense. They can't be straight open censorious, because for them the world is too wonderful for that. Any any human being is too marvelous to be treated as just a kind of sexual object. They may be very much a sexual object, but so marvelous, you have to stop with it and really go into the whole of that marvelous wonderful personality. So there is a trouble, keeps coming up for the west. When you go to church, and you suddenly go to a church where there's a marvelous clergyman and you think he is a very exemplar of life and you idealize him and then suddenly there develops a fightful scandal, that he has an affair with his secretary. And you think all is lost that faith has been sold out that everything's going to rack and ruin because he was not purely spiritual. And he himself may be terribly confused and worried about this. Because in our world, you see, we make the spiritual and the material mutually exclusive. But rijimuge, this third world means that between the spiritual and the material, there is no obstruction.

So we might say this. Would sound as if it were the highest level. But as one more to come. Which is call jijimuge. This means then suddenly ri has disappeared. But between ji and ji, there is no obstruction. Between one event, and any other event or events there is no mutual exclusiveness, should I put it that way? This is the doctrine of the highest doctrine of Mahayana Buddhism, which you could call the doctrine of the mutual interpenetration of all things, or the mutual interdependence of all things. And it symbol is the what is called Indra's net, that is used Avatanksara Sutra. Imagine at dawn, a multidimensional spider's web covered in dew. A vast, vast spider's web that is the whole cosmos, and is not only a kind of a flat thing but a solid thing and are solid in four five six and n dimensions, covered with jewels of dew, all of which have a rainbow coloring, and every drop of dew contains in it the reflection of every other drop of dew. And since every drop of dew contains the reflections of all the others, each reflected drop of dew contains the reflections, you see, of all the others, and

so ad infinitum. Now this is the Mahayana vision of the world. Which is to say this is relativity.

That whatever exists in this world and is characterized as something particular, as a thing, as an event as something or other you see as a unit. This does not exist without all other such things and events. So that you might say any one event, implies all events. And all events, the total universe, past, present, and future, depends on every single member. In other words, you may say, I can understand that I depend on this whole universe. There could not be me unless there was everything else it is harder to see the current corollary of that. That the whole universe depends on you. You might say, well how can that be? Because I come into being, and then I go out of being and when I am before I was born, I'm sure the universe was here and after I die, I'm sure it will go on. How can you say then that the whole thing depends on me? Very simply. It depends on, your supposing you're dead, and we're talking about someone in the past let's say we're talking about Socrates. And I'm going to say this whole universe depends on Socrates. I may put it more exactly. It depends on Socrates having existed. You see, your parents now, some of your parents may be alive, but some of your parents may be dead. Without your parents he would not have come into being. So you depend on your parents even when your parents have gone. So everything, even when you disappear, the universe will still depend on you. On your having been here. Or if you have not yet arrived, it depends on your going to be here. So we can say obviously, going back to Socrates, that the fact that Socrates existed tells us something about the kind of world we're living in. This world once Socratized, and that Socrates and his wisdom was a symptom of the kind of universe we're living in in just the same way as I showed you that an apple is a symptom of a tree certain kind of tree tells us something about that tree what it functions how it produces things. So a world which produced Socrates, or a world which produced John Doe. Who was nobody in particular, and nobody ever remembered him or thought to write his biography.

Nevertheless for all his obscurity the whole universe to them from him and it depends equally on every fruit fly every gnat every vibration of every gnats wing, and it depends on every last electron, however brief its

manifestation may be. So that, what this is saying is, that everything that there is implies everything else. And all those other things, collectively, in their totality, which we call the universe, in turn, imply. Each individual object event and so on. That's the meaning of Indra's net. So that, this is called in Zen, to take up a blade of grass and use it as a golden Buddha sixteen feet high. When you have a chain and you pick up a link, all the other links come up with it. Because it implies, if this is a link it is a link in a chain if it isn't it's just an oval piece of metal. But if it's a link, up come all other links. So if you are an event, every event, no there's no such thing as a single event the only possible single event is all events whatsoever. That could be regarded as the only possible atom. The only possible single thing is everything. But the things that we call things all imply each other, we know what we are only in relation to what we aren't. We know of the sensation of oneself only in relation to a sensation of something other.

So the other goes with the self as the back goes with the front. And your life, however short, everything depends on it. If that did not happen, nothing would have happened. So in this sense, the whole world there's your signature. It would not be the same world if it weren't for you. And you've heard, haven't you, what is called the pathetic fallacy. This was an idea of the nineteenth century which said that it was false and wrong to project human feelings on the world. The wind in the pine trees is not sighing. It's you who are sighing. The sun is not happy. It's you who are happy when the sun shines. So don't mix up your happiness with the sun, the sun has no feeling the sun is not human the wind has no feeling and is not human. The poet says the moon doth with delight look round when the heavens up there, and the logician says no, the poet looks around with delight at the bare heavens. How awful. I mean if that's what is the if that's the point you see better not say any poetry, just have prose. But actually, the moon does look around with delight, when the poet looks around but delight plants. The world of which one symptom is the moon is the same world of which another symptom is the poet. They go together a world where there is a moon implies a world where there is a poet. A world where there is a poet, implies a world where there is a moon. So in this sense, the moon can be said to look around with delight, through the agency of the poet. Because you can't separate poet and moon. Just as you can't separate head and feet without destroying the unity of the body.

So in that sense then, this whole world is a human world, and we should not take this silly attitude, of Philosophy call the philosophy of the pathetic fallacy, which says outside our skins it's all inhuman and dumb, and blind force, and only inside the skin is there the human world. All this world is human because it depends not only on the existence of humanity in general, but on the existence of Mary Smith in particular.

So the whole world is covered as it were, with your personal signature. But at that moment when you suddenly seem to be everything and to be Mr A, you know, you suddenly see the obverse of this, that your particular personality is nothing at all without everything else. That everybody else. I need in order to be Alan Watts I need every single other human being and the. Uncontrol, the uncontrollable otherness of all those other human beings that I can do anything about they are going to be themselves whatever I do. And yet at the same time, I depend on all their difference from me, and yet they all depend, likewise on me. So that I'm in a very funny position. The moment I would be egoless and say, I'm nothing without you, then suddenly I find I'm the kingpin they all depend on me then suddenly when when I get swelled headed about being the kingpin, I find I'm nothing at all without them. So everything keeps going bloop bloop bloop bloop in other words about how much you think you've got it in one state it transforms itself into the other. That's the jijimuge.

Now in jijimuge. I'm again see. You got a vision of the world, in which everybody is boss and nobody is boss. There is no one boss who governs the whole thing it takes care of itself it's a colossal democracy. But yet every man and every who agrees to and every snail is king. In this world. And at the same time is coming. And that's how it works. And there is no great king. Although, in Hinduism, they have an idea a very strange one to us the call Ishvara, means the supreme personal god. The top being in the Deva world. And they, many Buddhists believe, that there is such a God there is a ruler of the universe but he is lower than the Buddha. Because in the course of the endless cycles Ishvara, will dissolve into nothing. All gods, all Angels, are within the round of being. It's a very curious idea. Minds and therefore all the Buddhists believe in God In that sense. They don't take it importantly there are no shrines in Buddhism to Ishvara.

So then, it is through jijimuge, this idea of the mutual interpenetration and interdependence of all things. That we have the philosophical basis for Zen as a practical non-intellectual way of life. Because of the realisation that the most ordinary event, the charcoal brazier, the mat. Soup for dinner. Sneezing. Washing your hands, going to the bathroom, everything, all these so-called events, separate events, imply the universe. So this is why Zen people will use the ordinary event to demonstrate the cosmic and the metaphysical. Only, they don't rationalize it that way. To see infinity in a grain of sand and eternity in an hour is still and not rijimuge and not jijimuge. Jijimuge again, is when you offer somebody the grain of sand. For God's sake, stop thinking about eternity. Here's, that's the grain of sand, there is no difference between the grain of sand and eternity.

So you don't have to think about it and it has something implied by the. Of sand. The grain of sand is eternity. So in the same way exactly, our sitting here at this moment is not something different from Nirvana. We are nirvana, as sitting here exactly like this saying. So you don't have to say any philosophical comment, on the grain of sand, or on our sitting here. That's called legs on a snake or a beard on a eunuch. And you put legs on a snake, you see, and you embarrass the snake in its motion. And a eunuch doesn't need a beard. We would say in our idiom, don't gild the lily. Or Zen would say don't put frost on top of snow.

So all, what you might call specifically religious activity is legs on a snake. Eventually this is going to be eliminated, just as eventually, we hope that government will be eliminated, and will become unnecessary, because every individual will be self-governing, and therefore relate properly to his brother. And the state will vanish. So too, at the same time, the church will vanish. And that's why in the, in the Book of Revelation, in the New Testament, it is said that in Heaven there is no temple. Because the whole place is the temple. So in, when we achieve the fulfillment of Buddhism. There is no Buddha, no temple, no gong, no bell. Because the whole world is the sound of the bell. And the image of Buddha is everything you can look at. So as a Zen master was asked mountains and hills are they not all forms of the body of Buddha the master replied, 'Yes they are, but it's a pity to say so.'

Diamond Web

Now you know, those people you've just been listening to, chanting the sutras on Poyason [sic]. Which is the sort of ultimate center retreat in our sanctuary of Japanese practice of budgeting on a monthly on a Buddhism. [They] are a bunch of boys, who are just like and they're open college boys who play football. And they haven't the faintest idea what they're doing. Not today. They're doing this because their fathers have sent them there. Their father's own temples. And they've got to carry on their father's tradition, because after all the family business has to go on. And they have no more idea what this is all about than the man in the moon. And you and I can sit here, and we could get swinging with this music, we could dance to it, and we could go very far out on it, which was what you were originally supposed to do. And for them it's a chore, it's a thing you have to get up for at five o'clock in the morning. And you have to memorize all this and you have to get it exactly right and do it. And they've completely forgotten what it was all about. But it was originally there.

It's a funny thing how this happens you see, but you see how I was explaining to you this morning, how we have a rhythm, between remembering and not remembering. You remember long enough to know that you're there. Because if you don't remember, nothing makes any impression upon you, therefore we are not there. But then when memory gets too much, and you're too much of there then you have to realize that all memory is an illusion, that there is nothing except the present moment. And that there is no future, as equally no past. And then you are liberated. But when you get liberated. You have to come back in and play memory again there's a cleaning process. In other words, you wipe off the blackboard. And then you start writing again. And then you wipe it off, and then you start writing again, and this is the process whereby life is kept going. So in the same way with these people. They have come to a point in the historical development of their way of Life, where they remember too much, it's not new to them. And all this therefore becomes. What we call going through the motions. And so this is the same paradox that I was talking about this morning. That the Echo, which is memory, is simultaneously what tells you exist, and what traps you. So in the sense that it tells you you exist, it's an advantage to the extent that it traps, it's a debt.

You're in debt you should be thankful somebody gave it to you. Ultimately, in the Judeo Christian tradition the law of God did it all for you and you should be thankful. And say, anything bad that I did this for me. Dear God, anything good that I did was from you. You see? What a marvelous mix up that is. But all I'm saying is this. There is a point in in in all of this development, where, you have to say to people please come off it. In other words, these boys here and call your son I was a king to know enough Japanese to say to them. 'Do you realize what a great thing you have here.' Couldn't you possibly enjoy it for a few minutes, and let's get together and all join hands around here and go through this again, these Sutras, and really make it.

So I'm talking, you see, about the same process of what has been called Flip-Flop ability. Whereby we switch from one attitude to another, one situation to another, and this pulse switch situation, is the very nature of existence that's why your heart does that, that's why all sounds all light everything is going bloop bloop bloop bloop bloop. See and so because of that bloop, you know you're here. Well now, I've been trying to show how this game, has its own inner meaning. So finally, we we've got to come around to one form of Mahayana that I haven't really discussed at all to complete the whole scene which is what is called the School of the Pure Land. And this is the most popular form of Mahayana Buddhism in the in the Far East. In China, in Japan everywhere the the multitudes go for this kind. And it's all under the presiding image of the, one of those Johnny Buddhas, called Amitabha, whose name means boundless light, and who is a sort of subdivision or aspect of my How about O'Connor. Who is the great Sun Buddha. And who is therefore probably derived historically from a master. From Persia. The. Great Sun god of than Muzdans and it Pasis. But although that may have been what set it all off it has been greatly transformed. By being canonized through Buddhism. Now you have all seen. Photographs of the Buddha at chemical or the dye butz, that enormous bronze figure, that sits. In a beautiful park with pine trees. The Temple having long been demolished by a tidal wave. For which Thanks be to God, because if it hadn't been for that tidal wave nobody would ever have really seen this figure. But there is a comic or a huge bronze figure it's about forty two feet high. And here this creature sits, surrounded by a great business, thousands of schoolchildren are all the time on tours streaming by,

photographers, people selling this that and the other souvenirs. Exhibitions of dwarf trees and everything are all going on around and here this thing sits and looks down forever. And nothing can hush it. I mean, let's put it this way. It hushes everything. That no matter how much turmoil of children and cetera is going on in this park, this huge face presides over everything. And you cannot ignore it. It subdues you into peace. Without doing it in an authoritative way, it doesn't say to you shut up. It just is so peaceful that you cannot help catching the infection of peace that comes from this figure. And this is the figure of Amida, Amitabha. Not the historical Sakyamuni, Guatama Buddha, Living in India but one of the Johnny Buddha, who is not manifested in the world.

Now the religion connected with this figure is called Pure Land. Jodo, In Japanese Shinsho. The the true sect of the Pure Land. It comes, again the origins are always in India. But the Japanese. Under the. Genius of them Honan and Shinran, who were medieval Buddhist Saints developed their own special variety of it. And this is a very strange religion. Because it takes its basis as follows. We are living now in the most decadent period of history. That's what they say, and this comes back from the Hindu idea that this is the Kali Yuga. This is the end of time, where everything is completely fouled up. And this started in about three thousand B.C.. February the twenty third, three thousand and twenty three B.C. the Kali Yuga began and it's got to last yet for five thousand years, and then everything will fall apart, the universe will disappear out of sheer failure. So that now, nobody can be virtuous, because everybody who tries to be virtuous in this part, this epoch of the world is merely showing off. It's not really pure. It's just pretending it works it's a big act. In other words, so you give money to charity, not because you really love the people you're giving money to, but because you are under a sense of guilt and you feel you ought to. And therefore, because of that inescapable bad motivation, nobody can possibly liberate themselves from the chains of karma. The more you try to get out of your karma that is to say your conditioning your bondage to your past, the more you simply get yourself involved in it. And therefore all human beings living in the end time of the Kali Yuga or what the Japanese call Mapol are just hopeless. Hopelessly selfish. So in this predicament, you cannot rely on JiRiki, that means your own power. To get out, to get liberated from Self. You have to rely on Tariki which is the power of

something else altogether the new something quite different. So in the Jodo Shinsho sect. The Tariki, the other power is represented in the form of a me Tomba on. Japanese say Amida. This great beneficent Buddha figure, who everybody loves. And he's so strangely different. From any kind of authoritarian God figure that we have in the West. Amida doesn't bombinate. He sits there serenely. Quiet. He doesn't preach. And all you have to do is to say his name. In the formula. Namu amida butz. Which means namu,l name. I mean upwards of a meter Buddha. Namu Amida Butz.. All you have to do is to say that formula. And after death you will be reborn in a special paradise call Sukhavati, which is Jodo, the Pure Land, where becoming enlightened is a cinch. It has none of the difficulties surrounding it that we have in our ordinary life today. Everybody born in the Pure Land is Born in the inside of a lotus. There's a huge lotus pond in front of where a metre sits. With all his attendant. And the Lotus has come up and they go but the bug breaks and every time it goes up like there's there's a new little being in there who is somebody who said that formula Namu amida Butz. And those are human beings when our sitting on Lotus is like Buddhas.. And you should see you go to call your son and they have a great painting now in their museum of what it's like to arrive there. They have a huge panorama of Amitabha, and all his attendants and especially the Absaroke and she looks at you lovely longing eyes. And so this is welcome to Amida's paradise where you will also add on notices. And be Buddhas, without any difficulty but the point is all you have to do to get there, is to say Namu Amida Butz you don't even have to believe that it works.

Now that is the religion, of most Japanese Buddhists, believe it or not. In other words if you eat if you if you of course if you really get this and the feel that that's really going to happen to you you'll be grateful and you'll try to help other people and be able to stop that and so on and you know be generally helpful around the scene. But the whole idea is that you cannot do it by your own effort and if the moment you think you can do it by your own effort, you're a phony. You have instead to go completely with the other, to disown your own power and capability of being virtuous, unselfish, etc,

So then, this kind of religion develops a peculiar kind of saint. And they call these people Miokonen. Mio means wonderful, ko in this fine in means man. Or person. That can be a woman you know konen is not sexually restricted to men. So in your konen there's a very special kind of character. There are stories told about Miokonen. There is one for example a travelling man who comes to a temple during the course of the night. And walks in, and he takes the sacred cushions on which the priests sit, and arranges them right in front of the altar and goes to sleep. In the morning, the priest comes in and says what's going on here. And the miokonen looks around and goes oh, you must be a stranger, you belong to the family. Another time, he had a great ability for doing calligraphy, beautiful writing. And people were always trying to get his calligraphy from it. And he was cagey about it. It wasn't so easy to get it. So one day, a very very great man invited him for dinner. And again, left him alone in a reception room where there was stretched out on the floor some absolutely gorgeous paper. With ink and brushes just waiting there. And he got so fascinated. That he just couldn't resist. You know, like a child, he simply couldn't resist doing is calligraphy on that piece of paper and suddenly as he realized he had done it. That he had spoiled this god. Are just paper you know which was incredibly expensive the host walked in. And he apologized and said Really I don't know what to do. So sorry I couldn't resist the temptation to make some things on this beautiful paper. And the host said, Oh please don't worry about that. Because he had now possessed himself of the priceless object of a this man's work today Celts for thousands and thousands of dollars. So this is the spirit I'm trying I'm telling these anecdotes to try and illustrate the spirit of what's called a miokonen. Somebody in the swing of realizing that all the very great thing in life is not your own doing. That it comes from the side of things, the flip, in other words, of experience, that you call other. There are some people who believe it comes from the split in experience you call yourself that's the jariki people the tariki people believe it comes from the other. But now what happens is this. When you penetrate deeply into the doctrines of the Pure Land school, the simple people believe that there really is Amitabha Buddha, sitting on his golden Lotus, surrounded by all those apps ours. Exactly that from Japan one hundred eight thousand miles to the west there is a paradise where all those people sit and where you will be reborn you die. And the simple priests of the sect in the country villages today still insist that that's what you should believe.

But the sophisticated priests don't believe that at all. They know that Amitabha is in you, only it is that side of you which you don't define is you who. When you say, I have a body. You know instead of saying I am a body. That's because you feel that your body happens to you. That it's something you got mixed up with. That was given to you by your parents you don't say I beat my heart on purpose. You feel that your heart is something that happens to you.

So all that side of things that you experience as a passive recipient of it is tariki. But in all this who are you? Who is the recipient of these gifts? Don't you see that Self and Other go together? That you don't need to cling to yourself because you have everything you called other and that's you too. That if you, but you only realize this if you explore it. If you go to an extreme. So you can go to the extreme by pursuing the idea of total courage. Of letting go of everything being a true Zen monk, and abandoning all your property and living in a barn, and sitting in the middle of the night. In the cold and eating rice and pickles and so on, and you can explore liberation that way. That's going to an extreme.

But eventually, you will come around to the same point as the person who goes to the other extreme. Which is, no effort whatsoever. It comes of itself. Only, he gets in a kind of bind too. Because when am I making no effort, even if I say Namu Amida Butz I'm doing something about it now I gotta stop. Doing saying this now my meter but not saying this Namu Amida Butz, this is so easy. But it's still a little bit work. And I mustn't do any work at all! How could you get to the point where you don't do any work at all? You just mustn't do anything. And you find yourself that that is death as difficult as the other situation was, you see to do nothing really do nothing, with perfection is as difficult, as to do everything.

Transcending Duality

Now I want to go today into the subject of the male-female symbolism in tantric yoga. You will find that in the tantric forms, that every aspect of the Buddha has a feminine counterpart. And that not only do they have feminine counterparts, but they also have various levels on which they're represented. In other words, we started out you remember I described in the

last seminar there was the idea of five so called Jani Buddhas. And these five who represent as it were the center of a rose, ones in the middle and four surround. Then each one has a corresponding Bodhisattva form, and then each Bodhisattva has in turn a corresponding Hiroko form, but they're all forms of the original five then whether they're in the form of a Jani Buddha in the form of a Bodhisattva, or in the form of a Hiroko which is kind of wrathful and weird far out to kind of. Character often with bulls heads. There's one here. Which we can look out of the little statue, which Kim has brought over. There all reducible to the original group. And all have these female counterparts and they are represented as in sexual intercourse, touching at all points. In a complete embrace. And the idea is, that this embrace lasts for ever and ever and ever and ever and never ends. Because this is a way of representing, the nature of life. What is fundamentally involved in the system is self-knowledge. You see, without resonance, nothing happens. If there are no echoes, you can't hear anything.

Supposing we get a room in which we blanket all the walls. And blanket the floor, soundproof it in every possible direction. You can hardly hear anyone talk, because voice requires resonance. And that's why people enjoy singing in the bath tub. They suddenly discover they've got a good voice, because suddenly the bath and the structure of the room which is all non-soundproofed, resonates their voice. That's why you use a violin, or a cello or bass fiddle, has a big wooden structure to make the sound resonant. To play back to itself. And that's why we're all so fascinated with recording things taking photographs. Writing them down and above all remembering. It's a form of resonance. Because you see if you don't remember anything you don't know you're there. A person who had total amnesia, and lived in a split second only wouldn't know he was there. We could conceive, and perhaps there are some forms of life that don't know they're there. I don't know whether my in particular cells constituting my body. I don't know whether they know they're there. Maybe they do, maybe they have some wonderful system of resonance that I know nothing about and they're all worried about what I'm going to do with them. And having conferences and meetings and policy decisions, and so on and so forth, because there's this person in charge. You know, it might well be that when I die or when we all die all our cell suddenly say God is dead. And they have this big theological

controversy, and say well. We just have to fend for ourselves from now on and that's called corruption but they all go off on their own.

So, I don't know, it may be here that we've got some kind of a system like that, but certainly to know that you're there you need an echo. So I invented this limerick: 'There was a young man who said though, it seems that I know that I know what I would like to see is the I that knows me when I know that I know that I know.' So this is the the thing you see not only do you remember what happened and say it made an impression on me, which means it made me remember. Like your retina remembers whatever is seen so that it sticks there a little. In other words that's why you get the illusion of a circle of fire when you revolve a cigarette in the dark. It makes the impression of a circle because your retina remembers and holds, as it were the impression of the flame. And so then, beyond that, we have we are absolutely fascinated with the whole principle of remembering, and so then when there's some gathering of people. And we say, well this is a great day what a wonderful big picnic or whatever it is we're having, it's a pity somebody didn't bring a camera. It should have been photographed. Now, do you see that in this whole thing there is both a gain and the loss. The, one school of people are saying it should be photographed. The other school of people are saying let go of it. When you go around, we had so much experience of this in Japan because all our students brought cameras and were constantly photographing things and I had a camera and I was constantly photographing things, but I felt that as long as I had a camera with me, I was somehow distracted from actuality. I had a little box with which I went around grabbing life, of course it's great to come back and look at it, in the form of photographs, but there's something about the photograph that is inferior to the actual experience that you're photographing. But, there is an immense fascination, in photography, in painting, in reproducing, and reproducing you see is the same thing as sexuality it is reproduction. Only in another way. Because it tells you you're there, you're alive the thing bounces, it echoes.

So the duplicity in all this, is that you see, one school of religious people say let it all go, don't be attached in other words...and they also say live in the moment like Krishnamurti's doctrine of stop trying to remember everything you may need a kind of factual memory for your name and

address and telephone number. Or things like that but don't linger over memories and treasure memories and say well I'm going to keep my girlfriend's lock of hair and I'll take it out every now and then and look at it and feel wonderful thing that's clinging to life, because that memory has got you hooked. It holds you to the past, and it holds you to death. But, then there's the other school of thought, you see, quite opposite of this which says remember to remember, title of one of Henry Miller's books. Hold on to it all, get involved. Keep your girlfriend's hair. Keep all the photographs you know how in some houses the piano everything is completely covered with photographs and reminiscences.

I went to visit. Gloria Swanson once. I have never seen such a house full of memories. Everything in all directions was Gloria Swanson, photographed on this occasion, signed on that occasion presentation there's I want to visit once to the wife of a former Archbishop of Canterbury and the whole house was memorials when it was a complete clutter of Tombstone furniture. With little brass plates, on it presented on the occasion of this that or the other. Well, you say look that person isn't really living. And they're all in the past. But on the other hand., what is life, you see, except there is a memory, except there is an echo. So what I want to point out you see, is the duplicity of all this. That you don't take if you're a wise man you don't take sides in this issue. You do both sides. And that is the meaning of the unity of something Samsara and Nirvana. On the one hand, you let go of everything and you live in the eternal now because that's all there is the memory is an illusion, it's all gone. So everything you know about, that makes an impression on you, is no longer there that's the meaning of Maya. There is only the eternal now. There is only the present moment and never will be anything else. Because even what you're remembering is happening in the present, the memory is in the eternal now there isn't it see so it's all really absolutely here. But on the other hand what fun to drag it out. And to make it echo, and to get involved. And to fall in love. And to become attached.

Once R.H. Blythe wrote and said to me, I may have told some of you the story before you wrote me a letter and said What are you doing these days as for me I am now abandoning all kinds of satori and enlightened and I am trying to become as deeply attached to as many people and as many things as possible. As these are the two sides.

So, the thing is this. It's just like riding a bicycle. It's a balance trick. You suddenly find yourself falling over one way. Well, you balance that you turn into that direction and you stay up. And so in the same way when you find yourself becoming, too attached to life, you correct that with the realisation that there is nothing except the eternal now. Then when you feel it's all right now you see you're safe again to is the only done that once my. You go and get attached. Or you get involved, you get concerned, about some enterprises social, political, amorous, familial, scholarly, artistic, whatever it is, you get involved. And the two always go together, so this is the meaning of the symbolism. Because the male only knows he's there if there's a female. It's the echo, and she only knows she's there if there's a male. Nobody ever came into existence without a couple of parents, see. And there's a simply no other way into this you universe.

Now this is simply I'm using this simply not as the main point, but as a sort of illustration of the simultaneity of attachment-detachment all in evolution and evolution involution is how you get involved evolution is how you get out. Well now, this tantric yoga represents all of us in the most extraordinary symbolism, which is basically the human body. Again, it's not simply the sexual functioning of the human body, it's the whole nervous system. If you really dig into this, you will find, that there is a psychic anatomy, and this psychic anatomy in yoga philosophy belongs to what I explained yesterday as the subtle body. You must not expect to find this in the physical organism. Nor must you expect to find that there is in addition to the physical organism a sort of spook that goes around with us. The physical body is the body as examined by others. The subtle body is the way you feel yourself.

Now, there is a then again an anatomy of the subtle body. Which consists of the process of involution and evolution. There is a spinal tree, and it's represented as having two paths down it. It is a represented as a canal called the social. And then in this canal are two routes one is called the IDA and the others call the pingala. P I N G L A and the IDA, Ida. And one come current Something is going down. On the other something is coming up and you will recognize I think the familiar image of two serpents on a rod The Caduceus, is carried by Mercury. And alchemically the mercury. The mirror substance is the void is the pure clear light the same thing as the blood is

done. Now down at the base of the spinal column according to the chakra system. There is what's called the kundalini, which is the serpent power. And the symbol of the serpent power, is an inverted triangle, with a phallus upright and erect, and a sleeping serpent coiled all the way around the phallus. That is in other words, involution, to be absolutely involved. And the sex symbol is used again because sex stands for symbolically complete involvement. Now when you got in the trick is to get out. See?

So then, the process of yoga is represented as waking up that sleeping serpent, who is under the sleeve of Maya, who is captivated by illusion and thinks that the world really exists in other words the female echo of himself, or the male echo of herself has captivated. Memory has caught you. And you think it's all really there and you don't realize this is there's only the eternal now. And you need to know that. In order not to get quite lost, because if you go out to any one end of the spectrum, you forget you're there. At sort of a non-existence, you can't really non exist, you always come back eventually, but if you get one extreme too much you don't know you're there.

So then, the symbol is that you draw up the energy located in the kundalini, which is the sex symbol. And you send it back up the spinal tree to the top again from whence it came. Now, this is the theory of sex yoga. The theory is that, the male and the female partners. Well as I explained yesterday husband and wife or, some kind of spiritual marriage. What they do is this: by, the male sits in the normal meditation posture. And the female sits on top of them wrapping her legs around his waist and her arms around his neck, and he holds her around the waist. And in this position they arouse the sexual force. Now the theory goes on to say this. That instead of dissipating this energy, in the ordinary way, having aroused it, they send it up the spinal tree. Back into the brain. Now, don't take this literally, this is a symbolism. It's just the same kind of superstition is thinking that heaven is somewhere up in the sky and that there really are streets of gold, and angels wandering around in night with harps. All this is a way of talking about inner. Inner anatomy psychic anatomy. The kingdom of heaven is within you. And when Jesus ascended into heaven he went right into the middle of himself. And disappeared. You know, like the gates of heaven, there are pearls. People think the pearly gates the gates covered in pearls, there's

nothing of the kind. The gates of heaven are pearls each one is one pearl and you know a poem has a very thin hole through it for the thread to go in and that's why it's a camel can't go through the eye of a needle. Because you have to become no one to get through that hole. That's why the idea of many incarnations is likened to beads strung together on a thread and this thread is called the Sutraman. Sutra is a thread are among the self the threading self that angles all the beads together but it's so thin you see that. It's like nobody. The real you. You have to divest yourself of all hang ups, you see, to discover the real you. Well, we're back again to the thing of pulling the snake up the tree the serpent power... You have to let go of the hang ups and realize that there are no possessions everything's falling away all your memories are holding onto illusions. And then when you thoroughly understand that, you can go back in.

So you've got a marvelous picture of the world of the sort of systole and diastole. Of attachment and detachment, attachment and detachment. And this takes us right back you see the Bodhisattva who is liberated, who has let go and is no longer attached, to a given up memory. And in this is the meaning of giving up woman. Who was your resonator. Give that up, see, and you find you're free. There's only the eternal now. So the Bodhisattva, instead of staying there, goes back in. And there are all sorts of funny symbolic stories about Bodhisattva's appearing in the world as whores, and all kind of using every conceivable kind of device in order to liberate other beings. But this takes us completely back, you see, to the original Hindu image, of the world as the Pralaya and the Mahapralaya. The Mahapralaya is the period in which Brahma manifests himself as multiple beings for four million, three hundred twenty thousand years. And the Pralaya is the period in which he withdraws and everything disappears. And then starts all over again, and this goes on forever and ever and ever in not only our kind of time but in many other kinds of time. And in all sorts of different kinds of spaces. But it's the same fundamental myth, recreated in another form.

And you may say this is pretty monotonous. And that is you see one of the basic feelings underlying Buddhism. Must we go around again? So indeed you see you stay right now for this let's go to sleep. Let's stop, time must have a stop, so you stop. Well when you do that, you forget that it has happened, you see, this is a marvelous arrangement. Because then it can

start all over again without your knowing that it happened before, so you were never bored, and this is a cure for being tired of it. Because if you didn't know, I mean, that's where the memory goes you see. And so when you come back, there's no problem. At least no problem of boredom, of remembering the past are going to be all sorts of new problems. But you won't know you've had any problems that far so that won't worry you. Until you begin to accumulate memories again and you've had these problems, and it's becoming a bore dealing with problems and then you get rid of yourself. It's called death. It's a beautiful arrangement for keeping everything young and new. And for keeping the universe running without getting tired of itself and that's the definition of keeping on.

So you see, these are the two motions, that fundamentally then represented by the male and the female, the in and the out, the now moment and the memory, see, memory remember, creates the future as well as the past. You wouldn't know you were going to have anything happen tomorrow unless something happened yesterday. You figure because the sun, rose yesterday and yesterday and yesterday that it will arise again tomorrow. If you didn't remember it, you wouldn't know there was going to be any TOMORROW. Because there isn't, tomorrow is an illusion. So was yesterday. Simply isn't here where is it. Bring me tomorrow's newspaper. This is perfectly marvelous arrangement you see.

So that, you may feel as you think these things over that you are almost on the verge of going mad. I sometimes feel that, when I get involved in the sort of contemplative state, it is so weird and so far out that I think I'm going to lose my mind. But don't worry. You see, just like being dead. Just like....Just... let go. And swing with it. Because it always bounce. And what makes you gives you the sense of going mad, all is that you think you're not in control. And that it's all lost and someone someone else is going to take over. Or something else is going to take over. Well of course it has to. Because like you say, when you've driven long enough in the car you say to your wife will you drive for a while please? You want relief or something else has to take over. But it's all you. So do see that the how the nature of being is constructed in this extraordinarily fascinating way. So that. It constantly renews itself, and therefore is worth going on by eternal forgetting and getting rid of itself.

Eastern and Western Zen

Introduction to Zen

Reading the Book of Changes at the morning window, I rub the million stick of ink in the deal that drips from the pine trees. Discussing the sutras with a visitor, the sound of the wooden clapper is borne away on the wind from the bamboo. An ancient worth says, 'The shadow of the bamboo sweeps over the stairs, but the dust does not move.' The disc of the moon passes through the water of the lake, leaving no trace. One of our Confucians says, the stream rushes down swiftly but all is silent around. The flowers fall incessantly. But we feel quiet. If you have grasped the meaning of this in all your relations with things you are free in mind and body.

Zen and Taoism in common, involve not a system of doctrine, not a set of beliefs as we ordinarily understand religion, they involve a transformation of your consciousness that is to say out the way in which you experience your own existence at every moment. One might say that the average individual, not only in the West, but also in the east, has a feeling of himself as separate from his surroundings. From his, from other people, and from the Earth itself and from the space and the stars and everything around the earth.

He feels this in such a way that it's expressed in all the phrases of common speech. We talk about coming into the world. I came into this world. As a matter of fact you didn't. You came out of it, just in the same way as an apple comes out of an apple tree, as an expression of the apple tree. We say, I'm facing facts, as if facts, that is to say that the things going on in nature around you were something you confronted as a being alien from different from those facts. And meeting them as if they were total strangers. We talk about the conquest of nature, as a phrase expressing man's control over his environment, which is a very hostile phrase. Now, in order to get the Chinese point of view, may I be so simple as to take you back to the old

lesson about the bees and the flowers. Not to illustrate how sex works, but to illustrate the very fundamental property of nature. There are no flowers where there are no insects. There are no insects where there are no flowers. They go together, just in the same way as your head goes with your feet. Or as the head of a cat goes of the tail of a cat. Except in the case of Manx cats that don't have tails. But ordinarily, if you were watching a cat walking, and you had never seen a cat before, and you were looking at it through a narrow crack in a fence, you would see first the head and then the tail. Then the cat would turn around and walk past again, and you would see first the head and then the tail and you might assume that the.. your experience of the head of the cat was one event. And the tail was another example that they would be separate from each other but they would be related as cause to effect. But if you are a crack in the fence but widened, and you would see it was all one cat and that the head and the tail go together.

Now we have a way of attending to life which we call conscious attention, and that is like a narrow crack in a fence. Our speech reflects it, you can only think of one thing at a time. And that is our one of our ways of experiencing the world. Bit by bit, for example if you want to eat a chicken, you have to cut it up, and so you go to the grocery and you get a cut up fryer where else you cut it up at the table. Chickens do not come out of eggs as cut up friers. They come out the entire chicken. And so the world that we live in and we experience, is not caught up into things and events. It all goes together in the same way that the bees and the flowers go together, only we don't notice this we've got a way of thinking which splits it all up, and as a result of that we think of ourselves and so feel ourselves as if we were something separate from the whole domain of nature.

And to make a long story short and to tell you the whole quite right at the beginning, the the disciplines of our them and of Zen supposed change of consciousness in such a way that you will no longer feel that you are an isolated unit locked up inside a bag of skin but that you will actually experience the fact that your real self, the real you, is everything that there is. But concentrated on expressing itself at the point called your physical organism. There is of course, there are of course intimations of this in the west just as much as in the East. For example, to go back to something that is. Whole partly superstitious.

To my point of view that is to say astrology. Astrology does not seem to me to be an effective method of predicting the future. But it had some sense to it in that, when a child was born and people consulted the astrologers what he did was to draw a map of the person soul, his character. And this map consisted in a symbolic picture of the universe as it was at the moment when the child was born. Now, if the picture of that child's soul is the same thing as a picture of the universe. It shows that your soul is not in your body, your body is in your soul. And what your soul is, is the entire pattern of everything that there is, focused at the point you know as here and now. Just like you can focus the sun on a small point with a with a magnifying glass. Now, we know this to be true from the point of view of twentieth century Western science.

The science of ecology, which studies the relationship between organisms and environments is very acutely aware in an intellectual way. That an organism whether human or animal or insect or plant it doesn't matter what it is is not merely a something in an environment. Like you might say you are in this room. But the organism and the environment behave together. They go with each other. In the sense of the saying in the Gospels, figs do not grow on thistles, nor grapes on thorns. Has this application that human being in this do not grow in a cosmos which is unintelligent. If human beings are intelligent, and we define intelligence as the behavior of human beings. And their way of thinking, feeling and so on you will not get an intelligent organism in an unintelligent environment. An apple tree doesn't grow apples all the time. Planets and stars do not produce life all the time. But every so often, they do.

So if an apple tree may be said to Apple, this kind of universe in which we live peoples. It's a peopling world. And we go with it. But the problem you see, is we don't feel that. In the ordinary way we feel strangers in the earth and so talk about the conquest of nature and facing facts and all that nonsense. So that there is proposed then to get a transformation of our everyday consciousness which is a new kind of sensation. The sensation that what is going on outside you. Is all one process with what's going inside you, and that you are all that there is now you don't necessarily know this in the same way as you know something else out over there.

Let me just take this illustration. Conscious attention, which is the faculty we use most to negotiate and get around, is rather like the headlight of a car. And the headlight illuminates the road in front but it does not shine on the wiring that connects the headlight with the battery and the battery with the engine, so we are not ordinarily aware of how we are aware. And as a result of that, we don't understand our connection with the world, and we are unaware of what our real self is. Therefore, we get anxious. And we are afraid that death may be the end of us, and that somehow we will just pass out of this world altogether that will be that. Well this is of course the purest superstition. Because you're everybody is indestructible. We, as individual organisms as what we call physical bodies we come and go like leaves on a tree but there's the tree. And you are the tree. In the saying of Jesus 'I am the vine. You are the branches.' But that I am Before Abraham was I am. Is the self and this what the Hindus call the Brahman and the Chinese call the Tao. And are. The Tao is curious.

And so, the basic idea in this is that life is a dance. Of flowing downs which consists of going on and stopping that is to say what the Chinese call yang and yin. Yang is the southern side, or the sunny side of the mountain. It is a sunny south side of a mountain or the north bank of a river, where ever the sun falls. Yin is therefore a shadow side. Now imagine a mountain with only one side nobody has. A river with only one bank. Now life, you see, is a highly a game of Now You See It Now you don't. On up a wave. Moves in crests and troughs. Now you can have a wave unless you have both a crest and a trough. This is true in hydraulics, in terms of water, in electronics, in terms of physics, without the one you don't have the other. And so the relationship between least two things is called it this is the most important term there is in Taoist philosophy, is called mutual arising, and it's done like this.

This is the most important idea in the whole thing, this character means reciprocal or mutual, and this is based on an old idea ground for of a plant growing a rise to come into being and the whole of the fundamental idea is that the yang and the yin come into being together. You never find one without the other there's a sort of secret conspiracy, like Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee agreed to have a battle. So that, although there are different, like front and back are different too high and low are different, being and

nonbeing are different. Nevertheless they always go together so that to be on not to be is not the question. See it is the question for the west for all existentialist thinking to be on not to be that really if the question therefore man must necessarily be anxious, trembling always, the moment he knows that he is, he faces the possibility that he might not be. And so he trembles.

So, it is because of this then that the individual person all comes to feel that he is not something strange in this world. He comes to feel that he's an expression of it, and of the world as himself rather than his physical body alone. His physical body yes, that's you. And it has a certain degree of independence. But it's an expression of the whole thing in the same way as a wave as an expression of the ocean. See the ocean waves, and says yoo-hoo, I'm here. So in the same way, the whole cosmos waves with you and says I. And to the other waves hello glad to meet but we are all really. The one center expressing itself play in an infinite variety of ways.

Now then you say well what does this lead to in terms of practical consequences. Well it leads to a respect for the external world as one's own body. It leads to knowing how to get with it. Knowing how to do things, to act with the grain, rather than against the grain. And this is a, the most important lesson that ancient China has to teach the modern west, the modern technological west, is how to get with it. Because you see we have in technology as fantastic power to altering the not only the external environment, but for altering ourselves. What we can by technology, by neurological surgery, and by drugs and all sorts of things, we can change our own brains and begin to interfere technologically with our own characters. Now, the most asinine thing for us to do, would be to live in this lovely environment and spoil it by living in it. That's ridiculous.

So if you are a skillful architect works on the principle of the traditional Taoist and Zen architecture. You go to your environment let's say it is great still here and you say to it Good morning. And you even about so to it and say 'I want to live here but what kind of house would you like to have on the Hill.' Well the Hill says 'I would like a house that will disrupt as little as possible, because I have a game going on.' I have a huge complexity of plants and insects and small animals that manage to keep this hill here all these plants retain the hill they they prevented from falling down the they

prevent avalanches and all sorts of things like that so the Hill suggest to the sensitive artist the architect to build a house that does not interfere with the ecology of the hill. And so he thinks now, how will I do this, and he comes up with a solution where the only alteration he need to make to the Hill is to build some sort of a road to the house. But actually, what we're doing instead of that is we're going into our kills with bulldozers and we're terracing them, so as to make room for houses that would be appropriate on flat land and put them in the hills now we need the flat land for agriculture. All flat land anywhere available in California should be farmed, and people should live in the hills. But in order to do that we've got to understand how to treat hills. You see?

So if you look at the way the hills on the north side and the east side of Kyoto have been civilized. Why they never did that thing that...They have the most beautiful way of concealing houses in the hills so that you hardly know they're there. They don't know they didn't have any bulldozers. And the way the farmers have adapted their land to the landscape and done contour farming in the in the hills it's exquisite. So that a country, which is eighty percent of the land, is non Arab or because it's mountain. Has been made in combination with the sea eighty percent self-supporting. It's simply fantastic. They farm in the sea of eight seaweeds and things that we don't eat but all along the California coast there is a fantastic abundance of money in food kelp. You know how to cook it was just great. But we have to learn these lessons you see, in order to get by because we're going to have a terrible time if we don't know so this is the principle that is call him in Taoist philosophy wu-wei. This means not to force things. That's the best English translation, I've come to. It's sometimes translated not doing. No artificiality and no interference. But our work forcing as when a forced laugh forcing a lock forced behavior forced kindness fostered love in that sense forcing don't force it.

So, it means action in accordance with the character of the moment, and of the circumstances in which you're acting you see you can't not interfere with the world. Everything you do interferes with your environment and nobody knows this better than a chemist or physicist. Because he realizes the especially the physicist, that whenever he so much as inspects the behavior of electrons the things he has to do to inspect their behavior alter

the way in which they behave. Another was shine a light on something to look at it and that bombardment of light effect it. Especially at the nuclear level.

So in another way, let's say you, you put fertilizers in the soil, and that alters the ground. Now, ground that has had fertilizers put into it is not the same kind of ground as ground that hasn't. You understood the ground before you put the fertilizers in it and decided what to put in, but after you put it in it you've got to study it all over again to see what's happened to know what to do next time. And you see this constantly keeps moving. To know things is to change them. You cannot, not interfere. So the idea is to learn how to interfere skillfully. That's wu-wei. How to act with the grain.

And then there's one other thing but it has to be understood. Which goes into this this is not found in ancient Taoism but it is found in Zen it comes in later Chinese philosophy but it's based historically on the Taoist view of the world and this is the word Li. Now this is a very fascinating expression. It means, originally, markings in Jade. Grain in wood. Fiber in muscle. Western scholars have translated it reason or principle, but this isn't very good it doesn't get the feeling of it. Li is the word used to designate the character of the order of nature. And so our scholars tend to translate it the laws of nature, see? But the Chinese have no word that we can correctly translate as the laws of nature. Because they don't look upon nature as obeying laws. They look upon it as orderly but not legal.

Now you cannot write down the rules of fair play. It something that we know without being it's too complicated to be put into words. Just in the same way exactly, that we cannot describe our own nervous system. It's too complicated. And will always elude us, but where we'll get somewhere near it, right now the judge who understands equity goes beyond law. Because he is informed with this principle. Here Li. And the markings in creators like this when you get a piece of jade and look at its markings and. You don't think of them as chaotic. When you see a dirty old ashtray with cigarette butts in it and rolled up bits of paper the pieces of Kleenex and things that everybody is throw away, you know that that's a mess. And you don't want that kind of a mess around. You get rid of it. But, when you look at the patterns on rocks or the shapes of clouds or the outlines of trees,

you've got something which isn't orderly in the sense of being symmetrical. It doesn't form fours, you know? But you know it's beautiful.

And so the painter in the Western tradition has copied clouds and trees and everybody when he copies clouds and trees as it were that's a picture I know what that's about. But clouds don't mean anything. They're not a picture of anything they're just clouds, they're just clouding. And so the poem. I don't know if I wrote it that now I didn't there's one called. 'Blue Mountains are spontaneously Blue Mountains white clouds are spontaneously white clouds. They just do that you see that's their game. But they what they are definitely something that we recognise as having an order and not being chaos. But we can't quite pin down where in that order consists. We know it is order. And we can analyze it physically, chemically, and we can find out a lot about the behavior of surface tensions, which are a way of explaining why our bubbles in water form the way they do white clouds form the way they do it separates etc. But, what we get is only an approximation to it. Like for example, when you measure a piece of land, you're a surveyor, and you'll reduce it to so many small triangles and you measure those triangles and that measures the land that's only an approximation to what's actually there. Fine, so far so good, but we never quite get it.

So there is there's always I'm graspable indefinable principle of order in things which is Li. And that explains why Chinese art appreciates in all that it does a certain element of the uncontrolled. Now you see when you use for example a brush. Let's take it right here. In our Here the brush runs a little dry. And you are at the mercy of the hairs of this brush. Now some painters like to let everything go wild. In a certain sense, the man who did that has let things go pretty wild. But what the ideal that they're aiming at is what you have to be a tremendous master to accomplish is to let it go wild within limits. To create a situation which overall is orderly, but allows for the unexpected random surprises. And so they look upon our daily life in exactly the same way.

I was talking about bees earlier on, and somebody suggested to me the other day that these are quite remarkable for this reason. That every bee does exactly what it feels like doing. And yet. It's all orderly. Imagine that,

supposing you could get up at the beginning of the day and live in such a way that you did just exactly what you personally wanted to do. You didn't pay any attention about what anybody else thought of doing or the schedules are anything like that you did just what you felt like. But it so turned out that what you felt like was what everybody else felt like doing with you, and it was an orderly performance.

Well the bees have it. And so to follow the Tao. is to acquire the art of doing exactly what you feel like doing. And at the same time it wu wei, in the sense that it does not force anything on anybody. Or impose on you. But, to do that, to act naturally, you have to understand this word, which in Chinese is called ziran. That which is. Now where this mean so, this means self. Self -so. What is so of itself this is pronounced ziran. And this we translate into English nature. Although it's very unlike our word nature. It means what happens without being shoved. Without being forced. What is so, of itself. What happens naturally we do have it in that sense it comes naturally when we say that. It's second nature. Something like that, when we say that we get this thing so the Tao. Passage and Lao-Tzu's writing places the Tao's method, is to be so of itself.

Now, we have had an image of the universe in which it's run by somebody the Lord God is in control. And he made it all he engineering it all, understands all about it and he remains in control. The Chinese is exactly the opposite. It looks as a part of the universe as not being in control at all. But is being perfectly orderly of itself. So he says the great Tao flows everywhere, both to the left and to the right. It loves and nourishes all things, but does not lauded over them. And when good things are accomplished it lays no claim to them.

I know for example, an order, in a sort of a religious order in Japan, where it's both men and women. They live in about two hundred of them they live in families. And they live very simple way and they're fantastically happy people. But what there they do is they they round their garden and farm and so on, but they also they they are always buzzing around town finding out if somebody is sick and a family is in a hopeless mess. Everybody is sick, they can't even clean up their toilets they can't do their washing and so on

these people move in and they do clean out the toilets they do the washing and they clean up the whole house and disappear.

You know it's a very curious kind of a thing but they just vanish. So there's a poem in Zen which says 'Entering the forest he does not disturb a blade of grass. Entering the water he doesn't make a ripple.' Because he was so in accord with the scene. And he flowed so easy through it that nobody noticed.

Water not disturbed by waves, settles down of itself. A mirror covered with dust it is clear and bright. The mind should be like this.

Early Chinese Zen

One of the things that is a really interesting problem, is just why Zen has become so fascinating to many people in the West. Because as you find Zen in Japan today, it's a pretty tough scene. There are very few Japanese interested in it. The Monastery of Myoshinji in Kyoto, was built to accommodate six hundred monks. There are now thirty. For example, I wanted to have a conversation with a learned priest of the Shingon sect. And I had two interpreters; his wife, who speaks very good English and the interpreter we had for our group. And as we got into things, they started to say sorry but this is impossible to translate into English. We don't know what it means. So I said, All right let's get some paper. And when any word arose that they didn't understand I had him write it in Chinese characters. Which I can more or less read.

And so we managed to can't converse in this very strange roundabout way of the syntax being conveyed by the interpreters and the actual terms being written. But that shows who say that they've been quite intelligent people, but the interpreter was a very intelligent man and the priest wife a very and well educated woman. But they don't know what it's all about. So how come then you see, this fascination in the West? Well, it's due very largely to the way in which certain people have presented Zen to the west notably Suzuki. And R.H. Blithe. They have made a great use of the Zen story of the anecdotes. There is a book of Zen anecdotes, these conversations between the masters and their students. They're called Mondo or question-

answer. There is a book which is called the Mooman Khan. And it's just a collection of stories. And I remember a friend of mine in England, when this was first in circulation, getting this book when he was in hospital. And he said I don't understand it at all but it's cheered me up immensely.

So the typical sort of Zen story where the student asks the teacher a question. What is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism? And the master says, 'Wait around until there's no one here and I'll tell you.' So later the student says to him, 'now there's nobody around Master what is it?' and he takes him out into the garden. And he points at the bamboos. And the students as I don't understand. The master says, 'What a long bamboo that one is. What a short one that one is.' Period. It has a kind of a shaggy dog feeling, it has a it just leaves you wondering. Well what's this meant to convey?

And the answer of course is that Suzuki explains most carefully it's not a symbolical tale. In other words you're not supposed to understand that bamboos symbolize something. In the way that for example the parables in the New Testament are symbolical tales. Is not like that at all. All these zen mando. Are absolutely clear there is no concealed symbolism except in very rare incident and then the symbolic element is subordinate. Always the answer is completely straight. For example, there is a famous koan, where the answer to the question, 'What is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism?' is the second son of the Sho family, and the third son of the Cole family. Or something like that.

And once a student. Gave an answer to this koan. And the teacher accepted it, but the teacher's chief student who was standing by at the time said when the other student had gone away, he said I think you should test on this. And, I don't think he really understands. So he called him back the next day and said oh I gave him this koan again and he gave the same answers he gave before and the teacher said no no that won't do at all. But Master you accepted this answer yesterday. But the Master replied, 'Yesterday it was yes but today it is no.'

When another, when we had a talk with one of the great Roshi's in Japan on our last visit. We were discussing the translation of zen texts into English. And there's quite a work going on in that way. But he said it's not

necessary. If you understand Zen, you can use any book to teach it with. You could use the Bible you could use Alice in Wonderland. After all he said the sound of the rain needs no translation. And this is a very very straight story, you see, this is saying exactly what it's about in the plainest language. Only people overlook it. You know, when something's right under your nose and you can't see it and you go looking over there there there there there and you're carrying it you see. It's like that. And so Suzuki has explained that that's the way it is. That once when Sabro Hasegawa, the great Japanese painter was at a dinner party here in San Francisco somebody asked him what about understanding Zinn How long does it take. He said 'it might take you thirty years it might take you three minutes. I mean that.'

So you see the element of fascination that it's right under your nose you're looking right at it and see Asika you don't get sort of strangely puzzled when you've lost something, and somebody is kidding you. They're not piling it up deal with that why don't you see it. It's right there. And you can't for the new. I have you with it I mean it's far more interesting that sort of situation than something that's really difficult to find anywhere you'd have to go digging on the floors in it some and if a treasure were concealed in the walls of this ferryboat and I would have to go digging through the walls and look at all sorts of things but here is the treasure concealed in full view, and concealed by being in full view but in the place that's too obvious to look. So that's the flavor of Zen, and that's why it's become so fascinating. Also, there are other elements in it that. It has a humor to it which is peculiarly Chinese. I don't think the Japanese have quite the humor in their Zen that the Chinese had. And you because you see this humor comes from Taoism. The say the writings of Chuang Tzu, who was the great Taoist philosopher who lived shortly after three hundred B.C. He's the only really great humorous philosopher. And that flavor has passed on into Zen. And also Zen is something experiential. You're not required to believe in anything. It doesn't have any doctrines. It's entirely consists in a state of consciousness. Awakened consciousness, so as if I were to say to you, you if you were puzzled about something you know, you were what calls concerned about being. What is this thing, life? Why are we here? Why it why is that suffering? Why do all these creatures multiply in different ways? Shapes Why are the ducks? Why are the trees while other

snails clams people all out for heaven sakes why? And why do they come and go on what happens to them when they go we all want to know that. So that's the kind of concern.

Zen answers this, not with an idea but with a changed state of consciousness. And we'll never know whether you can get that change state of consciousness instantly right now without further ado or whether you have to work for many long years. There was an American student of Zen. Went to Japan on a Fulbright. And he started and started he practiced his meditations and sat in the meditation posture with all the other monks. And the last part of the technique is to work up a state of intense doubt, puzzling about what is it? You know what's this? What is it? What is existence? What is isness? Well he worked and worked and worked at it. And nothing happened. And the time for his stay was very close to the end, and he couldn't get a renewal of the grant and he had to go back to the United States and he thought this is absolutely terrible I won't get it I won't get the Satori, the Awakened insight. So he went to the master and said look this is desperate you've got to help. The Master said, "Now look you'll do what you've got to do is now go into what's called seshen. Seshenn means study of the mind. And but it means prolonged meditation where you hardly even sleep. And it isn't really get to work on your koan, and see me four times a day. And see if you can answer your can and I'll help you. So you worked and it worked and it worked and he sat there and nothing happened nothing have. Until almost the day he had to leave when suddenly he saw that there was nothing to realize. And then he had it.

You see, Zen works on this principle it's called using an empty fist to deceive a child. You know when you say an hour to a child what have I got here? The child is all interest what is in there and you hide your hand this way that way and so on when the child is fantastically interested and then finally, there's nothing. So in the same way, you can get a problem about life. Which is a closed fist. What is it all about? It's like asking what's that pit in the middle of an onion? And you take off all the skins and so on zones on and suddenly you find you've got a litter of skins and no pit. There wasn't anything in it. And you might say well that's it's a hoax. It's, the life is a deception. A tale told by an idiot. And yet, what you had missed, in looking for the pit, were the beautiful skins. See, that's the edible part of the

onion. Whereas you may peel a potato. The Onion is all skint. But excellent.

Now they might have one has done under these circumstances is you have missed the point by being too eager. You have therefore overlooked what was obvious. And so problems are made about the nature of the universe by asking the wrong questions. May I repeat that there are four great philosophical questions. And in a way they are all of the mistaken. But they are the questions that people have asked through all history about the world one who started it.? Two, Are we going to make it? Three, Where are we going to put it? And four who's going to clean up? Plato.Aristotle. Kant. Descartes are all discussing these four questions. Now you see but they give you the beginning the beginning who started it that's a misleading question. Know what it is if it was always here you know, it is what there is. And you had it there. But if you see if you get under that you know what what do I see when the some kind of shenanigans going on, the police come by, they want to who started it. They're looking for a ringleader because they want someone to blame society requires that somebody should be blamed.

So what we do is from childhood, all human beings get together and they make up the idea that you started it. Only it's no fun if we know immediately who started it. It has to be sort of concealed so people tell lies and cover up and so on and so we want to know who's good guys and who are the bad guys really there aren't any differences. We're all collectively doing what we're doing, and because one person is as we know say a criminal it has to do with his parents and his environment and so on but that mustn't be admitted. Because we wouldn't know how to deal with all of us. See, if the thing that's that that's the matter with human beings is all human beings in addition to their environment and the fishes and the birds and everything it all goes together, it's absolutely interconnected. And but that's no fun you see, so we break, we pretend that it's all broken up into bits. And that one starts it and so on.

So, once you've done that once you've broken it all up into bits, and you start playing cops and robbers. Then you have problems. And it may be fun to have problems, it's perfectly alright to have problems. Because that's the interest of things. We make life interesting by making it difficult. And

sometimes we overdo it. And then it gets desperate, and then people begin to ask well what's it all about? Why are we doing this? Then you have to go to a zen master or somebody like that to be cured of your illusions. And the way he does it, you see, is to make you ask intensely What is it? What is the sound of one hand? Listen. Really listen what is the sound of one hand? What is that say when somebody asks as a master what is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism? He said 'the cypress tree in the yard'. All right go up there and look at it. Are just the sound moo. The Great Master Joshu was asked does a dog have Buddha nature. And he said no. Moon Chinese. But everybody knows if they started any Mahayana Buddhism they're not only good dogs have it in them but in nature which means the capacity to become a Buddha, an awakened one or you could say it means Buddha nature could roughly mean. The divine center.

So why did the master say no? So they what they do is this. They they work on the word no. And sometimes the masters teach them to say No really. Now he says Say No shout it. And the student shouts, and the teacher says, 'You didn't really mean it, try again.' And so he gets to yelling No This in no no no and the teacher is no this is not good enough get behind it, get with it. And the student get so frustrated, he suddenly realizes he can't say no. Well now, you know a little bit about this. Supposing you take the word know and you say it many times NO NO NO NO NO. And it becomes funny. You wonder isn't it strange that this funny sound no, which makes you it a little bit on the tip of your nose means no, well what does no mean?. What does it mean that you don't know what I mean when I say No see I mean no means I won't. I don't want any dinner or something I won't play with you.

But take the situation of a person making this exchange with another. See, we know we know the meaning of the word no. But what does it mean that we are able to have this exchange of meaning this communication. Does that mean anything? Well, it in a way it doesn't you can come and sit over here there's plenty of room. What, that is is the fact that we as human beings communicate, that we say how do you do in the morning and goodbye at night that we eat, that we have children, and they all put in the boxes, and they become doctors and lawyers and business executives, and they do this and they do that it's just that the trees go up and they do this

and they wave in the wind and the birds flap around and they eat things and that makes bird because all the food you eat flows into your shape just like a flowing stream has a whirlpool in it and it keeps the whirlpool there but the Whirlpool is never the same water it goes on and on.

So in just the same way all these creatures are a kind of a tide of food and it goes in and it does that creature and it flaps around and then it goes out again. So what's all that about? In the Buddhist philosophy is that all that is called thusness. It's like that. Like did you ever see a lady go this way go that way. And so a Buddha is called in Sanskrit a tathagata, which means one who comes or goes thus. This very simple, that's that that's what it's doing and things are doing that. Only to make a kind of game of it, we put valuations on it. It's like poker you get chips how much of the chips worth well they're worth anything you want to say their work. So in the same way all this is going on and you say well what is important. Is the something important or well yes we say there are certain things that are more important than others. We've agreed among ourselves because we are people that we are more important than seagulls. And the seagulls have agreed among themselves that they're more important than people. And they they recognise their kind and they pick out in life all the things that are significant to their needs as we pick out the things that are significant to our needs. We say now that's the thing that really must happen but actually nothing must happen. It just, it just happens. And that's called thusness are such a mess. And so the zen is concerned that the whole nature of Zen is to get you back to seeing the suchness of things. You see, it's a process of un-hypnotizing things. You see, when you you hypnotize people by making them pay attention. So I want you to look very closely at my finger. And I want you to relax completely and pay attention only to this finger. And there are many other ways of doing it you. You hypnotized people much better by not letting them know that's what your doing. And all showbiz and teaching and so on is hypnosis. Your parents began to entice you in the moment you were born because they told you what was important to look at you know baby looks at everything. They really is interested in just anything around I mean children sometimes point out things for which we have no words to say what's that. You say what do you mean? Why don't you see that? Roanoke a perfectly clear I'm that what's what's about it what's the word for that you suddenly realize that they're pointing out a

configuration of patterns on something that we don't have a word for. Me, for example we don't have a single word in English for dry space. We don't have a word for most kinds of smell. For example, the smell of cheap perfume. Like Ben-Hur, or that sort of very metallic, crude kind of perfume. We don't have any word that describes that specific quality of smell. Because we haven't thought it significant very much to bother about our noses. But little children smell everything, they look into everything, they suck their toes, they explore their whole bodies everything all around. And they're fascinated. But the adults say now now don't touch this do touch that look at this don't bother about that, because they're teaching them the human game and what is significant and what is not.

Now, when you see you have picked out things in the world that are very important things, the significant things. In other words the scenes a thing is a name for something you think about. All things are units of thought like an inch is a unit of measurement or an ounce is a unit of weight a saying is a unit of thought it's a think. And so when you say you can only think of one thing at a time you can only think one think at a time that's what it's saying because actually think of the things think of the tape recorder how many things is the tape recorder? You know it's a mass of stuff. Human body likewise. But when that predicament is foisted upon you, are divided life into all these things. Then you are under the delusion that the world is all separated and disjointed. And that you are only something in the world. You forget by doing that, that you are, that your physical organism. Let me put it this way, is something that the whole. Cosmos is doing. The real you is all that there is, the whole works. There's no real separation. I mean, when I say there are there's no separation don't imagine that I'm saying that there aren't any skins, there aren't any outlines, there aren't any surfaces or lines. Yes of course there are.

But the basic lesson in metaphysics is that for every inside there is an outside that's really all you need to know. Once you really understand that you have mastered all philosophies. That the inside and the outside go together in other words people think that I'm in the inside and you're on the outside. But where would my inside be without the outside. See, imagine a bottle, which has an inside but no outside. It won't work. There's no such thing. Imagine an object, with no external space around it. It wouldn't exist.

So the space and the object go together just in the same way as your front and your back go together. And that's it only you see we're taught by pointing out what things are important and what and not, to ignore that. So ignoring it, is in Sanskrit ignore and it's our video and the Buddhists say video is the beginning of the trouble.

You just ignore are the inside and the outside go together. So, the the the work of Zen is to get people un-hypnotized by this sort of thing, back to the point where they started in babyhood, but they never cultivated it because they were developed along other lines. To its call to regain one's original treasure. That you received from your father and mother. Or what is sometimes called to get the unborn mind. That's a curious phrase, the mind that didn't arise. That is to say what you are fundamentally, as distinct from what you pop up and declare yourself to be. Imagine for example, a big sow with many tits on it, all these passages to a central source of. And so they unite together under the surface well in the same sort of a way you see we are all, united like that. We are channels. Through which it is happening.

Only, we are sensitive only on the tip of the nipple. [laughs] We are all our concentration is there at that point. And so, we've lost the realisation of being the whole thing. That happened very very early in our infancy. Now when you get it back, you don't become incapacitated. In other words, it isn't as if you lost sensation and the comprehension of what we call the different things and events in the world their names their places all that sort of practical knowledge. The knowledge in other words that is helpful for survival. You don't lose that. That you see all these separate things, and people and events, in a new context. You might say, against a new background. In which you see that they're all one. Or if I'm going to get very very technical as the Indian logicians like to, he would say they are non-dual. Because the word one is still a dual word. It has an opposite one as opposed to many or to none. Whereas this whatever it is, that we're all on. Doesn't have an opposite, because it's everything, so the word one isn't quite the right word for it so they use the word non-dual which is a kind of a fancy word. They use it. I mean non-dualism is of course the opposite of dual. But they have a convention about it. Imagine, when you draw on a flat surface, and you want to represent the third dimension of depth. You do it. Still using lines on the flat surface, but by a convention that we all agree on

certain slanting lines indicate this dimension, and we all know that so in the same way in Indian philosophy certain words are used. To designate a dimension not in our ordinary way of thinking our ordinary where thinking is either this or that we think in dualities, and that may have something to do with the fact that our brain as two sides, and we have two eyes two ears and so on two nostrils. This, and the way our ribs are formed growing out of the spine and two legs and two arms. That probably, that structure is connected with the way we think. Either this or that. When you have what's in the left hand all you have what's in the right?

And so, we can't talk about, we can't say anything sensible about everything, about the universe. Because we can't find something that's not the universe. So then what we do is we take a dualistic word and say, it is to be understood that this word refers. To what is beyond all dualistic ideas. See, look at it this way. In order to make a word mean something. I have to be able to say what is excluded from the meaning of this word. It's like a box. If the box is there, there must be what's inside the box, and there must be what's outside the box. Now I want to talk to you about a box which is the ultimate box, the class of all classes, as logicians say, and there isn't anything outside it. Everything is in this box. Well, a logician would say that's absurd there could be no such box it wouldn't be a box. Unless you can show me that it has an outside I'm sorry.

Well, I'm going to get tied up with this fellow I want to say yeah. My box has an outside. And the outside and the inside, however, go together. Actually the box I have here. Is constructed in a Q peculiar way you know what a mobius strip is don't you? You take a strip of paper, you twist it once and you draw in the two ends have a continuous strip. Now this has a very strange property. It has only one side and only one edge. You can hold that strip of paper between your fingers and say well look here, I've got one finger on one side and one on the other. It obviously has two sides. Say wait a minute. Take a pencil light. Bright red pencil and run it along that so-called one side that you think you have there, and keep going. And you'll find when you have followed the pencil back to the place where you started. That you never took it off the paper to go around to the other side.

In the same way, you run your finger along one edge of it and you keep running and you'll get back to the point where you started from and you will have covered the whole thing, both sides. Both edges. Now, just put that now into three dimensions, instead of two. And you have what's called a Klein bottle. If you I think somewhere around the house I'll dig it out we have the Life magazine book on mathematics and has a beautiful drawing of a Klein bottle in it. That has the same property in three dimensions. Now imagine a world which has the same property in four dimensions. And you got something like what our universe is. It's outside is the same as it's inside. Crazy. And you you see, it's difficult to talk about that in the kind of language that we have. Just in the same way mathematicians affair especially in with mathematics applied in physics, have ideas, which they can express in their formulae, but which they can't talk, they can't tell the layman about. Because in order to instruct the layman as to the meaning of these concepts they have to put them into our ordinary three-dimensional sensory images and they always distort it.

So you see, the view that's why it said that Zen cannot be explained in words. Although it is in a way explained very clearly in words in all these little stories. Nevertheless, these stories are not intelligible until you have what I can only call a new dimension of consciousness. You see, a lot of people don't really have depth perception. They would look at the moon and see it as a disk. They don't see a ball, the same way a lot of people attend there. They hear noises, but never hear tunes. It's something like that. Suddenly, one day, you say, 'Good heavens the moons of all. Are you suddenly become alive to what it is that people dig in music.

Well, in just that sort of way, you can become suddenly alive. Till then, I'll just call it the oneness of everything that's going on. And you'll see that that's all you. And you are eternal. Your what there is. And there's nothing to be afraid of. Because of where we're coming and going we go through a whole spectrum of feelings from the most rapturous pleasures, to the most ghastly agonies, and it's all as insubstantial as weaving smoke. And just go, you know, just get with it and go. And then you have the basic understanding of Zen.

Now, all that I've said that's far is simple introduction to what Zen is about. If this way of understanding things. Arose independently in both India and China. In India in what we call the tradition of the opening shots in Vedanta and yoga and so on. Then in Buddhism, in China in the form of Taoism and. And they reached each other eventually. And the confluence of the Buddhist and the Taoist traditions, came to be Zen. And this, the formation of Zen really began in about four hundred fifteen A.D. In China. With the students. Of a great Hindu monk. Camara Gita. And. In the following, two hundred years. Three hundred years, it slowly took form and took form. Until a very remarkable man by the name of Hui Neng. HUI, NENG, who died in seven hundred thirteen A.D. was the man who put it on the map. Who. As it were. Brought all the threads together. And could be called the real founder of Chinese Zen. Now we're going to do in the course of the seminar we're going to look at the work of Wayne and. That I want first before we. Look at him to look at some of the earlier people especially Dogen. Was a couple of generations before spiritual generations that is, Master-pupil, master-pupil, who wrote the most succinct summary of Zen. That exists which is called the Hsin Hsin me. That is to say the treatise on trust in the mind. Mind with a capital M.. Which means many things mind is used in Zen they use the word Shin and when a Chinese says shin he points here. Japanese the heart mind. The psychic center of gravity. But it means mind in a. Much wider sense than that. It means mind in the sense of do mind? Mind out. And it also means mind in the sense of space. Everything that we see is on the Mind. Like the sound of the radio is on the diaphragm of the loudspeaker. It's a very wide sense of the word. Well let's have an intermission now.

This morning, I simply tried to give you a general survey of what Zen is about, by way of being an introduction. And I was discussing the peculiar reasons for the interest in Zen in the West, stressing the extraordinary way in which the sort of, now you see it, now you don't, implication of zen literature has fired people's imagination, curiosity. That the feeling, there is a new vision of the world in it the aspect of its unity as distinct from our ordinary vision of the world in the aspect of its multiplicity, and broken-upness, fallen-apartness. And that this is something that you might somehow suddenly catch at any minute. It isn't that then is an easy thing or that it's a difficult thing. It might be either. And, but it exercises this peculiar fascination, by saying that the vision of the world and its unity is

terribly obvious. It's right under your nose only, you're looking too hard in the wrong place, so you don't see it. And so this is always the same puzzle as if I said to you. If you came here you know, and said well we want some philosophical enlightenment or whatever, and I looked at you in a funny way and said 'But you've forgotten something.' You know as if you hadn't got your pants on or something. What have you forgotten? You know. Who do you think you are, any how? I'm I'm just me. Oh now come on don't give me that line. What do you mean I'm just poor little me, ahhh nuts. Don't put on that act. And they're essentially you see it's that kind of Upaya. Which is in teacher use, is a Sanskrit word meaning pedagogical techniques. In spiritual disciplines. In politics it means cunning but in the vocabulary of butism or endures and it means. The expert cunning used by a teacher to surprise and trick is students out of their egocentricity. And Zen, therefore in all these koans, dialogues, rough czars and practices and so on it's all. It's a colossal hoax, but a very beneficence one.

So now, true Zen, came to birth in China as a result of a sort of interplay between Buddhism and Taoism. Now Taoism, is a kind of, exists in a sort of contrapuntal relationship to Confucianism. Confucianism is the philosophy of social order. And it is a very literary kind of attitude to life. Confucianism centers around the idea that sanity is grounded in words, numbers and ritual. You might say Confucianism is a social ritual, rather than a religion. It's based on the idea that you've got to find the right names for things, and it's terribly important to name things properly. Exactness of languages is critical. And so also music has to be just right. So Confucianism makes for a very high order of civilised conventional living. Not I might say, in passing, without a certain humor. Their humor is all through the Chinese nature. Confucius was a profoundly humorous man, but in a very cool way. He didn't have Chuang Tzu's belly laugh.

But you see they stick to Confucianism is the idea of what is called Jen. This is Romanized J E N But it's this character and shanks. And it means. Human heartedness. To be a reasonable person is the highest of all virtues and that really it means, the it involves, for example, the ability to come off it. To avoid fanaticism, to accept the fact that all human beings are good-bad. That we all have in ourselves an element of the rascal. And that you should simply get along by recognizing that so that if somebody picks a

fight with you, you work out a compromise you realize that he picked a fight center because he had emotions and he was human and he was greedy or whatever it is and so are you. And so you work out a compromise. And the Confucian would say that the human being as he is, both bad and good, is more trustworthy and reliable than a person who pretends that he's not like that. A person who pretends that he is good and moral and in all things model of integrity is a very dangerous man. Confucius said the goody-goodies are the thieves of virtue. So jen is the Confucian norm.

But then they like to, live a very artificial style of life, with a great deal of formality and good manners and propriety and Confucians are rather much Puritans when it comes to sex. On the other hand the Taoists represent the opposite pole. They make fun of all attempts to pin things down in words, because they say with what words would you define the right words, and with what words will you define those. They know that a dictionary is circular. Have you ever played a game called Vish? Short for vicious circle. What you do is this: You have a number of people sitting around a table each one with the standard college dictionary. And there's a referee. And at the word go a certain word is given. And everybody looks up that word. Then they look up the key word in the definition of that word. And then they look up the key word in the definition of that word and so on, when they get round to the Start word again they call up Vish the person who calls out this first is the winner of the game. But the referee is to decide whether you played fair, you know, whether you really look up a significant word in each clause. And you have to keep both you have a pad to keep a record of your steps the words you look up.

So that anyone challenges you the referee can judge. So Taoism is the force in Chinese culture which represents disillusion with the social game. You see Lao Tzu himself, by legend, who was supposed to have lived around six hundred B.C. to be a contemporary of Confucius but probably lived rather later than that. He was supposed to be the court librarian. And who became absolutely sick of the intrigue and the flattery and the insincerity of court life, and decided to quit. Just go off by himself and I can the mountains. But he was stopped at the gate by the captain of the guard who said, 'We can't let you go unless you first leave behind. A compendium of your wisdom.' So he's supposed to have sat down in the court in the gate house, and

written the stanzas of the Tao Te Ching, translated over seventy times into English alone. And then the guard let him go. And he disappeared into the mountains.

So the idea of, to put it very baldly, the idea of Confucianism is that all details of living should be done in a state of highly controlled consciousness. And should be just so exactly right according to the rules. The counter idea of Taoism is that it's better to let everything happen by itself. Trust your impulses, trust your instincts, trust your natural urges, let go of it all. Now, these two ways of describing Confucianism and Taoism are exaggerated. I'm caricaturing them for the sake of contrast. For example, a Taoist is not really a person who believes in pure laissez faire. What he is trying to say, the principle in Taoism called Wu-Wei which means non-interference, non-aggression, non-assertion. He's saying don't act against the grain of things act with it. Wu-wei is applied in Judo.

Now judo isn't as you know a highly effective form of interfering with things. But it does it on the principle of going with the grain. In other words, if, in Judo. There is a form of Judo. Which is called JunoKata And it's slow motion judo, to demonstrate the principles. And in one of these Juno Kata exercises... There is the always the attacker and the defender, and the attacker begins. By going at you like this. And this is the lead. Now what does the defender do? Instead of hitting back at that lead, he does this. He takes the hand of the attacker and pulls it off like this. Then he catches the other hand. And bends the fellow across and caught. In another one the attacker, does this, going to the jaw. The defender catches this upswinging hand, like this carries it right on twelve the fellow around and locks thus. The attacker is now bending backwards like this, but he is facing this way, and his right arm is thus caught. So these are the formal exercises which demonstrate the principles, the principle of Judo is. Overcoming nature. By cooperating. Same way as a sail tacks against the wind.

So you see it isn't quite not doing anything. It's as we say striking while the iron is hot taking time by the forelock etc etc. There is a tide in the affairs of men which taken at its flood leads on to fortune. And that's Taoism. But Taoism does tend, to be the attitude of skepticism towards the social and commercial rat race. And says really, do we have to play that game?

Wouldn't you actually be better off living in a kind of dignified poverty. And so easy in a way, Taoism is a philosophy for old people. After you've sowed your wild oats, and you made something in life and had children and so on and you become an old gent and others had enough of that. And so, you asked the question now, behind this facade I put on this role I've been playing and pretending that I'm someone who am I really? And what is all this thing about.

So the Taoist is a kind of a mountain man. He goes to the mountains. And you know that lovely Chinese poem. It's called Seeking the hermit. 'I asked the boy beneath the pines and he says the master's gone alone, herb-gathering somewhere on the mount, cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown.' And so, you know, there's this notion you know the old man mysterious old man somewhere up there on Mount Tamalpais. And there's trails it and by that missed all that ours really dig that and that's the landscape paintings of the China of the old masters. Sitting. On craggy canyons drinking sack a of whatever plum wine or whatever. That's their idea of a good life.

Now, both the Confucians and the Taoists. Are not. Although there's a certain Puritanism in Confucian ethics. They all believe in the physical world. As a good thing. The Taoist loves nature the Confucian is particular about parents and family and all that. The Buddhists of India on the other hand, tended, very often to be anti-physical. I mean in other words, to be celibate to be interested in getting out of this state of consciousness, in which the world appears to us in its multiplicity. The Chinese never could get on with that. They didn't see any sense in that Indian attitude. So when Buddhism came to China, the Chinese did a flip with it. And they wanted a kind of Buddhism which although it was sort of monastic in the Indian tradition, was not monastic in the way that it is in India. Or in Burma, Solon.

Buddhism, for the Chinese is to some extent a thing which you go into for a time. And you'll attain enlightenment. And then you can come back as it were, and do anything you want. You can have family you can be a tramp, you can just play it anyway. But they feel with it in into the whole tone of the Mahayana type of Buddhism even in India, is that once enlightened you want to come back. So the situation of a Buddhist monk in the Far East is

generally speaking, that he's not quite like a monk as we understand monks in the West. Monks in the West take a life of ours. They vow poverty chastity and obedience until they die. But in the Far East, a Buddhist monk may go into the discipline for a number of years. And then return to lay a life with no bad feelings in fact he may be considered a considerable success in having done so.

So, that kind of trend in the Confucian and the Taoist attitudes, when it coalesces with Indian Buddhism, produces something very different from anything you'll find in India. And Zen., uniquely and outstandingly represents this sort of attitude. So, too, when these Indian monks, worked with their Chinese opposites the scholars to translate the Buddhist Sanskrit texts into Chinese. It was obvious that they would find equivalent words from the vocabulary of Taoism and so, for example, when any Chinese master is addressing his students, the phrase which he is liable to use, in saying students he says W. Tao you'll means. We translated Oh you'll followers of the way. Of the doubt. The way of nature. But the Buddhist Marga, the path, the Noble Eightfold Path. The road, the path, finds the Chinese equivalent in Tao. But Tao means far more than Marga. Tao has overtones which the word Marga doesn't have in Sanskrit. Marga is simply something like a message. A course of discipline a set of stages but without. Means. The fundamental way of the world. What is innate, so that if you can find out what is innate in you to do or to be, and follow that, you are following the Tao. You're not following any laid down set of rules but Marga, in Sanskrit, means a set of rules.

So you see what happens now Furthermore say Dalia is to say little character Lou. Which. This follower actually means. Slow. So you get Fung Yu which means the flow of the wind. And thus has come to mean elegance of a certain kind. Supposing somebody is sitting by the stream. Like here on a misty evening and a bird is crawling in the distance and he's sitting there fishing. But he's not fishing just to catch fish. He's not just a peasant who needs fish. He's a poet, who . doesn't care whether he catches a fish or not it just loves to be there and dig that scene that's feng yu. It's a it's a word that means everything of the Feng which means ordinarily wind also means atmosphere in the sense that when you say a place or a room has a certain atmosphere. That restaurant has atmosphere feng. There's also... The

Chinese word.. Japanese would say. Fooshu, the atmosphere of our school. In other words, the Zen school, has a certain flavor to it which you recognise in the way a man walks or a style.

So it's enlightened experience, it's satori, has a certain style to it that is different from other people's in life and although they're all. Fully enlightened. Soul you know the funnel you is the flow So, when you translate from Sanskrit. 'Follower of the path' and you come out with a goal you'll a Tao Yu Japanese say Do Yul. You get an entirely different meaning. Somebody who flows with the Tao. So is then monkeys called in Chinese. Yung Swe. Cloud water man. Union cloud sway water. Because he rests like a cloud he has no attachments or sea and he flows like water. He may be called in Sanskrit, 'One who has entered the stream.' That's the technical meaning for somebody who's started on the way of Buddhism. He has entered the street. But this doesn't have the same quality of meaning as yung swe. He has entered the stream in the sense that he is crossing the stream, from the shore to the other shore. But yung swe means he is going with the stream. If you have read that marvelous book of Herman Hesse called Siddharta, where he ends up with the enlightenment of his hero by watching a river. And get and learning from the river you know exactly what the Taoist means by flowing with the Tao. Because he sees across the river a simultaneously at its source and at its goal, and that all the forms in it are forms of the whole river, and at the same time there's nothing individual about them well I mean the form is individual but at the same time it isn't a lump of water you know a wave isn't a lump of water, it's water passing constantly, flowing through, the way of the wave stays there but the water flows through it, so that's what he learned from the stream. So you see, how the Chinese language. When you turn Sanskrit words into it the Chinese language with the background of meaning that these words have acquired from Taoist philosophy made a complete change in the nature of Buddhism.

Also, there's another thing to it. The Chinese call the bluff on a lot of Indian nonsense. I have to explain this by telling a sort of a modern anecdote. Joseph Campbell, who is as you know the editor of all the works of Heinrich Zimmer, and actually wrote them him self out of Zimmer's notes. Went to India. And he went to the greatest living guru in India today, who is

an ex policeman. And, said to him, 'The Sutras say that all things are Brahman. Isn't this also true of the illusion, of the of the Maya?' Isn't that the for the way you know we feel every day and just ordinary kind of human beings isn't that the Brahman too? And this man said You know it's interesting that was the first question I asked my teacher. He said, Of course they are. Well, Joe said, Nobody in India teaches that anymore. So, the guru took Joseph downstairs to all his students and said I want you to meet a great rishi sage, from America and he really has found it and you should. He will get now give you a lecture or something and it was....

In other words, the Hindu tends to say, 'Yes In fact all this well that you see now before your eyes is the divine ultimate Nandu all reality.' But of course. You have to find out that it is. And when you do it will disappear. You will go into what they call Nirvikalpa samadhi. That means., technically it means being in a state of Samadhi without having concepts, but they mean something else by it, they mean, as if all the shapes that you saw before you were suddenly dim out. And instead there is nothing but light as any. Maybe this is the light is slightly Violet but I don't know any way that every kind of sense you are in a sensual experience disappears. Now then, the way in which you have to argue this with the Hindu Swami and take this line is to say but your position is still dualistic. Because you moved from the vision of form, to the formless vision. This isn't and this is just changing places, this is not liberation, it's somewhere else on the wheel. And you know, they have to admit it. And I once had an argument with a swami in which I brought up a point we were discussing this morning. He was referring to the Brahman the ultimate reality, as the One, as one is as distinct from multiplicity I said I'm one as has an opposite. And the Brahman has no opposite. What you think you said is if you argue just like a Hindu.. Well he knew very well and he was using loose language and, as we all do.

So, this this was the thing you see historically in the development of Indian philosophy that took place between about one hundred and four hundred A.D.. That they face the fact that looking for a state of consciousness that's radically different from this state now is just an escape. It hasn't really come to terms with the problem. The problem is, you see that the state of consciousness you're in now however last up it may be is in Hindu

language the player Vishnu. You are all Vishnu playing that you're in this mess which is the part of the cosmic dance.

So, if that's the case they get to say I mean get with it, be that. So, the Chinese caught on to this. An when you could say, this very moment, this very world, this very body is the point. Now. and it, but if you see a you're seeking something beyond all the time you never get with it you never here. So they say they saw that very clearly. So this man son son who I was talking about at the end of this morning session who is one of the first I would say really articulate people about zen. Who wrote the Shin Shin Ming. He starts out by saying the Great Tao, or the perfect Tao, is without difficulty. Except that it avoids picking and choosing. Only when you neither love nor hate does it appear in all clarity. A hair's breadth of deviation from it and a deep Gulf is set between heaven and earth. If you want to get hold of what it looks like, don't not be anti or pro anything. The conflict of longing and loathing, this is the disease of the mind.

OK, Now if you take that quite literally, if you try to avoid picking and choosing, that's another kind of choice, isn't it? If you say, I ought not to love anything, I ought not to hate anything, I ought not to take any extreme attitudes, you're still choosing. If I say, in psychological jargon, for psychiatric health, you ought to accept yourself. You know. Accept everything that happens well among the things that happen is the very concrete fact that there are things you don't accept. And that you can't accept, so you have to accept that. Now do you see what this does? It's a very interesting technique. It's saying that you are, each one a Buddha, enlightened, even before you've accepted yourself. Now you don't have to do anything about it. But it's terribly difficult for human beings to resist the temptation to do something about it. So it says, OK do that. If you want to practice yoga, meditation, go ahead, if you feel that would make you better do it. But the point is that doesn't it is really nothing to do with there's nothing not to do either. You won't get this by sort of acting spontaneous in a funny way but you can do that if you wanted to. But you are it right where you stand, without making a single move. And that's what's meant you see you profoundly, by avoiding picking and choosing. Actually, there's nothing in it there's nothing you can do about it. You may get the illusion that you

are picking and choosing makes a real difference, that your choices really do change the nature of things, but they don't.

And so, so long as you want to hang onto that illusion and play it, there you are, but actually, you are as you live and all sit around this room at the moment in the various stages of what you may consider subjectively to be goodness and badness sickness and health, sanity and insanity. Every one of you, is as much of a splendid accomplishment as the shape of the clouds. And just as natural. You know, with all the funny hairdos and artificially and everything, we are all like the birds. Only we have a complicated way of pretending that we aren't so that we figure out with something special and that's it too, you see But, it is a tough job getting anybody to see that. So what do they do? They have all these techniques, and they put you through the mill. Because people won't accept this vision, until they feel they've paid for it. Until they feel they if they finally discover after enormous effort, like the student I told you about this morning, there isn't anything to realize. It really is fantastic. See so all this is very direct and simple so not picking and choosing doesn't mean that you have to cultivate being detached. You can try that sure. But then you find you're terribly attached to your non-attachment. Like you're proud of your humility or something like that. It just goes round and round and round, so you know come unstuck. Well you always were unstuck, because you're in the flow, and nothing is stuck it all is changing, changing journey one is nothing but a flow of change there isn't anything to hang on to and nobody to hang on to it. You know, here is decaying hand grasping at smoke. It's all falling apart, and there's nothing anybody can do about it because what anybody is who perhaps could do something about it that is falling apart too. That's what's meant by the doctrine of Anatman, there is no. The Buddhist idea that there is no permanent self because it's all falling apart.

So cheer up you know it's great [laughs]. So, not knowing the profound meaning of things, we disturb our original peace of mind to no purpose. Original peace of mind is what I was referring to as the child's in the infants the baby's fundamental knowledge of, the unity of the world. The oceanic feeling Freud calls it. Perfect like great space the Tao lacks nothing, and has nothing in excess. Truly, because of our accepting and rejecting we don't get the suchness of things. You see, I explained suchness this morning, how

it's the way everything is just like that, and that we pick out some things as significant and other things as not significant. And this prevents us from seeing that all the insignificant things are in a way significant, and all the significant things are in a way insignificant. See, that I go on living is for me, significant. Until I don't anymore. But that means I'm going to run around as it is it is it talk a lot and work and eat and entertain and do this that and the other and it is it's a great dance. Actually, it has no more ultimate meaning than somebody sitting down to be able to be a little bit in the little of the little ones and master said 'From the bathtub to the bathtub I have uttered stuff and nonsense.' That was his death verse and the bath tub in which the baby is washed at birth the bath tub in which the corpses washed before burial all the time he's been talking nonsense. And so all these birds are going around. I don't want to always go and beings are going making this great hullabaloo and building houses and all that kind of thing and it's all, well it's just suchness, that's the point.

So neither follow after, nor dwell with the doctrine of the void. I mean, don't get hooked on the idea that things are empty, and therefore that this is a way of saying that the world is a ghastly sham and something you ought to avoid. That's what this means. So don't try to catch hold of this doctrine as if it would do you some good. And on the other hand don't. Dwell with it, don't get attached to it. For if the mind is at peace, these wrong views disappear of themselves. The mind at peace is not quite what we ordinarily mean by peace of mind. Oh, he quotes a thing here, on the comment neither follow after nor dwell with the doctrine of the void, this verse. From another early Chinese Zen master: 'Getting rid of things and clinging to emptiness is an illness of the same kind. It is just like throwing oneself into a fire to avoid being drowned.' When activity is stopped, there is passivity. Now when activity is stopped and there is passivity this passivity again is a state of activity. You see, if you practice detachment and being calm in mind and free from all worldly passions this in its own turn is a worldly passion, since you are attached to this new status. See that's the Chinese criticism of the Hindu viewpoint. Stay where you are. If you try to be spiritual. This is putting legs on a snake. And the snake doesn't need any legs and is only confused by them when it gets them. But you may have to try to be spiritual or whatever the equivalent of this is psychoanalyzed, integrated, clear, all the words that are used. You may have to try to do that

to find this out. But that everything you add in this way by clinging to some idea of detachment, spiritual freedom, Nirvana, whatever. All that in the end is an artificiality that will be sloughed off. So you might say to you Spiegelberg's phrase Zen is the religion of no religion. That the the highest perfection of religion. Is just not to have any noticeable religion. See the gulls don't have a religion, they don't preach, they don't pray, they don't recite sutras. But the human beings have to do this thing and have Buddhas and all that and. When you really get the point, none of that's necessary. But then you can have it just for kicks.

Uncarved Block

Now what I want to talk to you about this afternoon are some of the aesthetic principles underlying both Chinese and Japanese arts. And there deriving from these Taoistic and Buddhist philosophies that have inspired them. And to speak about them tell it technically. In the language of Taoism, there are certain words used which are the foundations of their aesthetic ideas. One of these words is the uncarved block. And another is unbleached silk. And as I already intimated in talking to you about the Taoist view of the relationship of man and nature, the Taoists make a distinction between the natural and the artificial, and seem to be all on the side of the natural and rather against the artificial. Although you must be cautioned against taking this too seriously. Too literally. You might say, of course, that the distinction between the artificial and the natural, is an artificial distinction. Because really, and truly, a human building is no more no less artificial than a bird's nest. But the Taoists use a kind of art. And a kind of poetry which you could call indicative. That is to say, while understanding that everything that man does is natural, some things that he does a more natural than others. That is to say, they look more natural they they go that way.

And so the idea of unbleached silk. Means silk in the raw, raw silk, natural silk. And so in the same way the uncarved block is the sort of stone that would be selected for a Chinese or Japanese garden. Chinese stones tend, as I see it to be rather more elaborate. Rather more fussy than Japanese stones and I think that in the art of bun seche which means growing rocks. The Japanese are a bit more sophisticated than the Chinese although this doesn't

often happen. But the Japanese are masters of growing rocks. So, this rock that you would find in a Japanese garden, is the uncarved block, even though it may have been. What has happened really it's what we call in the Western *objet trouvé*. Where the artist instead of making something selects it. He finds a glorious thing and shares his finding with other people and that finding is a work of art. And you see that is connected with the whole thought in this tradition of aesthetics in the Far East, that superb art is a work of nature. It is not something imposed upon nature, even though as you've seen, in many Japanese gardens, that there are very complex espalier work. On trees and that an enormous amount of pruning and trimming is done, and in fact the discipline of the garden is amazingly complicated, and requires a great deal of care.

But the object always is, through the discipline of the art to make the garden seem more natural than it would look if you left it to itself. Understand that, is to work upon nature with skill and craft, but to move in the direction in which nature is already going. So that, the uncarved block may be extended into a sculpture. But what the carver, to make the block uncarved, even when the sculpture is finished, what the sculptor is going to ask the block in the first place, is what do you want to become? In other words, along what lines have you already started in the direction of the sculpture, and I will and I will cooperate with you and bring it to completion. So that's the principle, really, you see that underlies judo. Judo means the gentle way, the gentle Tao. And it is the art of going along with nature, that is also called Wu Wei, or Mui in Japanese. And no doing nothing literally not being because after all it's man's nature to act and you can't do nothing literally. But to act mui without really it's as to act without feeling that your actions are separate from nature. When you feel that everything you do is simply part of the course of things, then the way in which you do things is changed. You wouldn't think so, it isn't logical that it should be. But nevertheless if you really feel, that you can't deviate from the Tao, that it lies behind it. We think that you do your type of action in your style of behavior will in fact be changed. And it will be in that it will tend to be in the direction, of your seeming to other people in some ways to be more passive, than you might ordinarily be. And the difficulty here is that. Westerners, when they hear about Buddhism and Taoism and the sort of thing, they interpret it one-sidedly as passivity. And don't see that what sometimes looks like passivity,

is cleverness. You as businessmen often know if you leave letters unanswered for a month when you return to the many of them have already answered themselves. And sometimes, when you sit and do nothing you avoid making very serious mistakes. Which would have arisen if you had acted prematurely earlier if you had done something about it. I've practiced this in activity of this kind for many years and I've always been accused of being lucky. Because when I should have done something and been up and at it I was supposed to go and sit and do nothing and then when it turned out all right, this is terrible. Just like no I know you haven't said. That's why I'm still married to you!

But anyway this is so in that so. This tendency to look inactive and to go in the direction in the arts of a kind of primitivity to which we know in the words Shibui. The quality course in Japan is a certain kind of sophisticated primitivity. Listen to these contradictions, these paradoxes the sophisticated primitivity controlled accident. Where you see a. Man and Nature are really collaborating, man as the controller the reason, the logical being and yet at the same time. Not ruining life. By making it all logic and all control. To have logic and to have control, that is to say in short to have order, you have to have randomness. Because where there is no randomness, order cannot manifest itself.

Well now., in the vocabulary of Japanese aesthetics, there are a number of terms which you should understand thoroughly, and which are basic. The first is *sabi*. And that goes along with something that rhymes with it *wabi*. So often Japanese people speak of *Wabi Sabi*, or *Sabi wabi* as a kind of mood of the art of certain art feeling or of Zen taste. And then there is *aware*, which I've mentioned in passing. As another kind of mood there is *Yugen*. There is *furyu*. Such words which designate the basic moods of painting and poetry and so on. Now to begin with *sabi*. The basic feeling of *Sabi* is loneliness. One of the great paintings that illustrate *Sabi* is the lonely crow on a tree branch. It is the feeling of the hermit. It is the feeling which the garden artist tries to create, when in a crowded country, he wants to give you the sensation of being way off in a mountain landscape. So this sense, you see, of solitariness, of being able to wander off on your own, is *Sabi* and is a thing of course that any sane person has to have. One has to have

privacy, you have to have space in which to be alone, so as not to become a rubberstamp.

You see it's often thought that Eastern philosophy is against individuality. And this is not true. The unity of man in the universe is not a loss, or a merging of personality in something impersonal. It's more like the fact that when individuality, when personality, is known and experienced as an expression of the whole cosmos, then the person becomes more individual not less individual but he becomes individual in a non strident way. In a way that has in it, the spirit of the uncarved block, and the unbleached silk. And so, one of the qualities of this is solitariness. The great Chinese poem which has *sabi* in it it preeminently, is asking for the master. I asked the boy beneath the pines he says the master's gone alone. Herb-gathering somewhere on the Mount cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown.

So all the whole idea you see of zen that. Wherever you stand, if you realize Zen, you create a mountain. Every Where is the mountain solitude even in the middle of an uproar this is *Sabi*. And for this reason then an enormous amount of the subject matter of Far Eastern painting and poetry is solitude. The love of solitude. Now there is next, *wabi*. This is a more difficult idea. Let's imagine that you are feeling very bad about something, you're depressed, the world is too much with you. Just, you're sick of life. And then quite surprisingly, you notice a small weed. Growing underneath the hedge. And this weed is really after all not just to be dismissed as a weed, but some rather lovely design that is in the nature of this plant. Or supposing you are bothered by financial uproar, wars, politics, and everything like that, and you are sitting on a beach and you become aware of the water endlessly crossing pebbles. And you get a sense that this goes on forever and ever and ever it is long before you were thought of, long before all human history, empires, schemes and so on and will endure long after. But it's something that strikes you that is very simple, very ordinary, like the water on the pebbles, or like the little weed under the hedge. That suggests a kind of amazing eternal reliability of nature. That in a very humble form goes on and on and on and whatever human beings may do this everlasting sanity persists. Now that strange flip, from the mood of depression to the mood of a certain consolation in this weed is *wabi*.

Now, don't let me be too dictatorial. I'm trying to explain these things through examples rather than through trying to give you philosophical definitions. It's better to give examples than to pin it down with abstract terminologies. Wabi comes out in the haiku, very much a Brushwood gate. And for a lock this nail. This is wabi. This is all there is, the path comes to an end among the parsley. Which has a touch of you again but also wabi because the parsey is just well everybody has parsley in the garden.

Now, next, this word aware. A W A R E. is very much connected with the Buddhist feeling for the transience of life. That everything is change, and nothing at all can be held onto or possessed. This feeling of transience, is at the root of the philosophy of poverty that exists in Buddhism and it has a curious difference in it from the Christian philosophy of poverty as say explained by Sir Francis of Assisi. It's cognate, it it's like it but a little subtle difference. Somehow one feels in the Christian emphasis on poverty that poverty contrasts with the richness as good to evil. In other words, poverty is unpleasant, but it's something you ought to share with the poor who live unpleasant lives. So if you are to expiate your sins, well you ought to be poor. And to, live roughly. And so, for this reason, in Buddhism, one would not say so much poverty, as one would say simplicity. Not going without, not clinging to things because it's good for you. But because it is actually the happiest way to live. Because nothing is more terrifying than the state the chronic anxiety, which one has if you are subject to the illusion that something or other in life could be held onto and safeguarded. And nothing can.

So the acceptance of everything flowing away is absolutely basic to freedom, to being an unsui, a cloud water person who drifts like cloud and flows like water. But in this, we mustn't take ourselves too ridiculously. I mean, naturally, all human beings have in them certain clinging. So you can't let go totally. You wouldn't be human if you did. You can't be just a leaf on the wind or just a ball in a mountain stream to use as an poetic phrase because if you were that you wouldn't be human just as I pointed out that a person with no emotions who is completely controlled his emotions as a stone Buddha. So a person who would be completely let go. Would also be some kind of an inanimate object.

So Zen very definitely emphasizes, being human. Being perfectly human as its ideal and so to be perfectly human. One must have not a state of absolute detachment. But a state of detachment which contains a little bit of resistance. A certain clinging still, they say in India are Divan Mukta, a man who is liberated in this world that he has to cultivate a few mild bad habits in order to stay in the body because if he were absolutely perfect he would disappear for manifestation. And so the, the yogi, great yogis maybe he smokes a cigarette or has a bad temper occasionally something that keeps him human. And that thing little thing, isn't very important it's like the salt in a stew. It's the, it grounds him. Well, this is another way of saying that even a very great sage, a great Buddha, will have in him a touch of regret, that life is fleeting, Because if he doesn't have that touch of regret, he's not human and he's incapable of compassion towards people who regret very much that life is fleeting.

So the mood aware, is that touch of regret. Of nostalgia. Of, you know that poem which speaks of the feeling of a banquet hall deserted. Here it is, been a great banquet you know and that's all the guests have gone home and there are empty glasses and dirty plates and crushed napkins and all sorts of things all over and somehow the echo of voices and merriment is still there. And so this mood. A lottery comes up so even a very great person. You're should feel that because the prize otherwise is not to be human.

So for this reason, Buddhist and Taoist poetry is not unemotional. It's not, dehumanised. And so somehow speaks very much to us as people. And, does not have in it the feeling that we ought instead to turn into saints or Superman. That's the main thing about this philosophy of life. The next word, the special term is furyu. Know who you means literally. Wind flow who is the character for wind the real means flowing. And the dictionary's translated elegance, and this won't do. furyu, fiirst of all you must remember that the word wind is used in Chinese and Japanese a light to indicate atmosphere. The atmosphere of a place. So when a person has say a certain school or philosophy. It's called The Family wind. That means that the atmosphere the slant the attitude of this particular school. So that meaning of wind, atmosphere comes into the expression furyu. And who are you is, like this. Here is a land of fishing. And he's sitting in the evening in the twilight on the edge of a river, with his fishing rod in a lonely little

boat tied up by the bank. Now if this man is fishing with his mind intent simply on catching fish this is not for you. But if he's also digging the atmosphere. It's *furyu*. To flow with the wind you see to dig the atmosphere American offers the most beautiful possibilities of translation for in our incomparable slang for some Oriental ideas. *furyu* is there to you know to get with it, to flow with it, and not again you see in the sense of the merely passive leaf flowing on the wind. But, *furyu*, has in it you see a touch of self-consciousness, like that man fishing. Now, you would think if you started Taoist philosophy that this would be very bad. Chuang Tzu somewhere says that. A comfortable belt is one that you don't feel. And you're unaware of it. That's not the most comfortable belt. That comfortable shoes, would you be completely unconscious of comfortable shoes, no! Something better than comfortable shoes are shoes that you know are comfortable. So in the same way, Self-consciousness adds something to life. It's one thing to be happy, and not know it. It's another thing to be happy and to know it. It's like one's voice in the shower room or bath tub has more resonance than one's voice in the open air. And that's why temples of cathedrals and resonating boxes for guitars and drums and things are created to give this little quality of echo. For all echo is a certain kind of feedback which enables you to reflect upon what you're doing and to know that you know. So one might say that ordinary people are Buddhas but they don't know it. And the Buddha is one who knows he's a Buddha. Only, they don't let you settle for this comfortably, and easily, because really to know is also defined as not to know. In the Upanishads, it is said that if you think you know what Brahman is you have yet some started to be done. For those who know Brahman do not know Brahman and those who do not know Brahman really know. Now all this paradoxical language is intended to keep you confused. So that you can't say I've got it. So, but disposition is is not one sided. There is something about being human, about being self-conscious you see that is not a. Me. Stake of nature. Not a completely evil fall into self-awareness but self-awareness although it creates all kinds of problems because through self-awareness we him in the human being is in some sense a cell frustrating mechanism. He knows that he is going to die, and the price of being able to control the future, is to know that in the long run you won't be able to and worry about that. But also with self-consciousness goes the possibility of resonance, of

realisation, of becoming enlightened, liberated, and knowing it, and therefore able to enjoy it.

So, furyu adds this to the dimension of going with it. Something more than the mere passive it of going with but knowing that you're going. Now. But it does at the same time it isn't entirely wrong that the dictionaries have translated it elegance. It you could say it for you. Is style. When we say somebody really has style. Now but this designates a particular kind of style. It is the style. Of. What one might call. The elegant poor man. The interesting Pratik bum. The the rich pauper you see. Now you find that a good deal in. The things that we've been seeing. We've gone to many temples. Well, nobody really owns anything. And yet in a way they're like serious. This is for you. The next word Yugen. F U R Y U furyu. I have spoken about you again but I haven't told you. The basic symbol of Yugen as the flower which grows from a rock. And so there is something about that which is improbable mysterious contradictory that a flower could come out of a rock. But Yugen, more than any other of these terms defies translation. The two characters which I shall draw for you shortly. Are rather interesting one the first character yu, shows the basic form of a mountain. And then the mountain is combined with characters indicating dark, darkness, you see in the character for mountain, which is simply it's just it's just like this there are these things the other the valleys and the dark is put in the valley say in each case.

Now, you get so the idea of the deep valley. There's a poem which says, 'The wind drops but the petals keep falling. The bird calls and the mountain becomes more mysterious. Little sounds emphasizing silence little motions emphasizing stillness.' This quality you see, is in this word yun. Gen is in Chinese Guan, which means the the original deep deep mysterious darkness out of which everything arises the depth. Yakob Erm I would say urgrund. The. In the Book of Genesis. And darkness covered the face of the deep or the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters those waters of chaos the primeval blackness, which is the same blackness as your head. You know, how your head appears invisible to your eyes. That is gen, it is darker than darkness, because it isn't it is blacker than black, you see, it is practically nothing that's it so mysterious, so when you put these two characters together you get yugen. And so yugen is first of all,

suggestiveness. I was looking around one of the temples a few days ago, where I noticed that, you couldn't figure out how big it was. Or it didn't have any limits. Because always everyone wore say of a room seemed to be a screen which led to something else beyond. And at the back of every garden, there seemed to be a little gate that led to some other courtyard. And everything led into something else and I said to the priest, I don't know whether I'm going to go exploring on art or just leave it alone and think that well here I left Kyoto and I never did find out what was through that little gate. And so what. Forever there will be magic behind there, which I didn't define, I didn't draw in. And so this whole temple was was done that way. All sorts of suggestions, of little avenues disappearing, like a mountain path winding up among the trees where does it go? True, if you follow it, you will eventually go up out of Kyoto here and get down to absolute and then I was you find yourself back in the suburbs. But there is the sense of that disappearing mountain path, like we've got going up here that it goes to the place. And everybody has in the back of their minds, an image of the place, that you want to go to, or some no not really an image though it's always slightly indefinite there's the certain feeling of there ought to be somewhere the thing I've always wanted. We get disappointed, of course, because as we get older we feel that perhaps that doesn't exist at all. That one just has to put up with the second best or with something half a loaf is better than no bread. But still I find that Far Eastern art is very, very full of hints about what is sometimes called Horison. Horison is the magical island somewhere out in the Pacific. Which is the paradise island. And all these Chinese paintings of wonderful floating Pagodas and terraces with scholars sitting around drinking wine and so on are hints of the Paradise world. And that somewhere then, these little steps lead up to that thing. And you've seen these steps, Japan is full of them, as you just go along in the train and look up the hills and there are arches, steps disappearing into the hills all of which suggests the feeling I'm not with that thing. So yugen, as it were comes around full circle to subbie. The wonderful lonely place. At the end of the road. Where there won't be any mother-in-law to bother you. Any of that sort of dreadful social difficulty. But solitude which fits befits a bearded old gentleman. Now of course, you see all these things are symbols. On one level, they're very human, and they reflect our perhaps childish and immature desires to be really alone, to have that Paradise thing. And realistic people say well you ought not to bother yourself or fool

yourself with such fantasies and nowadays I find that we feel very guilty about thinking of paradise. Of horizon, or whatever it is, the enchanted garden. I think na-ah. Reality is what you read about in the newspapers and you've got to face it. And everything isn't pleasant I know there's the hard boiled school of zoologists for example who insist that birds hate flying. You know, everybody is always envied a bird, and wanted really to live on long wings you know and so there comes up somebody who is usually some wretched academician who says, 'No now we've discovered by measurements that birds loath flying.' I'm going to feel very satisfactory when you found that out because you've smashed an ideal. Oh for the wings of a dove, far away would I roam in the wilderness build me and theirs and remain there forever at rest I'm quoting the Psalms. But, apparently doves just hate this chore of flying.

Now it is just in the same way as it's ridiculous to try to be so inhuman as never to feel any regrets about the passing of time of life. And so on, it's likewise inhuman, not to have the paradise fantasy of the mysterious place round the corner, just over the crest of the hill. Just behind the island in the distance. You see, because that place is really the big joke, that's you. That's why, you have found that at the end of the line, when you get through the last tory and up. Alas their way you are liable to be confronted with a mirror. And so, everybody is seeking seeking seeking seeking seeking, for that thing that you've got to have, you see, well you've got it. And but nobody's going to believe this. But there it is, the real the real thing that you are is the Paradise land if you're looking for at the end of the line. And it's far, far more reliable than any kind of an external scene which you could love and cling to hold on to. Of course the whole fascination of life is that that seems perfectly incredible.

So, I think these terms are the crucial ones. Let me repeat them briefly, you've got, firstly the uncarved block. And the unbleached silk, these are the prototypes. Then you have sabi. The mood of solitariness. Wabi, the flip from disillusion with everything, to the sudden recognition of how faithful the weeds are. How the sparrows chirping in the eaves suddenly take your mind away from important and dreadful business. Aware, the the regret of the passing of life, which somehow makes that very passing beautiful. Fuyu, getting with it. And living with style. That is to say with rich

poverty. Elegant simplicity. Yugen, the aesthetic equivalent of... Well let me put it this way. There was a philosopher by the name of Vandal Lew who once said that the mystery of life is not a problem to be solved but a reality to be experienced. That's yugen. And that mystery that deep deep ever so deep thing which is before all worlds is you. The unrecognized Self. So let's have a brief intermission.

Zen Bones

Once upon a time, there was a Zen student who quoted an old Buddhist poem to his teacher, which says:

The voices of torrents are from one great tongue, the lions of the hills are the pure body of Buddha. Isn't that right? he said to the teacher. It is, said the teacher, but it's a pity to say so.

It would be, of course, much better, if this occasion were celebrated with no talk at all, and if I addressed you in the manner of the ancient teachers of Zen, I should hit the microphone with my fan and leave. But I somehow have the feeling that since you have contributed to the support of the Zen Center, in expectation of learning something, a few words should be said, even though I warn you, that by explaining these things to you, I shall subject you to a very serious hoax.

Because if I allow you to leave here this evening, under the impression that you understand something about Zen, you will have missed the point entirely. Because Zen is a way of life, a state of being, that is not possible to embrace in any concept whatsoever, so that any concepts, any ideas, any words that I shall put across to you this evening will have as their object, showing you the limitations of words and of thinking.

Now then, if one must try to say something about what Zen is, and I want to do this by way of introduction, I must make it emphatic that Zen, in its essence, is not a doctrine. There's nothing you're supposed to believe in. It's not a philosophy in our sense, that is to say a set of ideas, an intellectual net in which one tries to catch the fish of reality. Actually, the fish of reality is more like water—it always slips through the net. And in water you know

when you get into it there's nothing to hang on to. All this universe is like water; it is fluid, it is transient, it is changing. And when you're thrown into the water after being accustomed to living on the dry land, you're not used to the idea of swimming. You try to stand on the water, you try to catch hold of it, and as a result you drown. The only way to survive in the water, and this refers particularly to the waters of modern philosophical confusion, where God is dead, metaphysical propositions are meaningless, and there's really nothing to hang on to, because we're all just falling apart. And the only thing to do under those circumstances is to learn how to swim. And to swim, you relax, you let go, you give yourself to the water, and you have to know how to breathe in the right way. And then you find that the water holds you up; indeed, in a certain way you become the water. And so in the same way, one might say if one attempted to—again I say misleadingly—to put Zen into any sort of concept, it simply comes down to this:

That in this universe, there is one great energy, and we have no name for it. People have tried various names for it, like God, like Brahman, like Tao, but in the West, the word God has got so many funny associations attached to it that most of us are bored with it. When people say God the father almighty, most people feel funny inside. So we like to hear new words, we like to hear about Tao, about Brahman, about Shinto, and ___-___-___, and such strange names from the far East because they don't carry the same associations of mawkish sanctimony and funny meanings from the past. And actually, some of these words that the Buddhists use for the basic energy of the world really don't mean anything at all. The word tathata (तथाता), which is translated from the Sanskrit as 'suchness' or 'thusness' or something like that, really means something more like 'dadada,' based on the word tat (तत्), which in Sanskrit means 'that,' and so in Sanskrit it is said tat tvam asi (तत् त्वमसि तथामि), 'that thou art,' or in modern America, 'you're it.' But 'da, da'—that's the first sound a baby makes when it comes into the world, because the baby looks around and says 'da, da, da, da' and fathers flatter themselves and think it's saying 'DaDa,' which means 'Daddy,' but according to Buddhist philosophy, all this universe is one 'dadada.' That means 'ten thousand functions, ten thousand things, one suchness,' and we're all one suchness. And that means that suchness comes and goes like anything else because this whole world is an on-and-off system. As the Chinese say, it's the yang and the yin, and therefore it

consists of ‘now you see it, now you don’t, here you are, here you aren’t, here you are,’ because that the nature of energy, to be like waves, and waves have crests and troughs, only we, being under a kind of sleepiness or illusion, imagine that the trough is going to overcome the wave or the crest, the yin, or the dark principle, is going to overcome the yang, or the light principle, and that ‘off’ is going to finally triumph over ‘on.’ And we, shall I say, bug ourselves by indulging in that illusion. ‘Hey, supposing darkness did win out, wouldn’t that be terrible!’ And so we’re constantly trembling and thinking that it may, because after all, isn’t it odd that anything exists? It’s most peculiar, it requires effort, it requires energy, and it would have been so much easier for there to have been nothing at all. Therefore, we think ‘well, since being, since the ‘is’ side of things is so much effort’ you always give up after a while and you sink back into death. But death is just the other face of energy, and it’s the rest, the not being anything around, that produces something around, just in the same way that you can’t have ‘solid’ without ‘space,’ or ‘space’ without ‘solid.’ When you wake up to this, and realize that the more it changes the more it’s the same thing, as the French say, that you are really a train of this one energy, and there is nothing else but that that is you, but that for you to be always you would be an insufferable bore, and therefore it is arranged that you stop being you after a while and then come back as someone else altogether, and so when you find that out, you become full energy and delight. As Blake said, ‘Energy is eternal delight.’ And you suddenly see through the whole sham thing. You realize you’re That—we won’t put a name on it— you’re That, and you can’t be anything else. So you are relieved of fundamental terror. That doesn’t mean that you’re always going to be a great hero, that you won’t jump when you hear a bang, that you won’t worry occasionally, that you won’t lose your temper. It means, though, that fundamentally deep, deep, deep down within you, you will be able to be human, not a stone Buddha—you know in Zen there is a difference made between a living Buddha and a stone Buddha. If you go up to a stone Buddha and you hit him hard on the head, nothing happens. You break your fist or your stick. But if you hit a living Buddha, he may say ‘ouch,’ and he may feel pain, because if he didn’t feel something, he wouldn’t be a human being. Buddhas are human, they are not devas, they are not gods. They are enlightened men and women. But the point is that they are not afraid to be human, they are not afraid to let themselves participate in the pains, difficulties and struggles

that naturally go with human existence. The only difference is—and it's almost an undetectable difference—it takes one to know one. As a Zen poem says, 'when two Zen masters meet each other on the street, they need no introduction. When fiends meet, they recognize one another instantly.' So a person who is a real cool Zen understands that, does not go around 'Oh, I understand Zen, I have satori, I have this attainment, I have that attainment, I have the other attainment,' because if he said that, he wouldn't understand the first thing about it.

So it is Zen that, if I may put it metaphorically, Zhuang Zhou said, the perfect man employs his mind as a mirror. It grasps nothing, it refuses nothing. It receives but does not keep. And another poem says of wild geese flying over a lake, 'The wild geese do not intend to cast their reflection, and the water has no mind to retain their image.' In other words this is to be—to put it very strictly into our modern idiom—this is to live without hang-ups, the word 'hang-up' being an almost exact translation of the Japanese *bono* and the Sanskrit *klesa*, ordinarily translated 'worldly attachment,' though that sounds a little bit—you know what I mean—it sounds pious, and in Zen, things that sound pious are said to stink of Zen, but to have no hang-ups, that is to say, to be able to drift like a cloud and flow like water, seeing that all life is a magnificent illusion, a plane of energy, and that there is absolutely nothing to be afraid of. Fundamentally. You will be afraid on the surface. You will be afraid of putting your hand in the fire. You will be afraid of getting sick, etc. But you will not be afraid of fear. Fear will pass over your mind like a black cloud will be reflected in the mirror. But of course, the mirror isn't quite the right illustration; space would be better. Like a black cloud flows through space without leaving any track. Like the stars don't leave trails behind them. And so that fundamental—it is called 'the void' in Buddhism; it doesn't mean 'void' in the sense that it's void in the ordinary sense of emptiness. It means void in that is the most real thing there is, but nobody can conceive it. It's rather the same situation that you get between the speaker, in a radio and all the various sounds which it produces. On the speaker you hear human voices, you hear every kind of musical instrument, honking of horns, the sounds of traffic, the explosions of guns, and yet all that tremendous variety of sounds are the vibrations of one diaphragm, but it never says so. The announcer doesn't come on first thing in the morning and say 'Ladies and gentlemen, all the sounds that you

will hear subsequently during the day will be the vibration of this diaphragm; don't take them for real.' And the radio never mentions its own construction, you see? And in exactly the same way, you are never able, really, to examine, to make an object of your own mind, just as you can't look directly into your own eyes or bite your own teeth, because you ARE that, and if you try to find it, and make it something to possess, why that's a great lack of confidence. That shows that you don't really know your 'it'. And if you're 'it,' you don't need to make anything of it. There's nothing to look for. But the test is, are you still looking? Do you know that? I mean, not as kind of knowledge you possess, not something you've learned in school like you've got a degree, and 'you know, I've mastered the contents of these books and remembered it.' In this knowledge, there's nothing to be remembered; nothing to be formulated. You know it best when you say 'I don't know it.' Because that means, 'I'm not holding on to it, I'm not trying to cling to it' in the form of a concept, because there's absolutely no necessity to do so. That would be, in Zen language, putting legs on a snake or a beard on a eunuch, or as we would say, gilding the lily.

Now you say, 'Well, that sounds pretty easy. You mean to say all we have to do is relax? We don't have to go around chasing anything anymore? We abandon religion, we abandon meditations, we abandon this, that, and the other, and just live it up anyhow? Just go on.' You know, like a father says to his child who keeps asking 'Why? Why, Why, Why, Why, Why? Why did God make the universe? Who made God? Why are the trees green?' and so on and so forth, and father says finally, 'Oh, shut up and eat your bun.' It isn't quite like that, because, you see, the thing is this:

All those people who try to realize Zen by doing nothing about it are still trying desperately to find it, and they're on the wrong track. There is another Zen poem which says, 'You cannot attain it by thinking, you cannot grasp it by not thinking.' Or you could say, you cannot catch hold of the meaning of Zen by doing something about it, but equally, you cannot see into its meaning by doing nothing about it, because both are, in their different ways, attempts to move from where you are now, here, to somewhere else, and the point is that we come to an understanding of this, what I call suchness, only through being completely here. And no means are necessary to be completely here. Neither active means on the one hand,

nor passive means on the other. Because in both ways, you are trying to move away from the immediate now. But you see, it's difficult to understand language like that. And to understand what all that is about, there is really one absolutely necessary prerequisite, and this is to stop thinking. Now, I am not saying this in the spirit of being an anti-intellectual, because I think a lot, talk a lot, write a lot of books, and am a sort of half-baked scholar. But you know, if you talk all the time, you will never hear what anybody else has to say, and therefore, all you'll have to talk about is your own conversation. The same is true for people who think all the time. That means, when I use the word 'think,' talking to yourself, subvocal conversation, the constant chit-chat of symbols and images and talk and words inside your skull. Now, if you do that all the time, you'll find that you've nothing to think about except thinking, and just as you have to stop talking to hear what I have to say, you have to stop thinking to find out what life is about. And the moment you stop thinking, you come into immediate contact with what Korzybski called, so delightfully, 'the unspeakable world,' that is to say, the nonverbal world. Some people would call it the physical world, but these words 'physical,' 'nonverbal,' are all conceptual, not a concept either, it's (bangs stick). So when you are awake to that world, you suddenly find that all the so-called differences between self and other, life and death, pleasure and pain, are all conceptual, and they're not there. They don't exist at all in that world which is (bangs stick). In other words, if I hit you hard enough, 'ouch' doesn't hurt, if you're in a state of what is called no-thought. There is a certain experience, you see, but you don't call it 'hurt.' It's like when you were small children, they banged you about, and you cried, and they said 'Don't cry' because they wanted to make you hurt and not cry at the same time. People are rather curious about the things they do like that. But you see, they really wanted you to cry, the same way if you threw up one day. It's very good to throw up if you've eaten something that isn't good for you, but your mother said 'Enough!' and made you repress it and feel that throwing up wasn't a good thing to do. Because then when you saw people die, and everybody around you started weeping and making a fuss, and then you learned from that that dying was terrible. When somebody got sick, everybody else got anxious, and you learned that getting sick was something awful. You learned it from a concept.

So the reason why there is in the practice of Zen, what we did before this lecture began, to practice Za-zen, sitting Zen. Incidentally, there are three other kinds of Zen besides Za-zen. Standing Zen, walking Zen, and lying Zen. In Buddhism, they speak of the three dignities of man. Walking, standing, sitting, and lying. And they say when you sit, just sit. When you walk, just walk. But whatever you do, don't wobble. In fact, of course, you can wobble, if you really wobble well. When the old master Hyakujo was asked 'What is Zen?' he said 'When hungry, eat, when tired, sleep,' and they said, 'Well isn't that what everybody does? Aren't you just like ordinary people?' 'Oh no,' he said, 'they don't do anything of the kind. When they're hungry, they don't just eat, they think of all sorts of things. When they're tired, they don't just sleep, but dream all sorts of dreams.' I know the Jungians won't like that, but there comes a time when you just dream yourself out, and no more dreams. You sleep deeply and breathe from your heels. Now, therefore, Za-zen, or sitting Zen, is a very, very good thing in the Western world. We have been running around far too much. It's all right; we've been active, and our action has achieved a lot of good things. But as Aristotle pointed out long ago—and this is one of the good things about Aristotle. He said 'the goal of action is contemplation.' In other words, busy, busy, busy, busy, busy, but what's it all about? Especially when people are busy because they think they're going somewhere, that they're going to get something and attain something. There's quite a good deal of point to action if you know you're not going anywhere. If you act like you dance, or like you sing or play music, then you're really not going anywhere, you're just doing pure action, but if you act with a thought in mind that as a result of action you are eventually going to arrive at someplace where everything will be alright. Then you are on a squirrel cage, hopelessly condemned to what the Buddhists call samsara, the round, or rat-race of birth and death, because you think you're going to go somewhere. You're already there. And it is only a person who has discovered that he is already there who is capable of action, because he doesn't act frantically with the thought that he's going to get somewhere. He acts like he can go into walking meditation at that point, you see, where we walk not because we are in a great, great hurry to get to a destination, but because the walking itself is great. The walking itself is the meditation. And when you watch Zen monks walk, it's very fascinating. They have a different kind of walk from everybody else in Japan. Most Japanese shuffle

along, or if they wear Western clothes, they race and hurry like we do. Zen monks have a peculiar swing when they walk, and you have the feeling they walk rather the same way as a cat. There's something about it that isn't hesitant; they're going along all right, they're not sort of vagueing around, but they're walking just to walk. And that's walking meditation. But the point is that one cannot act creatively, except on the basis of stillness. Of having a mind that is capable from time to time of stopping thinking. And so this practice of sitting may seem very difficult at first, because if you sit in the Buddhist way, it makes your legs ache. Most Westerners start to fidget; they find it very boring to sit for a long time, but the reason they find it boring is that they're still thinking. If you weren't thinking, you wouldn't notice the passage of time, and as a matter of fact, far from being boring, the world when looked at without chatter becomes amazingly interesting. The most ordinary sights and sounds and smells, the texture of shadows on the floor in front of you. All these things, without being named, and saying 'that's a shadow, that's red, that's brown, that's somebody's foot.' When you don't name things anymore, you start seeing them. Because say when a person says 'I see a leaf,' immediately, one thinks of a spearhead-shaped thing outlined in black and filled in with flat green. No leaf looks like that. No leaves—leaves are not green. That's why Lao-Tzu said 'the five colors make a man blind, the five tones make a man deaf,' because if you can only see five colors, you're blind, and if you can only hear five tones in music, you're deaf. You see, if you force sound into five tones, you force color into five colors, you're blind and deaf. The world of color is infinite, as is the world of sound. And it is only by stopping fixing conceptions on the world of color and the world of sound that you really begin to hear it and see it.

So this—should I be so bold as to use the word 'discipline'—of meditation, or zazen, lies behind the extraordinary capacity of Zen people to develop such great arts as the gardens, the tea ceremony, the calligraphy, and the grand painting of the Sum Dynasty, and of the Japanese Sumi tradition. And it was because, especially in tea ceremony, which means literally chanoyu in Japanese, meaning 'hot water of tea,' they found in the very simplest of things in everyday life, magic. In the words of the poet Hokoji, 'marvelous power and supernatural activity, drawing water, carrying wood.' And you know how it is sometimes when you say a word and make the word meaningless, you take the word 'yes'—yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.

It becomes funny. That's why they use the word 'mu' in Zen training, which means 'no.' Mu. And you get this going for a long time, and the word ceases to mean anything, and it becomes magical. Now, what you have to realize in the further continuance of Za-zen, that as you— Well, let me say first in a preliminary way, the easiest way to stop thinking is first of all to think about something that doesn't have any meaning. That's my point in talking about 'mu' or 'yes,' or counting your breath, or listening to a sound that has no meaning, because that stops you thinking, and you become fascinated in the sound. Then as you get on and you just—the sound only—there comes a point when the sound is taken away, and you're wide open. Now at that point, there will be a kind of preliminary so-called satori, and you will think 'wowie, that's it!' You'll be so happy, you'll be walking on air. When Suzuki Daisetz was asked what was it like to have satori, he said 'well, it's like ordinary, everyday experience, except about two inches off the ground.' But there's another saying that the student who has obtained satori goes to hell as straight as an arrow. No satori around here, because anybody who has a spiritual experience, whether you get it through zazen, or through LSD, or anything, you know, that gives you that experience. If you hold on to it, say 'now I've got it,' it's gone out of the window, because the minute you grab the living thing, it's like catching a handful of water, the harder you clutch, the faster it squirts through your fingers. There's nothing to get hold of, because you don't NEED to get hold of anything. You had it from the beginning. Because you can see that, by various methods of meditation, but the trouble is that people come out of that and brag about it, say 'I've seen it.' Equally intolerable are the people who study Zen and come out and brag to their friends about how much their legs hurt, and how long they sat, and what an awful thing it was. They're sickening. Because the discipline side of this thing is not meant to be something awful. It's not done in a masochistic spirit, or a sadistic spirit: suffering builds character, therefore suffering is good for you. When I went to school in England, the basic premise of education was that suffering builds character, and therefore all senior boys were at liberty to bang about the junior ones with a perfectly clear conscience, because they were doing them a favor. It was good for them, it was building their character, and as a result of this attitude, the word 'discipline' has begun to stink. It's been stinking for a long time. But we need a kind of entirely new attitude towards this, because without that quiet, and that non- striving, a life

becomes messy. When you let go, finally, because there's nothing to hold onto, you have to be awfully careful not to turn into loose yogurt. Let me give two opposite illustrations. When you ask most people to lie flat on the floor and relax, you find that they are at full attention, because they don't really believe that the floor will hold them up, and therefore they're holding themselves together; they're uptight. They're afraid that if they don't do this, even though the floor is supporting them, they'll suddenly turn into a gelatinous mass and trickle away in all directions. Then there are other people who when you tell them to relax, they go like a limp rag. But you see, the human organism is a subtle combination of hardness and softness. Of flesh and bones. And the side of Zen which has to do with neither doing nor not doing, but knowing that you are It anyway, and you don't have to seek it, that's Zen-flesh. But the side in which you can come back into the world, with this attitude of not seeking, and knowing you're It, and not fall apart—that requires bones. And one of the most difficult things—this belongs to of course a generation we all know about that was running about some time ago—where they caught on to Zen, and they started anything-goes painting, they started anything-goes sculpture, they started anything-goes way of life. Now I think we're recovering from that today. At any rate, our painters are beginning once again to return to glory, to marvelous articulateness and vivid color. There's been nothing like it since the stained glass at Chartres. That's a good sign. But it requires that there be in our daily use of freedom, and I'm not just talking about political freedom. I'm talking about the freedom which comes when you know that you're It, forever and ever and ever. And it'll be so nice when you die, because that'll be a change, but it'll come back some other way. When you know that, and you've seen through the whole mirage, then watch out, because there may still be in you some seeds of hostility, some seeds of pride, some seeds of wanting to put down other people, or wanting to just defy the normal arrangements of life.

So that is why, in the order of a Zen monastery, various duties are assigned. The novices have the light duties, and the more senior you get, the heavy duties. For example, the Roshi very often is the one who cleans out the benjo, the toilet. And everything is kept in order. There is a kind of beautiful, almost princely aestheticism, because by reason of that order being kept all of the time, the vast free energy which is contained in the

system doesn't run amok. The understanding of Zen, the understanding of awakening, the understanding of— Well, we'll call it mystical experiences, one of the most dangerous things in the world. And for a person who cannot contain it, it's like putting a million volts through your electric shaver. You blow your mind and it stays blown. Now, if you go off in that way, that is what would be called in Buddhism a pratyeka-buddha—'private buddha'. He is one who goes off into the transcendental world and is never seen again. And he's made a mistake from the standpoint of Buddhism, because from the standpoint of Buddhism, there is no fundamental difference between the transcendental world and this everyday world. The bodhisattva, you see, who doesn't go off into a nirvana and stay there forever and ever, but comes back and lives ordinary everyday life to help other beings to see through it, too, he doesn't come back because he feels he has some sort of solemn duty to help mankind and all that kind of pious cant. He comes back because he sees the two worlds are the same. He sees all other beings as buddhas. He sees them, to use a phrase of G.K. Chesterton's, 'but now a great thing in the street, seems any human nod, where move in strange democracies the million masks of god.' And it's fantastic to look at people and see that they really, deep down, are enlightened. They're It. They're faces of the divine. And they look at you, and they say 'oh no, but I'm not divine. I'm just ordinary little me.' You look at them in a funny way, and here you see the buddha nature looking out of their eyes, straight at you, and saying it's not, and saying it quite sincerely. And that's why, when you get up against a great guru, the Zen master, or whatever, he has a funny look in his eyes. When you say 'I have a problem, guru. I'm really mixed up, I don't understand,' he looks at you in this queer way, and you think 'oh dear me, he's reading my most secret thoughts. He's seeing all the awful things I am, all my cowardice, all my shortcomings.' He isn't doing anything of the kind; he isn't even interested in such things. He's looking at, if I may use Hindu terminology, he's looking at Shiva, in you, saying 'my god, Shiva, won't you come off it?'

So then, you see, the bodhisattva, who is—I'm assuming quite a knowledge of Buddhism in this assembly—but the bodhisattva as distinct from the pratyeka-buddha, bodhisattva doesn't go off into nirvana, he doesn't go off into permanent withdrawn ecstasy, he doesn't go off into a kind of catatonic samadhi. That's all right. There are people who can do that; that's their

vocation. That's their specialty, just as a long thing is the long body of buddha, and a short thing is the short body of buddha. But if you really understand that Zen, that buddhist idea of enlightenment is not comprehended in the idea of the transcendental, neither is it comprehended in the idea of the ordinary. Not in terms with the infinite, not in terms with the finite. Not in terms of the eternal, not in terms of the temporal, because they're all concepts. So, let me say again, I am not talking about the ordering of ordinary everyday life in a reasonable and methodical way as being schoolteacherish, and saying 'if you were NICE people, that's what you would do.' For heaven's sake, don't be nice people. But the thing is, that unless you do have that basic framework of a certain kind of order, and a certain kind of discipline, the force of liberation will blow the world to pieces. It's too strong a current for the wire. So then, it's terribly important to see beyond ecstasy. Ecstasy here is the soft and lovable flesh, huggable and kissable, and that's very good. But beyond ecstasy are bones, what we call hard facts. Hard facts of everyday life, and incidentally, we shouldn't forget to mention the soft facts; there are many of them. But then the hard fact, it is what we mean, the world as seen in an ordinary, everyday state of consciousness. To find out that that is really no different from the world of supreme ecstasy, well, it's rather like this:

Let's suppose, as so often happens, you think of ecstasy as insight, as seeing light. There's a Zen poem which says

A sudden crash of thunder. The mind doors burst open,
and there sits the ordinary old man.

See? There's a sudden vision. Satori! Breaking! Wowee! And the doors of the mind are blown apart, and there sits the ordinary old man. It's just little you, you know? Lightning flashes, sparks shower. In one blink of your eyes, you've missed seeing. Why? Because here is the light. The light, the light, the light, every mystic in the world has 'seen the light.' That brilliant, blazing energy, brighter than a thousand suns, it is locked up in everything. Now imagine this. Imagine you're seeing it. Like you see aureoles around buddhas. Like you see the beatific vision at the end of Dante's 'Paradiso.' Vivid, vivid light, so bright that it is like the clear light of the void in the Tibetan Book of the Dead. It's beyond light, it's so bright. And you watch it

receding from you. And on the edges, like a great star, there becomes a rim of red. And beyond that, a rim of orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. You see this great mandala appearing this great sun, and beyond the violet, there's black. Black, like obsidian, not flat black, but transparent black, like lacquer. And again, blazing out of the black, as the yang comes from the yin, more light. Going, going, going. And along with this light, there comes sound. There is a sound so tremendous with the white light that you can't hear it, so piercing that it seems to annihilate the ears. But then along with the colors, the sound goes down the scale in harmonic intervals, down, down, down, down, until it gets to a deep thundering base which is so vibrant that it turns into something solid, and you begin to get the similar spectrum of textures. Now all this time, you've been watching a kind of thing radiating out. 'But,' it says, 'you know, this isn't all I can do,' and the rays start dancing like this, and the sound starts waving, too, as it comes out, and the textures start varying themselves, and they say, well, you've been looking at this this as I've been describing it so far in a flat dimension. Let's add a third dimension; it's going to come right at you now. And meanwhile, it says, we're not going to just do like this, we're going to do little curlicues. And it says, 'well, that's just the beginning!' Making squares and turns, and then suddenly you see in all the little details that become so intense, that all kinds of little subfigures are contained in what you originally thought were the main figures, and the sound starts going all different, amazing complexities of sound all over the place, and this thing's going, going, going, and you think you're going to go out of your mind, when suddenly it turns into... Why, us, sitting around here.

Thank you very much.

Biting an Iron Bull

This seminar is about a very sticky problem, which is to say the problem to which the Buddha primarily addressed himself, which is that of agony, suffering. But before we get into that. We have to be clear about certain basics. And these basics have to do not so much with concepts and ideas. As they do with the state of mind. Would call it also a state of feeling the state of sensation the state of consciousness. And, we need to understand that even be in that the fall we can really go very far.

And this is an extraordinarily difficult state of mind to talk about even though in its nature it's extremely simple. Because, it is in a way like we were when we were babies. When we hadn't been told anything and didn't know anything, other than what we felt, and we had no names for it. Now of course as we grow older, we learn to differentiate one thing from another, one event from another and above all, our selves from everything else. Well and good. Provided you don't lose the foundations. Just as mountains are differentiated, but they're all based on the earth so the multiple things of this world are differentiated. But, they have as it were, a basis. There is no word for that basis, not really, because words are only for distinctions. And so there can't really be a word not even an idea, of the non-distinction. We can feel it, but we can't think it. But we don't feel it like an object. You feel you're alive, you feel conscious, but you don't know what consciousness is because consciousness is present in every conceivable kind of experience. It's like, the space in which we live, which is everywhere. It's like a fish being in water and presumably a fish doesn't know it's in the water because it never goes out. A bird, presumably, knows nothing of the air. And we really know nothing of consciousness, and we pretend space isn't there.

So however, when you grow up, and become fascinated, which is really the right word, spellbound, enchanted, by all the things that adults say that you. You forget the background. And you come to think that all the distinctions which you have been learning are the supremely important things to be concerned with. You become hypnotized. And so when we are told to pay attention to what matters, we get stuck with it and that's what and but as I'm is called attachment. Attachment doesn't mean that you enjoy your dinner. Or that you enjoy sleeping. Or beauty. Those are responses of our organism in its environment as natural as feeling hot near a fire or cold near ice. So are certain responses of fear or of sorrow. They are not attachment. Attachment is exactly translated by the modern slang term hang-up. It's a kind of stickiness, or what in psychology would be called blocking. When you are in a state of wobbly hesitation, not knowing how to flow on, that's attachment. What is meant by the Sanskrit word klesha.

So, when the chicken has its big foot to the chalk line it's got a hang up. It's stuck on that line. And so in the same way, we get a hang up on all the various things that we're told as we grow up by our parents, our aunts and

uncles, our teachers and above all, by our peer group. And the first thing that everybody wants to tell us is the difference between ourselves and the rest of the world, and between those actions which are voluntary, and those which are involuntary what we do on the one hand and what happens to us on the other. And this is of course immensely confusing to a small child. Because it's told to do all sorts of things that are really supposed to happen. Like going to sleep, like having bowel movements, like not loving people. Like not blushing. Stopping being anxious, and all sorts of things like that.

So what happens is this. The child is told in sum, that we, your parents, elders and betters, command you to do what will please us only if you do it spontaneously. [laughs] One hundred and I want everybody is completely confused. We go through life with that burden on us. So, we therefore develop this curious thing. We develop a thing which is called an ego. And I've got to be very clear here what I mean by an ego. And ego is not the same thing as a particular living organism. From my philosophy, the particular living organism which is inseparable from a particular environment. That is to say, from the universe as centered here and now. As something real which isn't a thing, I call it a feature of the universe. But what we call our ego is something abstract. Which is to say, it has the same order and kind of reality. As an hour, or an inch or a pound, or a line of longitude. It is for purposes of discussion, it is for convenience, in other words, it is for social convention, that we have what is called an ego. But the fallacy, that all of us make is, is that we treat it as if it were a physical organ. As if it were real in that sense. When in fact it is composed on the one hand. Of our image of ourselves. That is our idea of ourselves, as when we say to somebody, you must improve your image.

Now this image of ourselves as obviously not ourselves any more, than an idea of a tree is a tree. Any more, than you can get wet in the word water. And, to go on with our image of ourselves as extremely inaccurate and incomplete. With that some God the gifted ears to see ourselves as others see us we done. So my image of me is not at all your image of me and my image of me is extremely incomplete in that it does not include any information to speak of about the functioning of my nervous system, my circulation, my metabolism, my subtle relationships with the entire surrounding human and non-human universe. So, the image I have of

myself as a caricature. It is arrived at through mainly, my interaction with other people, who tell me who I am in various ways, either directly or indirectly, and I play about with what that picture is of me and they play something back to me so that we set up this conception, and this started very, very early in life. And I was told, you see, and you were told, that we must have a consistent image. You must be you you have to find your identity. In terms of image and this is an awful red herring. A lot of the current quest for identity among younger people is a search for an acceptable image. What role can I play? Who am I in the sense of what am I going to do in life and so on. Now while that has a certain importance. If it's not backed up by deed but not has it's extraordinarily misleading. So that for on the one hand there is this image which is intellectual emotional. Imaginative. And so forth.

Now we would say I don't feel that I am only an image. I feel there's something more real than that because, I feel, I mean I have a sense of there being a particular sort of, how do we say a center of something, some sort of sensitive core inside the skin. And that corresponds to the word I. And let's take a look at this. Because the thing that we feel as being myself is certainly not the whole body. Because a lot of the body can be seen as an object. In other words, if you stand, stretch yourself out, lie on the floor and turn your head and look at yourself you know you can see your feet and your legs and all this up to here and finally it all vanishes and there's a sort of a vague nose in front. And you assume you have a head, because everybody else does, and you looked in a mirror and I told you you had a head which would never see it just like you can't see your back. So you tend to put your ego on the side of the unseen part of the body. The part you can't get at, because that seems to be where it all comes from and you feel it. But what is it that we feel? Because if I see clearly, and my eyes are in functioning order, the eyes certainly are not conscious of themselves no spots in front of them no defects in other words in the lens on the retina or in the optic nerves that give hallucinations. So also, therefore, if my ego my consciousness, is working properly, I ought not to be aware of it. As something sort of there. Being a nuisance in a way in the middle of things because your ego is often hard to take care of.

Well what is it that we feel? Well I think I've discovered what it is. It's a chronic habitual sense of muscular strain, which we were taught in the whole process of doing spontaneous things to order. When you're taking off in a jet plane, and the thing is gone rather further down the runway than you think it should have without getting up in the air, you start pulling at your seat belt. Get this thing off the ground, perfectly useless. So in the same way, when our community tells us, look carefully. Now listen, pay attention, we start using muscular strains around our eyes, ears, jaws, hands, to try to use our muscles to make our nerves work. Which is of course futile. And in fact it gets in the way of the functioning of the nerves. Try to concentrate.

And then when we try to control our emotions we hold our breath pull our stomachs in, tighten our rectal muscles. To hold ourselves together, pull yourself together, I mean really, what do you do? What is the child understanding that he does it, must get and pull himself together. This is useless. So everybody, chronically pulls himself together so that it's so funny if you get a person to just lie on the floor and relax, but there's the floor and he was firm as can be holding you up. Nevertheless, they will detect that the person is making all sorts of tensions lest he should suddenly turn into a nasty Jell-O on the floor. So that chronic condition which in Sanskrit is called Samkoca which means contraction. Is the root of what we call the feeling of the ego so that in other words this feeling of tightness is the physical referent for the psychological image of ourselves. So that we get the ego as the marriage of an illusion to a futility, even though the idea of an 'I' with a name, with a being, is naturally useful for social communication. Provided we know what we're doing and take it for what it is.

But we are so hung up on this concept. That it confuses us, even in the proposition that it might be possible for us to feel otherwise. Because we ask the question if we hear about people who have transcended the ego. Well we ask how do you do that? Well I say, 'What do you mean?' You how do you do that. Because the you you're talking about doesn't exist. So you can't do anything about it, any more than you can cut a cheese with a line of longitude. That sounds very discouraging doesn't it? But let's suppose now you are babies again and you don't know anything. Now, don't be frightened, because anything you know you can get back later. But for the time being. Here is awareness, and let's suppose you have no information

about this at all, no words for it. And that my talking to you is just a noise. Now don't try to do anything about this, but don't make any effort. Because naturally, by force of habit, certain tensions remain inside you, and certain ideas and words drift all the time through your mind. Just like the wind blows or clouds move across the sky. Don't bother with them at all. Don't try to get rid of them. Just be aware of what's going on in your head. Like it was clouds in the sky. Or the crackling of the fire. There's no problem to this. All you have to do really is look and listen, without naming, and if you are naming, never-mind. Just listen to that.

Now, you can't force anything here. That you can't, willfully stop thinking and stop naming is only telling you. That the separate you doesn't exist. It isn't a mark of defeat. It isn't a sign of your lack of practice and meditation. That it runs on all by itself, simply means that the individual separate you is a figment of your imagination. So you are aware at this point of a happening. Remember you don't know anything about the difference between you and it. You haven't been told that. You have no words for the difference between inside and outside. Between here and there. And nobody has taught you, that what you see out in front of you is either near or far from your eyes. Watch a baby put out a finger to touch the moon. You don't know about that.

Just, therefore, here it is. We'll just call it this. And if you will feel it. The going on, which includes absolutely everything you feel. Whatever that is, it's what the Chinese call Tao, what Buddhists call suchness, tathata. And it's a happening. It doesn't happen to you. Because where is that. You what you call you was part of the happening. Or an aspect of. It has no parts, it's not like a machine. And it's a little scary because you feel who's in control around here. Why should that be anyone. That's in a very weird notion we have that processes require something outside them to control them. It never occurred to us that processes could be self-controlling, even though we say to someone 'Control yourself!' We know what you know all of the think about self-control We split a person into. So there's a you are separate from the self that's supposed to be controlled well how can that achieve anything. How can a noun start a verb? Yet it's a fundamental superstition that that can be done.

So you have this process which is quite spontaneous going on. We call it life, it's controlling itself. It's aware of itself, it's aware of itself through you, you are an aperture through which the universe looks at itself. And because it's the universe looking at itself through you, there's always an aspect of itself that it can't see. So it's like that snake you see that is pursuing its tail. Cause the snake down see its head, like you can.

So therefore, we always find as we investigate the universe, make the microscope bigger and bigger and bigger and we will find evermore minute things. Make the telescope bigger and bigger and bigger, and the universe expands, because it's running away from itself. It won't do that, if you don't chase it. Ha ha ha ha ha ha ha. So, the universe is chasing its own tail. Here this is the thing we're talking about this Tao. It's a game of hide-and-seek. Really, when you ask the question who is doing the chasing? You are still working under the assumption that every verb has to have a subject. That when there is an action, that has to be a doer. But that's what I would call a grammatical convention leading to what Whitehead called the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. Like the famous It in 'It is raining.'

So when you say that cannot be knowing without a knower. This is merely saying no more than there can't be a verb without a subject. And that's a grammatical rule and not a law of nature. Anything you can think of as a thing, as a noun, can be described by a verb. And there are languages which do that. It sounds awkward in English. But face it, when you look for doers as distinct from deeds, you can't find them. Just as when you look for stuff, underlying the patterns of nature, you can't find in his stuff you just find more not patterns. There never was any stuff, it's a ghost. What we call stuff is simply patterns seen out focus and it's fuzzy so we call it stuff. You know that cakewalk.

So you know we have these words energy, matter, being, reality even Tao. And we can never find them. [They] always elude us entirely, although we do have the very strong intuition that all this that we see is connected are related. So we speak of a universe, although that word really means one turn. It's your turn now. Or like you make one turn to look at yourself. But you can't make two terms and see what's looking. It's very simple therefore. You only have to understand that you can't do

anything about it. And as they say in Zen, you cannot take hold of it, but you can't get rid of it. And in not being able to get it, you get it. So all these trials that gurus put their students through have as their ultimate object convincing you that you can't do anything. Only it's convincing you very thoroughly, it's convincing you in more than a theoretical way. Now perhaps I shouldn't tell you that. But you see I'm not a guru. In that, I don't give individual spiritual direction to people. And I give away the guru's tricks. That may not be very good, but on the other hand, those tricks are only necessary in the sense that, I would say to someone it's necessary for you to go to a psychiatrist if you think you must. And if you're not going to be satisfied without going to Japan and study ins and Buddhism from an Roshi, 'OK you better go.' It isn't necessary unless you say it is. If that's the only thing that will satisfy you, and you feel that deep down inside you you've got that yearning therefore you've got that yearning. But on the other hand you have and you haven't. And I'm not going to put you down on that account you see. The particles What do you want to do? What is it in you to do?

But there it is. That you can struggle and struggle and struggle. And indeed will do so, as long as you have the feeling inside you to missing something. And, people, your friends, all sorts of people will do the utmost to persuade you that you're missing something. Because they're missing something, and they think they're getting it through a certain way and therefore to assure themselves that like you to do it to. So there's this thing, and you see a clever guru beguiles his students, by letting them have the feeling of success and accomplishment in certain directions. A guru gives people exercises A. that are difficult but can be accomplished and B. that are impossible. You will always be hung up on the impossible ones but the possible ones you will feel get a feeling of making progress, so that you will double your efforts to solve the impossible exercises. And then they range things in many many ranks and levels through which you can advance. This stage of consciousness that state of consciousness all think of the degrees of Masonry or so on, ranks or learning things, the different belts you get in Judo market. You can do that. And gives people the sets of competing with themselves or even with others. Because of the feeling inside that there is just something I'm missing. And of course, if you are learning any sort of

skill, and you haven't perfected the skill, there is indeed something you're missing.

But in this thing that we're talking about, that isn't true. Because you, as the Buddhists say, are Buddhas from the very beginning. And all that searching is like looking for your own head. Which you can't see, and therefore might conceivably imagine that you're lost. So, that indeed is the point. That we don't see what looks. And therefore, we think we've lost it. And so, we're in search of the Self the Atman. Well that's the one thing we can't find. Because we have it, we are it! But we confuse it, with all these images. So therefore, if you understand perfectly clearly that you can't do anything. To find that very very, important thing. God, enlightenment, Nirvana. Whatever. Then what?

Well, I find you know it's so stupid, because even if I tell myself well there's nothing I can do about it. Why did I say that? You see. Why did I say that? Why did I go out of my way to tell myself there's nothing I can do about it? Because, in the back of my mind, there's the funny little feeling that if I did tell myself that something different but how easy all right. So even that doesn't work, nothing works. Now and absolutely no. Nothing works where are you. Well here we are I mean you know this is feeling something going on oh well doesn't stop dead when there's nothing you can do. Because there's something happening.

Now just there. That's what I'm talking about, there's the happening. When you are not doing anything about it you're not not doing anything about it you just can't help it it goes on despite anything you think or worry about or whatever, now there is the point. Right there. And remember, although you will think that first that this is a kind of determinism, there are two reasons why it isn't. One, there is no-body being determined. Now, other people think of determinism, as the direction of what happens by the past. The causation of what happens by the past. Now, if you will use your senses, you will see that that is a hallucination. The present does not come from the past. If you listen, and only listen, close your eyes. Where do the sounds come from, according to your ears? You hear, you hear them coming out of silence. The sounds come and then they fade off. They go like echoes or echoes in the labyrinths of your brain, which we call memories. The sounds

don't come from the past. They come out of now and trail off. You can do that later with your eyes. You can see, like when you're watching television, there's a vibration coming out of the screen to your eyes. And it starts from there somehow. Because we see the hands and then they move, we think that the movement is caused by the hands, and that the hands were there before and so can move later. We don't see that our memory of the hands is an echo of their always being now. They never were, they never will be, they're always now. So is the motion. And that that is recollected is the trailing off echo like the wake of a ship. And so, just as the wake doesn't move the ship, the past does not move the present. Unless you insist that it does. And if you say, 'Well naturally I'm always moved by the past.' That's an alibi. And it completely fails to explain how you never learn anything new. And that's why all the psychologists who are mostly behaviorists are completely bogged down in trying to find a theory of learning. Because according to the the theory of learning that we have, everything they knew that you assimilate is really only learned when translated into terms of what you already know.

So in that sense, learning becomes like a library, which increases only by the addition of books about books already in it. And a lot of libraries are indeed like that. So, that's what we call scholasticism. So then, you become aware that this happening isn't happening to you, because you are happening. The only you there is, is what's going on. You know, feel it. And disregard these stupid distinctions that you've been taught I mean stupid relatively speaking. And feel it genuinely. When you feel genuinely, you get down to rock bottom all that isn't there. That's a game that's been erected on. And it isn't determined. In other words, you get this odd feeling of a synthesis between doing and happening. In which doing is as much happening as happening and happening is as much doing as doing. And if you're not very careful at that point you'll Plame yourself God Almighty, in the Hebrew-Christian sense. Like Freud alleges, babies feel that they're omnipotent. And in a way they are. I am omnipotent insofar as on the universe. But I'm not omnipotent in the role of Alan Watts. Only cunning.

So now then, this sensation of that happening is basic to all we would want to explore. It's there as you see you can't do anything. And that as you see you can't do anything, you don't go and distract yourself with something

else, like committing suicide. Or getting drunk, or any sort of distraction. Because if you do that, you will miss what follows, from the feeling of what is going on when you're not doing anything. When you're not able even to not do anything. See, this is a sticky place. You can't get in, and you can't get out. That's why it's called in Zen it's called the mosquito biting the Iron Bull. Or the man who swallowed a ball of red hot iron that she can't gulp down can't spit out. It's that difficult What are you to do or not do not tell Suzy that dilemma. That what you saw was you just isn't there at all. I don't make it difficult because that's a form of evading it. Don't make it easy, that's a form of evading. It's neither difficult no easy because if it were difficult it would have to be difficult for someone if it were easy it would have to be easy for someone. And the someone we're talking about is just the one that isn't there. And if you think it is there, okay, it's a free country you can have that thought but it's a thought. In other words your ego is a thought among thoughts it is not in fact the controlling thinker, or the feeler or the sensor. It's one of them.

And so therefore all this thing is going along. And as I say we get anxious because we feel nobody is in control but nobody ever was. Now in your lives as far a reasonably orderly life I mean that have been some catastrophes and messes, but it's amazing how we have got this far I mean the thing looks after itself. And you well remember that a lot of times that when you thought you were in charge and doing something sensible, you did something extremely foolish and when you thought you did something extremely foolish, it turned out to be a blessing. And that's the way things go.

Now of course, this is a dangerous way of speaking, to people who are in the process of young people especially, who are still in the process of learning elementary competence in the culture, learning the taboos and the conventions. Because we take their minds off the happening. To do that, well it isn't necessary to do it that way. It isn't really necessary to turn a child into a moron in the process of becoming an adult, but that's what we do. Because we teach a child to be a child. And that that prevents them from growing up. It's a method of keeping them off the labor market. But if you take that to speak to a child from the beginning as if it were an adult, and talk not baby talk, but straight language, your child will become Master of

English language, say about three years old. Certainly in talking it. And will be able to tell you a lot of funny things you don't know. But then, the trouble is you have to send the thing to school. Where if it is that advanced it will be regarded as a freak. And have a very bad time of it so it will have to conceal itself as a moron. But sometimes children are brought up without that interruption of being a child. You know with all the cutie pie stuff and that's what bores me about Christmas it's a way of commercializing childhood. So there's our basic part of departure. And I will have an intermission in which we will have coffee and...

The World as Just So

A lecture on Zen is always something in the nature of a hoax, because it really does deal with a domain of experience that can't be talked about. But one must remember, at the same time, that there's really nothing at all that can be talked about adequately. And the whole art of poetry is to say what can't be said. So every poet—every artist—feels, when he gets to the end of his work, that there's something absolutely essential that was left out. So Zen has always described itself as a finger pointing at the moon.

In the Sanskrit saying *tat tvam asi*, 'that art thou,' Zen is concerned with 'that.' 'That,' of course, is the word which is used for 'Brahman,' the absolute reality in Hindu philosophy. And you're it—only in disguise, and disguised so well that you've forgotten it. But unfortunately, ideas like the Ultimate Ground of Being, the Self, Brahman, Ultimate Reality, the Great Void—all that is very, very abstract talk, and Zen is concerned with a much more direct way of coming to an understanding of 'that.' Or 'thatness,' as it's called; *tathātā* in Sanskrit.

So Zen has been summed up in four statements:

a direct transmission outside scriptures and apart from tradition,

no dependence on words and letters,

direct pointing to the human mind,

and seeing into one's own nature and becoming Buddha, that is, becoming enlightened—awakened—from the normal hypnosis under which almost all of us go 'round like somnambules.

It's extraordinary how much interest has existed in Zen in the United States, especially in the years since the war with Japan. And, naturally, I've often meditated on the reasons for this interest. I think, first of all, the appeal of Zen lies in its unusual quality of humor. Religions aren't, as a rule, humorous in any way. Religions are serious. And when one looks at Zen art and reads Zen stories it is quite apparent that something is going on here which isn't serious in the ordinary sense, however sincere it may be.

The next thing I think has appealed to Westerners is that Zen has no doctrines. There is nothing you have to believe, and it doesn't moralize at you very much. It's not particularly concerned with morals at all. It's a field of inquiry rather like physics. And you don't expect a physicist to discuss authoritatively about morals even though, as a human being, he has moral interests and problems. But as a physicist he is not a moral authority. Or, if you go to an oculist, or ophthalmologist, to have your eyes adjusted—that is so you can see clearly. And Zen is spiritual ophthalmology.

Another thing that appeals very much to Western students about Zen is that they read their Zen from Suzuki, and from some of my writings, and from R. H. Blyth, and these people present a rather different kind of Zen from that which you will find today in Japan. They present what is essentially early Chinese Zen from the old writings, ranging from about shortly before 700 A.D. to 1000 A.D. And that Zen has a very different flavor from modern Japanese Zen, and so, of course, many of the people who go to study Zen in Japan disapprove of Dr. Suzuki thoroughly. And also, naturally, of my exposition of Zen, because we don't make a great fetish of studying Zen by sitting.

In Japan, today, they sit and they sit and they sit. R. H. Blyth asked a Zen master, What would you do if you had only one half hour left to live? And he [the Zen master] said, I would do zazen, which means he would sit like a Buddha, here, and practice meditation. And Blyth had given him several choices: Would you like to listen to your favorite music? Would you have a dinner? Would you get drunk? Would you like the company of a beautiful

woman? Would you take a walk? What would you do? Or would you just go on with your daily business as if nothing was going to happen? In other words, would you wind up your watch? So he [Blyth] was very disappointed in this answer. And he said, You know, sitting is only one way of doing Zen.

Buddhism speaks of the four dignities of man: walking, standing, sitting, and lying. And so zazen is simply the Japanese word for 'sitting Zen.' There must also be walking Zen, standing Zen, and lying Zen. You should know, for example, how to sleep in a Zen way: that means to sleep thoroughly. Zen has been described as, When hungry, eat. When tired, sleep. And when the student got that description he said, Well, doesn't everybody do that? And the master said, They don't. When hungry, they don't just eat but think of 10,000 things. When tired, they don't just sleep but dream innumerable dreams.

So, in a sense, this sounds like the old Western truism whatever your hand finds to do, do it with all your might. But that's not the same thing as Zen. A lot of people like to see if they could sum up Zen in that way. In the Latin motto of the school I used to go to in England: age dum agis, 'act when you act,' or while you act.

There's a famous story which beautifully illustrates the current relationships between East and West. Paul Reps, who wrote—or rather, drew—a lovely book called Zen Telegrams, once asked a Zen master to sum up Buddhism in one phrase. And he said, Don't act, but act. So Reps was simply delighted because he thought the master had said, Don't act but act. And that, of course, would be the Taoist principle of wú wéi (無爲), of action in the spirit of not being separate from the world. Realizing so fully that you are the universe, too—that your action on it is not an interference, but an expression of the totality. But the master's English was very bad indeed, and Paul Reps had misunderstood him. He had said, Don't act bad act. And, you know, that is the sort of attitude that all clergy develop over the centuries. You know how it is when you go to church—if you do—so often the sermon boils down to, My dear people, you ought to be good. And everybody knows that—but hardly anybody knows how, or even what, 'good' is.

The fascination of Zen, to the West, is that it promises a sudden insight into something that is always supposed to take years and years and years. The psychoanalysts—if you're mixed up—they tell you the troubles you've got yourself into over all these years can't be undone in a day, and therefore it will take many, many sessions—maybe twice a week for several years—for you to get straightened out.

The Christians say that if you embark on a path of spiritual discipline, you get yourself a spiritual director and submit yourself to the will of God, but you may not get into the high states of contemplative prayer for very many years. The Hindus, the Vedanta society people, the Buddhists also say it'll require many long years of meditation, very hard concentration, very difficult practice, and stern discipline. Then, maybe, you'll make enough progress in this life to become a monk in your next life, and then you'll make enough progress to enter some of the preliminary stages leading to Buddhahood, but it's all likely to take you many, many incarnations.

But when this artist, Hasegawa, was asked, How does one see into Zen? he said: It may take you three seconds, it may take you thirty years. I mean that. And so, you see, there is always the possibility that it may take only three seconds. Zen literature abounds with stories, you see, in which there's a dialogue—or what is called in Japanese *mondō*, which means 'question-answer'—between a Zen teacher and his student, and these dialogues are fascinatingly incomprehensible. But it always seems to be that [at] the end of this swift interchange, the student gets the point. Sometimes he doesn't.

I gave a book of these dialogues, once, to a friend of mine who was deeply interested in Eastern philosophy. He said, I haven't understood a word of it, but it has cheered me up enormously. So this book—called the *Mumonkan*, which means 'the barrier with no gate,' or 'the gateless gate'—contains such stories as the student—I say student rather than monk, because Zen students are not monks in our sense of the word 'monk.' Our monks take life vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, and to make the grade you're expected to spend your whole life in the monastic state. But I call the Zen monk a student because he's more like a student in a theological seminary. He may stay much longer than the usual three years; he may stay thirty years or so, but it's always possible for him to leave with dignity, and to

graduate, and to go into lay life, or to become a regular priest who keeps charge of a temple, can get married and have a family, and only very few graduates of a Zen monastery become rōshi. Rōshi simply means ‘old teacher’—that is, the man in charge of the spiritual development of the students.

So one of these students in the book says to the master Jōshū, I have been here in this monastery for some time, and I’ve had no instruction from you. The master said, Have you had breakfast? Yes. Then go wash your bowl. And the monk was awakened. Now, you may think that the moral of the story is, do the work that’s nearest though it’s dull at times, helping, when you meet them, lame dogs over stiles [Charles Kingsley].

Or that the bowl might be a symbol of the great void, the all-containing universe, and that—probably—the monk had washed it already, because they immediately—after eating in Japan and China, in a monastery—they take tea and pour it into the bowl and swill it around, wash it and wipe it out. So maybe he had already washed the bowl. And in that case you might think that the master was saying, Don’t gild the lily. Don’t—to use a real nice Zen phrase—don’t put legs on a snake. Or a beard on a eunuch. No, the point of that story is so clear that that’s what’s difficult about it.

And all these stories resemble jokes in this sense. A joke is told to make you laugh. When you get the point of the joke, you laugh spontaneously. But if the point has to be explained to you, you don’t laugh so well; you force a laugh. There is some kind of sudden impact between the punchline and the laugh, and so in exactly the same way with these stories, there is expected to be something else than laughter, which is sudden insight into the nature of being. ‘Nature of being;’ that sounds—again—very abstract, but it was go wash your bowl.

So, another story in this book concerns a master who said, When a cow walks out of the enclosure—the corral—the horns and head, the four legs, and the body all get through, but not the tail. How is it that the tail can’t get through? And nobody could answer this.

Another story tells of a certain master called Bǎizhàng, who was so good that he had hundreds of students, and they couldn’t all be housed in one

monastery. So he had to find one of the students who could also be a master. And so he arranged a test. He put down a pitcher in front of them all and said, Without making an assertion, or without making a denial, tell me what is this? And the senior monk said, It couldn't be called a piece of wood. And the teacher didn't accept this answer. But the monastery cook came forward and kicked the pitcher over and walked away, and he got the job. And the commentator remarks, Maybe he wasn't so smart after all, for he gave up an easy job for a difficult one.

When an inquirer about Zen came to a master, often—you know—they approach a Zen master with a kind of key question. What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism? Or, Why did the bearded barbarian come from the West? Because Zen is supposed to have been brought into China by a Hindu named Bodhidharma. Bodhidharma is always represented as having a huge bushy beard and very fierce eyes. Now, Bodhidharma always insisted that he had nothing to teach. And so, why did he come? That's one of the fundamental questions.

You might say to me—I've often said when I'm giving a lecture—I'm not trying to improve you, I'm not trying to persuade you to a certain point of view; that is to say like a preacher would convert somebody. In fact, I have nothing to tell you at all. Because were I to presume that I had something to tell you, I would be like a person who picked your pocket and sold you your own watch. So you might say, then, why do I talk? You might ask the sky, Why are you blue? The clouds, Why do you float around? Birds, Why do you sing? And we've been busy trying to invent explanations for all this. And so there's this great Zen saying; one of the old masters said, When I was a young man and knew nothing of Buddhism, mountains were mountains and waters were waters. But when I began to understand a little Buddhism, mountains were no longer mountains and waters no longer waters. In other words, when one starts scientific and philosophical inquiries, everything gets explained away in terms of its causes or other things that go with it. Or one sees that all the things in the world—what we think are separate things—are, as 'things,' illusions; there is nothing separate. So—but he said at the end, But when I had thoroughly understood, mountains are mountains and waters are waters. So this is what's called direct pointing.

A Zen master was once talking with me, and he said, When water goes out of the wash basin down the drain, does it go clockwise or anti-clockwise? And this was all phrased in the middle of a very ordinary conversation and, you know, it just seemed like a speculative question. And I said, Oh, it might go either. He said, NO! Like this! Now he said, Which came first, egg or hen? I said, Bwock bwock bwock bwock bwkeeeeeeeek! Yeah, he said, that's the point.

Now, it is saying too much—I warn you—to say that Zen is trying to point to the physical universe so that you could look at it without forming ideas about it. That is saying too much, but it is the general idea. It's in the direction of being the right idea. Zen people speak of the virtue of what they call mushin, which means 'no mind,' or munen, 'no thought.' That red lantern says munen on it. No thought. This is not an anti-intellectual attitude. The ordinary simple person is just as bamboozled by thinking as a university professor. You can think intellectually in a 'no think' way; that's the art. It doesn't mean not to have any thoughts at all, it means not to be fooled by thoughts; not to be hypnotized by the forms of speech and images that we have for the world. Not to be hypnotized by them into thinking that that is the way the world really is. So, if I say, This is a fan, it isn't. To begin with, 'fan' is a noise, and this doesn't make the noise 'fan,' but just 'whoosh.' But it can be many other things than a fan. It can be a back scratcher, very well. All sorts of things. Don't let words limit the possibilities of life. Actually, this fan has an inscription on it, written by a Zen Master who is 100 years old, and it says, I don't understand, I don't know anything about it.

So that goes back to the story of Bodhidharma: that, when he first came to China sometime a little before 500 A.D., he was interviewed by the Emperor Wu, of Liang. The emperor was a great patron of Buddhism and said, We have caused many monasteries to be built, monks and nuns to be ordained, and the scriptures to be translated into Chinese. What is the merit of this? And Bodhidharma said, No merit whatever. Well, that really set the emperor back, because the popular understanding of Buddhism is that you do good things like that—religious things—and you acquire merit, and this leads you to better and better lives in the future so that you will eventually become liberated.

And so he was completely set back, so he said, What is the first principle of the Holy Doctrine? And Bodhidharma said, Vast emptiness and nothing holy. Or, In vast emptiness there is nothing holy. So the emperor said, Who is it, then, that stands before us? The implication being: aren't you supposed to be a holy man? And Bodhidharma said, I don't know.

So the poem says:

Plucking flowers to which the butterflies come,

Bodhidharma says 'I don't know.'

And another poem like it:

If you want to know where the flowers come from,

even the God of Spring doesn't know.

So anybody who says that he knows what Zen is, is a fraud. Nobody knows. Just like you don't know who you are. All this business about your name, and your accomplishments, your certificates, what your friends say about you—you know very well that's not you. But the problem to know who you are is the problem of smelling your own nose.

When the great Japanese master Dōgen came back from China in about the year 1,200 A.D. to bring his school of Zen into Japan, they asked him, What did you learn in China? He said, The eyes are horizontal, the nose is perpendicular. This man went on to write a tremendous book about Zen. They are so contradictory, these people. Don't expect consistency out of a Zen master. Big, big book called the Shōbōgenzō. I talked with a Zen master about this book—in Japan—and he said, Oooh, that's a terrible book! It explains everything so clearly! It gives the show away. He said, You don't need any book for Zen.

So, you see, it is this kind of way of going about things, this method of Zen, that has so fascinated the West. And everybody who reads about Zen wonders if somehow, you see, this understanding is right under your nose. You know how it is: sometimes, you get a crowd of people to come into a

room, and you put something in the room that's absurd—like, suppose there was a balloon floating on the ceiling—people could come in and not notice it at all. Or, you know, somebody puts on something weird—some kind of a funny necktie, or something—and you say to a person, Well, haven't you noticed? A woman in a new dress. You know? Haven't you noticed? You say, Well, no. Wh—what is it? You know? It's right under your nose. It's staring you in the face, but you don't see it. And Zen is exactly like that.

It is very obvious. The master Bokuju was asked, We have to dress and eat every day, and how do we escape from all that? In other words, how do we get out of routine? And he said, We dress, we eat. He said, I don't understand. Bokuju said, If you don't understand, put on your clothes and eat your food.

Another Zen master, in quite recent times, was interviewing a student—you see, all these stories I'm telling you are connected, and what I want you to do is to grasp, intuitively, the connection—was interviewing a student—Western student—and he said, Get up and walk across the room. He got up and walked and came back. He said, Where are your footprints?

Another monk asked Jōshū, What is the Way? Tao, in Chinese. The Tao. He said, Your everyday mind is the way. How do you get in accord with it? He said, When you try to accord, you deviate.

So here is this extraordinary phenomenon. Now, let me say—having presented you with all these fireworks—let me say a few sober things about Zen as a historical phenomenon. Zen is a subdivision of Mahāyāna Buddhism. And, as you know, that is the school of Buddhism which is concerned with realizing Buddha-nature in this world; not necessarily by going off to the mountains, or by renouncing family life, everyday life, et cetera, et cetera—as if that were an entanglement—but realizing, in the midst of life, the possibility of becoming a Buddha.

And so, the great ideal personality of Mahāyāna Buddhism is the Bodhisattva—a word now applied to somebody who has attained Nirvāṇa, but instead of disappearing, comes back in many, many guises. There's a famous painting of one of the Bodhisattvas in the form of a prostitute. And Bodhisattvas in Zen art are often represented as bums. There's the beautiful

one over there, painted by Sengai, of the bum Hotei—or Bùdài in Chinese—who is always immensely fat. And he's saying, Buddha is dead. Maitreya—who is supposed to be the next Buddha—hasn't come yet. I had a wonderful sleep and didn't even dream about Confucius. And he's just stretching and yawning as he wakes up.

So Zen is Mahāyāna—Indian Mahāyāna Buddhism—translated into Chinese and therefore deeply influenced by Taoism and Confucianism. Zen monks brought Confucian ideas to Japan. And the origins of Zen lie actually around the year 414 A.D., at which time a great Hindu scholar by the name of Kumārajīva was translating—with a group of assistants—the Buddha sūtras into Chinese. One of his students taught that all beings whatsoever have the capacity to become Buddha, to become enlightened—even rocks and stones—and that even heretics and evil-doers have the Buddha-nature, or Buddha potentiality, in them. And everybody said he was a dreadful heretic. But then a text called the Nirvāṇa Sūtra came from India, which said precisely that. So everybody had to admit that this man was right. He also began to teach that awakening must be instantaneous; it's a kind of all-or-nothing state. I don't mean that there aren't degrees of its intensity—but once you see the pinciple, you see the whole thing. As they say: when the bottom falls out of the bucket, all the water goes together. Those men, then, promulgated the way of sudden awakening. Bodhidharma came later, and he is supposed—in legend—to have been followed by a line of six patriarchs, of which he was the first.

The second was named Eka—I'm using the Japanese pronunciation—who was formerly a general of the army. Then the third was Sōsan, who wrote the Xìnxīn Míng, which is the most marvelous little summary of Buddhism in verse. And so on, until they came to Enō, the sixth patriarch. You know—perhaps, more familiarly—his Chinese name, Huìnéng. He died in 715 A.D. He's the real founder of Chinese Zen; the man who synthesized the whole thing, and was the—at least, his collected discourses are contained in what is called the Platform Sūtra. And any student of Zen should read the Platform Sūtra.

But Enō really fused Zen with the Chinese way of doing things, and he emphasized very thoroughly: Do not think you are going to attain

Buddhahood by sitting down all day and keeping your mind blank. Because a lot of those students who practice Dhyāna—which is Sanskrit for Chán, which is Chinese for Zen, which is, in turn, Japanese—it means ‘meditation’—or ‘contemplation,’ perhaps, would be a better translation in English. And everybody thought that the proper way to contemplate was to be as still as possible. But, according to Zen, that is to be a stone Buddha instead of a living Buddha.

Now, I can knock a stone Buddha on the head, clunk, and it has no feelings, and so it’s a stone Buddha. There was a famous Zen master called Tanka, who went to a little lonely temple on a freezing cold night. And he took the Buddha image—one of the Buddha images—off the altar, split it up, and made a fire. And when the attendant of the temple came in the morning—horrified! Broke the image, and Tanka took his stick, started raking in the ashes. And the temple priest said, What are you looking for? He said, I’m looking for the śarīra, that is to say, the jewels that are supposed to be found in the body of a genuine Buddha when he’s cremated. So the priest said, You couldn’t expect to find śarīra from a wooden Buddha. In that case, said Tanka, let me have that other Buddha for my fire.

That’s, you see, the difference between living Buddha and stone Buddha. But a person who thinks that, in order to be awakened, you have to be heartless—to have no emotions, no feelings, that you couldn’t possibly lose your temper, or get angry, or feel annoyed, or depressed—those people haven’t got the right idea at all. If that’s your ideal, said Enō, you might just as well be a block of wood or a piece of stone. What he wanted you to understand is that your real mind—while all those emotions are going on—is imperturbable. Just like when you move your hand through the sky you don’t leave a track. The birds don’t stain the blue when they pass by. And when the water reflects the image of the geese, the reflection doesn’t stick there.

So, to be pure-minded, in the Zen way—or clear-minded is a better way of translating it—is not to have no thoughts; it’s not a question of not thinking about dirty things. One great master of the Tang dynasty, when asked, What is Buddha? believe it or not, answered, A dried turd. So it’s not that kind of purity. It is purity, clarity, in the sense that your mind isn’t sticky. You don’t

harbor grievances. You don't be attached to the past. You go with it, with life. Life is flowing all the time. That is the Tao: the flow of life. You are going along with it whether you want to or not. You're like people in a stream. You can swim against the stream, but you'll still be moved along by it and all you'll do is wear yourself out in futility. But if you swim with the stream, the whole strength of the stream is yours. Of course, the difficulty that so many of us have is finding out which way the stream is going. But certainly, as it goes, all the past vanishes. The future has not yet arrived. And there is only one place to be, which is here and now. And there is no way of being anywhere else. None whatever. If you understand that thoroughly, your task is finished. You then become instantaneous and also momentous.

So this was Enō's principle. As I said, he died in 715 A.D., and he left five very great disciples who taught, substantially, the same sort of thing. But as things go, then, these disciples had disciples, and those disciples had disciples, and there's a genealogy. And Zen broke into what are called Five Houses. And these—some of them didn't go on. Zen went on in two main forms: one is called, by the Japanese, Rinzai Zen, after the great master Rinzai, who lived towards the end of the 9th century, and the Sōtō School comes from another line, and they have a slightly different emphasis. Sōtō is more serene in its approach; Rinzai more gutsy. Rinzai people use the kōan method in Zen studies. Sōtō people don't—at least not in the same way.

But this period between the death of the sixth Patriarch, Enō, and about the year 1,000 A.D., is the golden age of Zen. These were the really formative years. And after that, Zen began to decline in China. It became mixed up with other forms of Buddhism, and it suffered the fate of many, many forms of meditation-type, or Yoga-type, discipline. It got a little bit sidetracked into occult and psychic matters; what are called, in Buddhism, siddhi, or the development of supernormal powers. For Zen, this is completely beside the point. But it got involved with Chinese alchemy, with Taoistic alchemy, and all sorts of foolishness in that direction.

But a very strong strain of Zen went to Japan. The first being in about 1,130 A.D., the monk Eisai, and then about 1,200 A.D., the monk I told you

about, Dōgen, who founded the great, beautiful, gorgeous, galluptuous monastery at Eihei-ji—which exists to this day. Now, in this golden age of Chinese Zen, the main method of study was walking Zen rather than sitting Zen. All monks were great travelers, and they walked for miles and miles through fields and mountains, visiting temples to see if they could find a master who would cause their spark to flash. To get what is called in Mandarin wú—or in Japanese, satori, or in Cantonese, ng.

This always rather fascinates me; the way this character is written. The word ‘I,’ in Chinese, is sometimes represented by this right-hand side of the character alone: five mouths, five senses. This one means your mind or heart, the heart-mind, xīn. Now, when we say something very surprising happened, My heart came into my mouth. Here it comes into all five. So this character means ‘awakening’—it’s the same, in a way, as the Sanskrit bodhi—awakening from the illusion of being a separate ego locked up in a bag of skin; discovering that you are the whole universe. And, of course, if you do discover that, and you see into it all of a sudden, it’s a shock—because your whole common sense is turned directly inside out. Everything is the same as you’ve always seen it, but completely different. Because you know who you are; you know that—what the devil were you worrying about? What was all that fuss? What was all that to do? Well, you see, it was part of the game. Everything, from one point of view, is fuss and to do. To do, to do, what is there to do?

But when you wake up, you see, and discover that all this ‘to do’ wasn’t you—what you thought was you—but was the entire works, which we can just call ‘it.’ That you’re ‘it,’ and that ‘it’ is it, and everything is ‘it,’ and ‘it’ does all things that are done—then that is a great surprise. But it sounds tasteless. It sounds empty, it sounds void, because if I say Well, you’re all ‘it,’ that is a statement without the slightest logical sense—because we don’t know what is ‘it’ unless there’s something that isn’t ‘it’. But if it’s both all is’s and all isn’t’s, then we can’t think about it. Nevertheless, it is highly possible to see that that’s so in a way that’s so vivid it brings your heart into all of your five mouths.

Having discussed basic principles of what Zen is about, I’m passing on to the more practical side of it. A Zen monastery is not a monastery in the Christian sense. It’s more like a theological seminary, except that it

practices more than it teaches. A typical institution consists of a campus, and on the campus there are many buildings. First of all, around the edges, you will invariably find independent temples that were founded in times past by noble families, because one of the things that Buddhists did when they came to the Far East was they exploited ancestor worship.

This was very clever of them: this being the great religion of China, the Buddhist priests performed services like [?] masses for the repose of the souls, or for good incarnation—reincarnations—for one's ancestors, and they made quite a thing out of that. And so they have memorial services for the departed, and that's one of the principal functions of temples in Japan. People don't go to temple in the same way as Westerners go to church. They make pilgrimages to temples and—say, at a great temple like Eihei-ji—you will find, on a Sunday morning—or practically any morning—a swarm of about 500 people attending the 4 a.m. service of chanting. Chanting the Buddhist scriptures. But they are, kind of, in and out of their temples. They have special services, they have memorial services, weddings, funerals, or everything like that, but they don't have a parish kind of church community as we find it in the West.

Although, when Buddhism—through the Japanese immigrants—exports itself to the United States, they immediately copy the Protestant church institution and sing, Buddha loves me, this I know, for the sūtra tells me so. It's terrible. And all the young men—nisei, who have never been in Japan—the one thing they can't stand is sūtra chanting, because they don't know what it means, and the priests don't know what it means a lot of the time. And so—but it's beautiful to listen to, and they haven't got an educated Western ear yet to appreciate that kind of oriental music.

Well, now, aside from these many temples, each of which is in charge of a priest with his family—and some of them are having a hard time making a go of it these days, so they become restaurants for very elegant food, or museums, and all sorts of things.

Now, the central—the guts of the Zen temple is what's called the sōdō. Sō, in Japanese, is the saṅgha, the order of followers of the Buddha; dō simply means 'hall.' So the 'saṅgha hall,' or sōdō, is the center. And this consists of a number of rooms, but the main one—the actual sōdō itself—is a large,

long, spacious room, with platforms on either side and a wide passage down the center. The platforms are six feet wide and each contains a number of tatami mats, which are measured six by three, and every monk is assigned to a mat. And on a shelf behind the mat, against the wall, he has all his possessions, which are very simple. And so the mat is his sleeping place and his meditation place. There is an image of the bodhisattva Manjushri in the hall, more or less in the center of the passage between the platforms. Manjushri is a bodhisattva—called a monju in Japan—who holds in his hand a sword, and this sword is the sword of wisdom, or prajñā, which cuts asunder all illusions. That is the dwelling place and the meditation place of the monks, and then they have, of course, kitchens, and a library, and they have special temples that the monks use for various services.

Then, aside from that, there are the quarters of the kansho, who is the abbot, or administrative head, of the temple, and then the quarters of the rōshi, who is the spiritual teacher. There isn't, in the Zen—not in the Rinzai Zen School, at any rate—exactly a hierarchy. Every temple is independent. There's no Pope, no Archbishop, but there is a fraternal relationship between all the temples of the Rinzai sect. The Sōtō sect have a little bit of a hierarchy, but still, on the whole, the kansho—or administrative head of the temple—is the big boss. The rōshi is the respected boss, the man everybody's terrified of—at least on the outside, at any rate.

Now, if you want to get into one of these institutions and study, they make it difficult. It's so different from the welcome attitude you get when you go into a Christian church. Here, they repel you. Westerners, of course, are treated with a certain amount of courtesy that is not ordinarily accorded to Japanese—but even then it's made difficult, because they realize that a Westerner who's taken the trouble to learn Japanese, and to get himself over the oceans, and to live under unfamiliar conditions is certainly pretty serious about it. And there are a number of Western Zen monks. So funny—there's one at Taihei-ji, who comes from San Francisco, and he's tremendously tall, and to see him with all the others is quite amusing.

Anyway, the formal approach is that you arrive in your traveling gear at the gate, and the Zen monk's traveling gear is most picturesque: he wears a great mushroom on his head; enormous straw hat, about so wide, and then

he has a black robe—shorter than a kimono—and he has long white tabi socks underneath, and geta, which are the wooden sandals with bridges on them to keep you high up a bit. Or he may wear just plain waraji, which are straw sandals. Then he carries, on the front, his little box in which are his eating bowls, his razor, his toothbrush, and such necessities of life.

When he arrives he's told that the monastery is very poor and they can't afford to take on any more students, and that the teacher is getting old and it might tax his strength, and things like that. So he has to sit on the steps, and he puts his traveling box in front of him, he takes off his big hat, and he lays his head on the box—his forehead—and waits there all day. But he is invited in for meals to a special little guest house, because no traveling monk can be refused hospitality. And he is admitted at night into this special place, but he's expected not to sleep, but to spend all night in meditation. In olden times this went on for at least a week or ten days to test this fellow out. Then, finally, the assistant to the rōshi comes and tells him that the rōshi maybe will have a talk with him

IV

ENTERING THE TEMPLE

So, you must remember the aspect of a rōshi to this young monk: he's a formidable fellow; usually an older man who has about him something that is difficult to put your finger on. There's a certain fierceness coupled with a kind of tremendous directness, a sense of somebody who sees right through you. And so he really poses to this young fellow, What do you want? Why did you come here?

But he said, I came to be instructed in Zen.

And the teacher says, Well, we don't teach anything here. There isn't anything in Zen to study.

Well, the student knows—or thinks he knows—that this 'not anything,' which is studied in Zen, is the real thing; that's—of course, as a Buddhist, he knows—that what isn't anything is the universe, the great void, the śūnyatā. And so he isn't phased by that.

He says, Well, nevertheless, you do have people who are working here and meditating under your instruction, and I'd like to join them.

Well, maybe. But strictly on probation.

And then, of course, all the details are taken and he pays a ridiculously small fee—in modern Japan, at any rate—to be able to stay in the monastery. It's very, very inexpensive.

Now the teacher comes back and says, Now, you want to study Zen. Why?

Well, because I'm oppressed by the rounds of birth and death—in other words, by the vicious circles of life in which I find myself—by suffering, by pain, and so on, and I want to be emancipated.

The teacher says, Who is it that wants to be emancipated?

That's a stopper.

There was a good old story about one of these preliminary interviews. The master asks, first of all, very casual questions. Where is your hometown? What's your name? What did your father do? And where did you go to college? Why is my hand so much like the Buddha's hand? And suddenly, you know, in mid-stream of an ordinary conversation—clunk!—the student is blocked. And so there is devised the kōan—in Chinese: gōng'àn—and this means, literally, the word 'kōan' means a 'case,' in exactly the same sense as we talk about a case in law which functions as a precedent for future cases. 'Kōan' should be translated 'case.' The kōans are based on stories, mondō, of the conversations between the old masters and their students.

But you can make a kōan immediately by such a question, Why is my hand so much like the Buddha's hand? Or, Who are you that asked this question? If the student tries to verbalize on that and say, Well, I am so-and-so, he asks, Who knows that you are so-and-so? How do you know that you know? Who knows that you know? Find out! In other words, the basic kōan is always Who are you? Who is it that wants to escape from birth and

death? And I won't take words for an answer. I want to see you! And all you're showing me at the moment is your mask.

So, then the student is sent back to the monk's quarters, the sōdō, and the chief of the sōdō is—called the jikijitsu—is then put in charge of him, and he teaches him how to behave, what the rules are, how to eat, and how to meditate. In the Zen sect they sit on [a] padded cushion about the thickness of the San Francisco telephone directory—which is an admirable substitute. And then, with crossed legs in the lotus posture—with the feet resting on the thighs, like you always see a Buddha—they sit for half-hour periods. That's supposed to be the length of time it takes for a stick of incense to burn.

And then, when wooden clappers are knocked together, they all get up and they walk round and round the room—quite fast, kind of a slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam, slam pace—and this keeps you awake. Then, at a given signal, they go back and meditate again.

And, constantly, there is a monk, one on each side, carries a long, flat stick shaped almost like this fan—in the sense that it's thin at one end and rounded at the other—and if this guy sees a monk who's slouching, or sleeping, or goofing off in some way he very respectfully bows before him. And the monk rests his head on his knees, and this fellow takes the stick and hits him vigorously on the shoulders, here, like this. Now, most apologists for Zen say this is not punishment, it's simply to keep you awake. Don't you believe it. I've investigated this, and it's the same as the British boys' school—only it doesn't have the erotic qualities that the British floggings do. Zen people are cool about it. But it is a kind of a fierce thing.

Anyway, the point of the meditation, the zazen, is that—perhaps at the beginning—one does nothing more than count your breathing—so many breaths in, counting in tens—just to allow your thoughts to become still. Zen people do not close their eyes when they meditate, nor do they close their ears. They keep their eyes on the floor in front of them, and they don't try to force away any sounds that are going on, or any smell, or any sensation whatever. Only, they don't think about it. And this can become an extraordinarily pleasant occupation. All the little sounds of distant traffic, of

birds, of somebody carpentering somewhere and the hammer going, dog barking, or—especially—rain on the roof; gorgeous. They don't block that out.

But as time goes on, instead of counting breathing they devote themselves to the kōan problem which the rōshi has assigned. What is the sound of one hand? Who were you before your father and mother conceived you? When Jōshū was asked, Does a dog have Buddha nature? he replied, No. What is the meaning of 'no,' or mu? All sorts of these problems.

V

ANSWERING THE KŌAN

And so, as time goes on, everyday the student goes to the teacher for what is called sanzen. 'Sanzen' means 'studying Zen.' And he has to present a satisfactory answer to the kōan. Now, sanzen is the moment in the monastery when no holds are barred, although there's a very formal approach to it. The monk has to stop outside the master's quarters and make this mokugyo. He does that three times. And at a signal from the master, which is ringing a bell in reply, he goes in and sits down in front of the master, and bows right down to the floor, and then sits up, and he repeats the kōan that he's been given. And he's supposed to answer it.

Now, the master, if he's not satisfied with the answer, may simply ring his bell, which means: interview over, nothing doing. Or, if he's still not satisfied, he may try to do something to hint the student as to which way to go, or puzzle him further; some sort of comment. But what happens is this—do you see what kind of a situation has been set up here?—the student is really being asked to be absolutely genuine. If I said to you, Now, don't be self-conscious. I want you to be perfectly sincere. And, as a matter of fact, I'm a mindreader, and I know whether you're being sincere or not. I can see right down to that last little wiggly guzzle in the back of your mind. And if you think I can, you see, I'm putting you in a double bind. I'm commanding you to be genuine. How can you possibly do that on command? Especially when the person you're confronted with is a father figure, an authority figure. And in Japan, the sensei—the teacher—is even a more authoritative

figure than one's father, which is saying a lot. But you are being asked, in the presence of this tiger, to be completely spontaneous.

Or—it isn't put in that way, you see, though. I mean, I'm describing this from the standpoint of a psychologist observing what's going on here. No, the thing you've got to do is you've got to hear the sound of one hand. And as your answers become more and more rejected, you get more and more desperate. And there is built up the state that is called the 'great doubt.' The students do everything, you know? They read all the old Zen stories, and they come in with pieces of rock and wood, and they try and hit the teacher, they do everything—and nothing, nothing will do.

I remember I had a friend studying in Kyōto, and on the way to the master's quarters you pass through a lovely garden with a pool. And he saw a bullfrog in the garden. And he grabbed this bullfrog—they're very tame in Japan—put it in his sleeve in his kimono, and when he got in to give an answer to his kōan he produced the bullfrog. And the master shook his head and said, Nu-uh. Too intellectual. Of course, he meant not so much what we mean by 'intellectual,' but 'too contrived,' 'too pre-meditated.' You know, you're just copying other people's Zen antics, and that's something you just can't get away with.

Well, there does come a critical point of total desperation. And when the student reaches that point the teacher really starts encouraging him. He says, Now, come on. You're getting warm. But you must be ready to die for this. You must—students have even been put into the position that if they don't get it in so many days, they're going to commit suicide. And they have to stimulate this intense period—a thing called sesshin. Don't confuse the word 'sesshin' with the English 'session.' 'Sesshin' means 'studying' or 'observation of the shin'—the heart, the mind. The heart-mind.

And this time they only sleep four hours a night. And they meditate solidly all through the day. They go for the sanzen interview twice a day—every one of them—and it's a tremendous workout, and will last about five days. Five or six days. And in that period the pressure is really on. Everybody is worked into a pitch of, kind of, psychic fury; they have to get this thing answered.

There's a man in Japan today who has a five-day Zen system, and he practically guarantees that you have satori in his five days. I just got a book about it, written by a British—I haven't had a chance to read it yet.

Well, I had a—someone I knew of—who was over, studying Zen on a Fulbright grant, and the grant was winding up and he still hadn't got the sound of one hand. He said to the master, Look, my grant's running out and I can't stay here, and I've just got to get this thing. So, just a day before he left, he suddenly realized that there was nothing to realize. And that was it. You know, here he had spent his whole life thinking that there's something deficient in me. See? There's something wrong. Something I ought to find out to get this problem of life cleaned up.

Well, you know what you do. Rinzai, the old Chinese master, said, Zen teaching is like using an empty fist to deceive a child. Or like trying to stop a child crying by giving it a yellow leaf. See, the child wants gold, and so you give it an autumn leaf and say, Here, darling. There's some gold. Be alright. Or, with your closed fist you say, What have I got here? The child comes and tries to see and pull your fingers open. Then you hide it behind your back, and under your leg, and behind the chair; child gets absolutely fascinated. The longer you keep this up, the more the child is sure there is some real goodie inside the hand, and then at the end—psh—nothing. And that's Zen.

VI

SEEING PAST THE ILLUSION

So there comes a time, you see, when the student can go in front of the master and not give a damn. Because he sees—he's seen the point. There wasn't a problem. He made up the problem himself. He came and projected it on this master, who knew how to handle that kind of person by making him much more stupid than he was before—until he sees the essential stupidity of the human situation where we are playing a game of one-upmanship on other people and on the universe.

How to get the better of life? Well, what makes you think you're separate from life so that you can get the better of it? How can you beat the game?

What game? Or, who will beat it? This illusion of beating the game, of finding the thing out, of catching it by the tail, is therefore dissipated by the technique of the kōan. It's called—working on a kōan is like a mosquito biting an iron bull. It's the nature of the mosquito to bite. It's the nature of an iron bull to be unbiten. Or they say it's like swallowing a ball of molten lead. You can't swallow it down, you can't cough it up; you can't get rid of this thing. That's the great doubt, you see? But this is an exaggerated form of what everybody is ordinarily trying to do: to beat the game.

So, at that moment the student has heard the sound of one hand, or discovered who he was before father and mother conceived him, or what 'no' means. So the teacher says, Good. Now you have found the frontier gate to Zen. You've put your foot in at the door and you're across the threshold. But there's a long way to go! And now you have found this priceless thing out, you must redouble your efforts. So he gives him another kōan.

Now, the student may be able to answer that one instantly, because it's simply a test kōan. See, there are five classes of kōans. The first class is what you call the hīnayāna kōans, and the other four are the mahāyāna kōans. Hīnayāna is to reach Nirvāṇa. Mahāyāna is to come back and bring Nirvāṇa into the world as a bodhisattva.

So once you get the Great Void, you see there's nothing to catch on to—you are the universe, it doesn't matter whether you live or die—that's Nirvāṇa. All clinging to life—everything like that—you see, then, that it's hopeless and you give it up. Not because you think you ought to give it up; because you know there is no way of catching it. There's nothing to catch hold of. There's no safety in the cosmos. So you just have to give up.

Then, the next class of kōans are such things as asking for miracles. In that class comes, Take the four divisions of Tokyo out of your sleeve. Or, Stop the booming of a distant bell. Blow out a candle in Timbuktu. But as they go on in various ways they are concerned with all kinds of problems, and how Zen understanding deals with those problems. Until we get, in the end, to the study of morality and rules of social and monastic life. That's the last thing, and the Zen way of understanding it.

Now, this may—this takes very, very differing periods of time. Some people get through in as little as ten years; the whole thing. There is a very brilliant Westerner by the name of Walter Nowick, who has just about completed the whole thing. And he's a musician and pianist, and he'll come back to this country as the first accredited Zen master of the West. And he'll set up his little sōdō on a farm, and wait and see what happens.

The day of graduation comes, and then everybody turns out, and there's a great hullabaloo, and they salute the departing monk, and he goes out. He may just become a layman, as I said, or become a temple priest, or he may be, himself, a rōshi.

VII

THE DECLINE OF MODERN TEMPLES

Well, now, the essential of this whole system, as you see, is to use a hair of the dog that bit you for the cure of the bite. It's homeopathic. When people are under delusion they cannot be talked out of the delusion. No amount of talk could persuade anybody that his ego is an illusion, because he knows it's there. He knows I am I, and simply won't believe you if you tell him that this is nothing but posthypnotic suggestion.

So the only way to convince a fool of his folly is to make him persist in it. As Blake says, The fool who persists in his folly will become wise. Why, some psychiatrists I know—I know when they get a person who over-eats and is tremendously fat, the first thing they do is they make them put on fifteen more pounds. And get an alcoholic terribly drunk, oh, and sick, and just as awful as can be, you see? Really make him go at it, see? That's a method that's used. Sometimes works, sometimes doesn't; it's a rather desperate method, rather dangerous method. Zen is dangerous, too. People could easily go crazy under this sort of strain without a good advisor.

Well, it is clear, of course, that this method of Zen training is most unsuited to the modern age. And this is witnessed, too, by the fact that the temples are relatively empty. Myōshin-ji, the biggest one in Kyōto, is built to house 600 monks. There are only 80. And you might think that was quite a crowd, but it isn't—compared with the old days.

To young people in Japan today this is all incomprehensible. They see no point in it. A few—a few, yes, but they are mostly clergy's sons carrying out the family tradition, and that's very bad indeed. To be sent to a monastery, virtually. The only possible success can come for someone who goes because he feels that nothing else in the world will satisfy him. He just has to do it.

And so the traditions, as in all these ancient organizations, have become very fixed. A lot of it is meaningless. It is certainly not going to last; not in that form. It's falling apart right under our eyes. It's old and it's set in its ways.

Also, since the time of Hakuin, the kōans have been given fixed answers. That is to say, there is a sort of prescribed way in which to answer, and you've got to hit on the right one. And then, after you've answered it, you have to find a poem from a little book called the Zenrin-kushū, which means 'the Zen Forest Anthology.' And there are little couplets, and you've got to find one which represents the meaning of your kōan. I mean, you know, Take the four divisions of Tokyo out of your sleeve, nothing could be simpler. But some monk has recently threatened to publish all the answers to the kōans, so that the masters would have to get on their toes and invent new ones.

I know a rōshi who invents new ones, and the moment they open their mouths he stops them, No! No, no, nope! Too late! You know, he says—you could ask Christians, What's the first word in the Bible? And things like that. It becomes much more lively, you see, when there is this quick interchange of the teacher and the students. But—in modern idiom—who the devil wants to know about Joshu's mu anymore, or some ancient fellow's questions? Couched in language, incidentally—this is part of the problems they have—the language of these kōans is very archaic. I mean, What is the sound of one hand? Well, there's a Chinese proverb which says, One hand won't make a clap. So if you don't know that proverb—if that's a proverb that's in everyday use and I say to you, What is the sound of one hand? then it has some sense.

But there are all kinds of, shall I say, references—allusions—in the old stories, and they therefore don't necessarily fit our world, or the Japanese

world of date. You have to take the kōans out of everyday life; things that are going on now, you see? It's like asking—what's that man who advertises Schweppes, commander... Whitehead—Why has commander Whitehead no beard?

VIII

THE TRUTH OF BIRTHLESS MIND

There was, though—you see—there was a division in the history of Zen. There was a critical point in the 17th century when there were two very great masters: Hakuin and Bankei. Now, the 17th century is tremendously important in Japanese history because that was a time of what you might call the democratization of culture. Bashō invented haiku poetry so that everyone could be a poet. Not necessarily for publication, but for one's own fun. People didn't write poems for publication, necessarily—they wrote poems for parties. And he invented the 17-syllable haiku as a result of his Zen feeling for nature so that he could put this within the reach of everybody.

What had happened to poetry before that time was that it had become so obscure, and so effete, and so sophisticated that only great literati could do it at all. This happened to Chinese poetry; there were so many references to other poems it was like reading T. S. Eliot. You know, the Four Quartets. You could get an annotated Four Quartets showing you the sources of all the phrases he's borrowed, and sometimes you have to know the source in order to see what he means by it.

All shall be well, and

All manner of thing shall be well.

Alright, that's straight from the Revelations of Divine Love by the dame Julian of Norwich, but whoever would know that? You have to understand the scene she was digging in order to know, really, what Eliot's getting at in that All shall be well. And he's full of that. He quotes the Bhagavad Gita, he quotes everybody. So, if we all had to write that way, nobody could be a poet unless he was a great scholar.

So Bashō popularized the haiku, and the haiku are originally based on the Zenrin poems. They take their flavor from that. There is one, you see: Those bird calls, mountain changes to be more mysterious. The first line of that says, The wind drops, but the flowers keep on falling. The bird calls, and the mountain becomes more mysterious. And so haiku developed from that kind of short insight, that glimpse of nature.

Now, while Bashō was taking poetry to the peasants, Bankei was taking Zen to them as well—to the farmers. And he ran his Zen on an entirely different system. He talked, mainly, about what he called fushō. Fushō is the unborn; that which has not yet arisen and which, as a matter of fact, never does arise. And so he said there is in you the unborn mind which was given to you by your parents. Let me just read you a few quotations from him to show you what sort of a person he was :

[from Zen: Poems, Prayers, Sermons, Anecdotes, Interviews]

The mind, begotten by and given to each of us by our parents, is none other than the Buddha-mind. Birthless and immaculate, sufficient to manage all that life throws upon us. A proof: suppose at this very instant, while you face me listening, a crow caws and a sparrow twitters somewhere behind you. Without any intention on your part to distinguish between these sounds, you hear each distinctly. In doing so you are hearing with the birthless mind, which is yours for all eternity.

Well, we are to be in this mind from now on, and our sect will be known as the Buddha-mind sect. To consider my example of a moment ago, once again, if any of you feel you heard the crow and the sparrow intentionally, you are deluding yourselves, for you are listening to me, not to what goes on behind you. In spite of this there are moments when you hear such sounds distinctly, when you hear with the Buddha-mind of non-birth. Nobody here can deny this. All of you are living Buddhas, because the birthless mind which each possesses is the beginning and the basis of all.

Now, if the Buddha-mind is birthless, it is necessarily immortal, for how can what has never been born perish? You've all encountered the phrase "birthless and imperishable" in the sūtras—not born, not dying—but hitherto you've not had the slightest proof of its truth. Indeed I suppose like

most people you've memorized this phrase while being ignorant of the fact of birthlessness.

When I was twenty-five I realized that non-birth is all-sufficient to life, and since then, for forty years, I've been proving it to people just like you. I was the first to preach this greatest truth of life. I ask, have any of you priests heard anybody else teach this truth before me? Of course not.

—Verse 3

A priest said to him, Once in the Buddha-mind, I am absent-minded.

Bankei says, Well, suppose you are absent-minded as you say. If someone pricked you in the back with a gimlet, would you feel the pain?

Naturally!

Then you are not absent-minded. Feeling the pain, your mind would show itself to be alert.

—Verse 7

A layman says, Though I undertake Zen discipline, I often find myself lazy, weary of the whole thing, unable to advance.

And he replies, Once in the Buddha-mind there's no need to advance, nor is it possible to recede. Once in birthlessness, to attempt to advance is to have receded from the state of non-birth. A man secure in that state need not bother himself with such things: he's above them.

—Verse 9

The Buddha-mind in each of you is immaculate. All you've done is reflected in it, but if you bother about one such reflection, you're certain to go astray. Your thoughts don't lie deep enough—they rise from the shallows of your mind.

Remember that all you see and hear is reflected in the Buddha-mind and influenced by what was previously seen and heard. Needless to say,

thoughts aren't entities. So if you permit them to rise, reflect themselves, or cease altogether as they're prone to do, and if you don't worry about them, you'll never go astray. In this way let one hundred, nay, one thousand thoughts arise, and it's as if not one has arisen. You will remain undisturbed.

—Verse 13

The only thing I tell my people is to stay in the Buddha-mind. There are no regulations, no formal discipline. Nevertheless they have agreed among themselves to sit in Zen for a period of two incense sticks daily. All right, let them. But they should well understand that the birthless Buddha-mind has absolutely nothing to do with sitting with an incense stick burning in front of you. If one keeps in the Buddha-mind without straying, there's no further satori to seek. Whether awake or asleep, one is a living Buddha. Zazen means only one thing—sitting tranquilly in the Buddha-mind. But really, you know, one's everyday life, in its entirety, should be thought of as a kind of sitting in Zen.

Even during one's formal sitting, one may leave one's seat to attend to something. In my temple, at least, such things are allowed. Indeed it's sometimes advisable to walk in Zen for one incense stick's burning, and sit in Zen for the other. A natural thing, after all. One can't sleep all day, so one rises. One can't talk all day, so one sits in Zen. There are no binding rules here.

—Verse 16

And so that's what happened, you see? Bankei was the abbot of Myōshin-ji—the rōshi—and he stopped the monks from using the kaiseki stick to hit them when they weren't meditating or sleeping in meditation, because he said, Even a sleeping man is still a Buddha, and you shouldn't be disrespectful. And he attempted a Zen of no methods. You can meditate if you want to, that's fine. But that's like polishing a brick to make a mirror. And he used to say, too, that trying to purify your mind is like trying to wash off blood with blood.

But Bankei's Zen was elusive. Hakuin had 80 successors, Bankei had none. And some people think that that was the most admirable thing about him. In this morning's talk I was going into some of the fundamental features of Zen, and today I want to concentrate on that aspect of Zen practice which is called in Chinese yìzhí zǒu, or 'going straight ahead.'

A master who was once asked, What is the Tao—the Way? replied, Walk on. Actually, Go! As we say, Go, man! Go! Go, go. And it is this aspect of Zen which is what is truly understood by 'detachment,' or having a mind that isn't 'sticky' and that isn't stopped at any point in its whole working. To be stopped at a certain point is what is called 'having a doubt,' as when one fumbles, or wobbles, or hesitates about something—trying to find the right solution for the circumstances by thinking it out in a situation where there really is no time to think it out. So that when a Zen teacher asks his disciple a question, he expects an immediate answer, as it were, without thought or premeditation.

They speak in Zen—they use a phrase to have a mind of no deliberation. And they also speak of a kind of person, a man who doesn't depend on anything—that is to say, on a formula, on a theory, on a belief—to govern his action. And this person who doesn't stick anywhere is like Dante's image at the end of the *Paradiso*, where he says—in the presence of the vision of God—But my volition now and my desires were moved as a wheel revolving evenly by love that moves the sun and other stars. And the image of the wheel which is not too tight on its axle, and not too loose—that is really with the axle—is the Zen principle of 'not being attached;' 'not being sticky.'

It's very difficult for us to function in that way because we've been brought up to believe that there are two sides to ourselves. One, the animal side, and the other, the human and civilized side. And these are expressed in what Freud calls the Pleasure Principle, which he classifies with the animal side—with the Id—and the other the Reality Principle, which he puts on the side of society and the super-ego. And man is so split, that he is in a constant fight between these two. Theosophists sometimes speak of our having two selves: the higher self, which is spiritual, and the lower self, which is merely psychic; the Ego. And therefore, the problem of life is to

make the 'oneself,' the 'higher one,' take charge of the lower, as a rider takes charge of a horse.

But the problem that constantly arises is: how do you know that what you think is your higher self isn't really your lower self in disguise? When a thief is robbing a house and the police enter on the ground floor, the thief goes up to the second floor, and when the police follow up the stairs he goes higher and higher until, at last, he gets out to the rooftop. And in the same way, when one really feels oneself to be the lower self, that is to say, to be a separate Ego, and then the moralists come along—they are, of course, the police—and say, You ought not to be selfish! then the Ego disassembles and tries to pretend that he's a good person after all.

And therefore, one of the ways of doing this is for the Ego to say, I believe I have a higher self.

And I would say, Why do you believe that? Do you know the higher self?

No. If I knew it I would behave differently. But I'm trying to get there.

Well, why are you trying to get there?

Well, then the police wouldn't come around. Then the moralists wouldn't preach at me. Then I could feel that I was doing my duty, behaving as a proper member of society.

But all this is a great phony front. If you don't know that there is a higher self and you believe that there is one, on whose authority do you believe this? You say, Oh, such and such a teacher—Buddha, Jesus, Śaṅkara, the Upanishads—said that we have a higher self, and I believe it. Catholics sometimes say they believe their religion because they're told to, and they have to be obedient. The catechism starts out—I mean the Baltimore catechism—it starts out, We are bound to believe that there is but one God, the Father Almighty, creator of Heaven and Earth, et cetera. And they make jokes about Protestants and say, They don't have real authority in Protestant church because everybody interprets the Bible according to his own opinion. But we have an authoritative interpretation of the Bible. But this

always screens out the fact that it is fundamentally a matter of your own opinion, that you accept the authority of the Church to interpret the Bible.

You cannot escape, in all matters of belief, from opinion. In other words, it must become clear to you that you, yourself, create all the authorities you accept. And if you create them in order to dissimilate, in order to pretend that your motivations and your character are different, that you would like them to be different—this is the same old principle of the separate self trying to improve itself so that it will live longer, or survive in the spiritual world, or attain the riches and the progress of enlightenment. And the whole thing is phony.

So, in Zen, a duality between higher self and lower self is not made. Because if you believe in the higher self, this is a simple trick of the lower self. If you believe that there is no really lower self—that there is only the higher self, but that somehow or other the higher self has to shine through—the very fact that you think that it has to try to shine through still gives validity to the existence of a lower self. If you think you have a lower self—or an ego—to get rid of, and then you fight against it, nothing strengthens the delusion that it exists more than that.

So this tremendous schizophrenia in human beings—of thinking that they are rider and horse, soul in command of body, or will in command of passions, wrestling with them—all that kind of split thinking simply aggravates the problem, and we get more and more split. And so we have all sorts of people engaged in an interior conflict, which they will never, never resolve. Because the true self—either you know it or you don't. If you do know it, then you know it's the only one; and the other, so-called lower self, just ceases to be a problem. It becomes something like a mirage. And you don't go around hitting at mirages with a stick, or trying to put reigns on them. You just know that they are mirages and walk straight through them.

But if you were brought up to believe yourself split—I remember my mother used to say to me, when I did naughty things, she said Alan, that's not like you. So I had, you know, some conception of what was like me in my better moments—that is to say, in the moments when I remembered what my mother would like me to do. And so that split is implanted in us

all. And because of our being split-minded we are always dithering. Is the choice that I'm about to make of the higher self or of the lower self? Is it of the spirit, or is it of the flesh? Is the word that I received of the Lord, or is it of the Devil? And nobody can decide. Because if you knew how to choose, you wouldn't have to.

In the so-called Moral Re-Armament movement—which is a very significant title—you test your messages that you get from God in your quiet time by comparing them with standards of absolute honesty, absolute purity, absolute love, and so on. But, of course, if you knew what those things were, you wouldn't have to test. You would know immediately. And do you know what those things are? The more one thinks about the question, What would absolute love be?—supposing I could set myself the ideal of being absolutely loving to everybody, what would that imply in terms of conduct? Well, you can think about that until all is blue, because you could never get to the answer.

The problems of life are so subtle that to try to solve them with vague principles, as if those vague principles were specific instructions, is completely impossible. So it is important to overcome split-mindedness. But what is the way? Where can you start from if you're already split? A Taoist saying is that when the wrong man uses the right means, the right means work in the wrong way. So what are you to do? How can you get off it and get moving? Fundamentally, of course, you have to be surprised into it.

Winthrop Sargeant not so long ago interviewed a great Zen priest in Kyōto, who posed to him, Who are you?

And he said, Well, I'm Winthrop Sargeant.

And the priest laughed. No, he said, I don't mean that. I mean who are you really?

Well, then he went into all sorts of abstractions about his being a particular human being, and so on, who is a journalist, and so on, and the priest just laughed and said, No.

Then the priest just tossed off the conversation, and a little later made a joke, and Sargeant laughed. And he said, There you are!

There was an army officer who once came to a Zen master and said, I have heard a story about a man who kept a goose in a bottle, and it was growing very rapidly, and he didn't want to break the bottle and he didn't want to hurt the goose. So how would he get it out? The Zen master didn't answer the question at all, but simply changed the subject. Finally, the officer got up to leave and he went over to the door, and suddenly the Zen master called out, Oh, officer? And he turned around and said, Yes? The master said, There! It's out!

So, in the same way, if I say to you, Good morning, you say, Good morning. Nice day isn't it? Yes. Or if I hit you—you know, boom!—you say, Ouch! And you don't stop to hesitate to give these answers or responses. You don't think about it when I say Good morning, unless you're a psychiatrist. What could I be meaning? So you respond. So, in exactly the same way, that kind of response, which doesn't have to be a deliberate response, a response of a no-deliberating mind, is a response of a Buddha-Mind or an Unattached-Mind. But you must not imagine that this is necessarily a quick response. Because if you get hung up on the idea of responding quickly, the idea of quickness will be, itself, a form of obstruction.

Very often, when Dr. Suzuki is asked a question—very complicated question by some philosophy major from Columbia, when he's giving lectures there—he's silent for a full minute, and then says, Yes. And this is exactly as spontaneous a response as it would be if he had answered immediately. Because during the period of silence, he's not fishing around to think of something to say. He is not at all embarrassed of being silent, or at not knowing the answer. So if you don't know the answer, you can be silent. If nobody asks a question, you can be silent. There's no need to be embarrassed about it or to be stuck on it. But you cannot overcome being stuck if you think that, somehow, you would be guilty if you were stuck.

When you are perfectly free to feel stuck or not stuck, then you're unstuck. Because actually, nothing can stick on the real mind, and you will find this out if you watch the flow of your thoughts. There is an expression in Chinese which means 'the flow of thoughts,' or what we call in literary

criticism ‘stream of consciousness.’ And they put the character for thought (念) three times: niàn, niàn, niàn. And so you will notice that thought follows thought follows thought when you are just ruminating.

And those thoughts arise and go like waves on the water; all the time, they come and go. And when they go, they are as if they had never been here. So, actually, this shows your mind doesn’t stick. Really. You can get the illusion of it sticking by, for example, cycling the same succession of thoughts over and over again. And that gives a sense of permanence in the same way as when you revolve a cigarette butt in the dark, you get the illusion of there being a solid circle although there is only the single point of fire. And it is from this connecting of thoughts that we get the sensation that behind our thoughts there is a thinker who controls them and experiences them. Although, the notion that there is a thinker is just one member in the stream of thoughts.

For example, if you get a certain kind of rhythm that goes ‘diggy diggy diggy diggy boop diggy diggy diggy diggy boop diggy diggy diggy diggy boop diggy diggy diggy diggy boop,’ the ‘boop’ is part of the rhythm. But it can be used as a cue. So you get—in relation to ‘diggy diggy diggy diggy boop’—you get ‘thought thought thought thought thought thinker thought thought thought thought thinker.’ And if this happens regularly enough and long enough, you get the illusion of there being someone who thinks apart from the stream of thoughts that come and go; the stream of experiences. And we use such absurd phrases not only as ‘thinking our thoughts,’ but ‘feeling our feelings,’ ‘seeing sights,’ and ‘hearing sounds.’ But you must understand: it is perfectly obvious that seeing a sight is seeing; hearing a sound is hearing; feeling a feeling is feeling. So, in the same way, thinking a thought is thinking.

But you get split-minded, you see, and so you get ‘I’ and ‘me,’ and the ‘I’ who ought to—or must—control ‘me’ as a sensation of some real entity that stands aside from thoughts and chooses among them, controls them, regulates them, and so on.

Actually, this is a way to have one’s thoughts not controlled. The more there is this duality of the separate ‘thinker’ standing aside from the thoughts—

the separate ‘feeler’ watching or feeling the feelings—the more the stream of feelings is coaxed into self-protective activity; into getting more and more like a stuck record, the purposes of which are to protect and to aggrandize and enlarge the status of the supposed ‘thinker.’

When Jōshū, who was a Tang dynasty Zen master, was asked—he had made some reference to the enlightened mind being like the mind of a child—and they said, Well, what is the mind of a child?

And he said, A ball in a mountain stream.

Why?

Thought follows thought instantaneously without interruption.

So the saying: Walk or sit as you will. But whatever you do, don’t wobble.

Now, we can see this very clearly from confusions we can get into in activity. I have just said, We can see this very clearly from confusions we get into in activity. What kind of a statement is that? When I raised the question—what kind of a statement was it that I just made—I’m beginning to talk about talking. And one can do that, provided you don’t try to do it while you are making the original statement.

If I want to say something about what I’ve just said, then I must do it later, mustn’t I? But not at the same time. I cannot say You are a fool, and at the same time say I’m giving you an insult in so many words. I cannot say—or, in mathematics—I cannot write down a certain equation, and as I’m writing in down, simultaneously, state what kind of an equation this is. Unless, of course, I invent an exceedingly complex language which talks about itself as it goes along. But in the ordinary way, people get completely mixed up by that. In the middle of being about to say to somebody anything, you start to think about whether this is the right thing to say. And you start wobbling. You get, in other words, too much feedback. And too much feedback makes any mechanism go crazy.

So, in the same way, when you are very, very aware of the difference between the deeds and the doer, and the doer—while doing the deeds—is

always sort of commenting on them; the doer really never gets with it! In other words, you are about to strike a nail and you wonder—as you are about to hit it—Is this the right place to put it? And so you've probably hit your thumbnail instead of the nail, because you don't go right through with hitting that nail. This is not saying—let me mark this again—it is not saying that there should be no criticism of thought. But if you criticize thought while thinking, as if there were a critic thinker standing aside from the stream of thought, then you get all balled up. And that is exactly what happens in the process of attachment, or what are called in Buddhist *kleśa*, which mean 'disturbing confusions of the mind.'

And, you see, this kind of confusion is something to which the human organism is peculiarly liable, because the human organism has language, has—you see, thinking is silent language, and I mean 'language' in the most inclusive sense of the word: not only words, but also images and numbers; notation. Just because, then, we can talk about anything. We can talk about talking, we can talk about thinking, we can talk about ourselves, as if we could stand aside and say, 'Said I to myself' said I. All we are actually doing is making a second thought, or thought stream, which comments on the one that went before, and then pretending that the second stream is a different stream than the first. That's because there are built into our minds all kinds of phony images about memory.

We think, for example, of memory by analogy with engraving. In order to remember something we write it down. And so we have a flat and stable piece of paper, and we make marks on it with a pencil, and they stay there. So we begin to think, Isn't mental memory something of the same kind? Is there something stable, upon which the passage of thoughts makes an impression? We say, He impressed me very much; this was a lasting impression on my mind, as if we were tablets. Indeed, the philosopher Locke used the expression *tabula rasa*, or 'clean slate,' to describe the mind of a child. This is a mind which has not yet collected any memories, as if there were some sort of surface which accumulated these things and preserved them, and that's me.

But, you see, this superstition is related to a much more ancient superstition that the world consists of two elements, one of which is 'stuff,' and the

other of which is 'form.' This is a myth based on a model of the world which is fundamentally ceramic. God formed Adam out of the dust of the ground. And so there is a 'stuff,' and so there are 'forms' engraved in it, or imposed on it, or stamped on it like a seal is stamped on wax.

What is stuff like apart from form? What is form like apart from stuff? All those problems—which have bothered people for centuries—are based on asking the question in the wrong way; on having used the wrong image for the process. Actually, since nobody ever saw a piece of shapeless stuff, and nobody ever saw a piece of stuff-less shape, the whole thing really is saying that they are the same. And there isn't any necessity even to think of a difference between them. Even the contrasting words, 'form' and 'substance,' or 'form' and 'matter,' are a nuisance.

There is process. There is the flow of thought. The flow of thought doesn't have to happen to anyone. Experience does not have to beat upon an experiencer. There is, all the time, simply the one stream going on, and we are convinced that we stand aside from it and observe it, because we've been brought up that way. But, you know, in your stream of thought and experience, I am an object, and a very fleeting and passing one. And also, in my stream of experience you, also, are people who come and go. We are all, you see, living in the same world. We think there is me, and there is an external world around me, but I am in your external world and you are in my external world, and if you think about that you see that we are all in one world going along together. There isn't really the 'internal' and the 'external,' there is simply the process.

It's very important to get rid of that illusion of duality between the thinker and the thought, so find out: who is the thinker behind the thoughts? Who is the real, genuine you? And so, one of the methods that is used is shouting. The Zen master would say to a student, Now, I want to hear you. I want to hear you say the word 'moo,' and really mean it! Because I want to hear not just the sound, but the person who says it. Now, produce—for me—that.

He goes, Moo!

And the Zen teacher says, No, no! Not yet.

Moo!!

And he says, It's only coming from your throat. I want to hear your belly, you know?

And always, you see, it'll never come while the person is trying to make a differentiation between a 'true' moo and a 'false' moo. To act with confidence, you just do it. But since people are not used to that, it is necessary to set up protected situations in which it can be done.

If we just—in the ordinary way of social intercourse—acted without deliberation, we would get into amazing confusions, as when people say, Always speak the truth. Never tell a white lie. And they say exactly what is true and what they think about other people. Well, they can raise a great deal of trouble. But the experience of Zen has been that there should be a kind of enclosure in which this kind of behavior can be done until the people are expert in it and know how to apply it in all situations.

And you will find, in everyday life, that there is a very clear distinction between people who always seem to be self-possessed, and people who are dithering and nervous and don't quite know how to react in any given situation; always getting embarrassed because they have their life too strongly programmed. You said—I mean, this is a common marriage argument—You said you would do such-and-such a thing at such-and-such a time! And now you've changed your plans! Not that the change of plans really caused any inconvenience, but just the feeling that when you say you will do something at a certain time, you ought to do it at that time come hell or high water! Well, that's being very unadaptable. That's being a stone—kind of sticky—thing. If it, after all, doesn't matter when we do it and somebody is offended because the time has been changed, that's simply because they are attached to punctuality as a fetish.

And this is one of the great problems. This causes many automobile accidents. Men rushing home to be on time for dinner, when they stayed late either working, or they had to stop for a drink at some bar, or when a girl feels that she has a fussy husband and she feels she has to have the dinner ready at exactly a certain moment, she ruins the cooking. He'd rather have a faithful wife and a bad cook. I hope I'm not treading on any toes.

So, you see, we spend an awful lot of energy trying to make our lives fit images of what life is or should be which they could never possibly fit. So Zen practice is in getting rid of these images. But it's so explosive, socially, to do that, and it so worries people they get vertigo, they get dizzy, they don't know which end is up. And this happens, you know, if you've ever been in one of those Blab-Lab sessions, where they call them 'tea groups'—I think, or something like that—where people gather together without any clear idea of what this gathering is about. They know it's somehow self-exploration, but just how do you begin on that? And so, somebody starts to push his idea, and then somebody else says, Well, why are you trying to push your idea on us? And then they all get into an argument about the argument, and the most amazing confusions come about—but sometimes they all see what idiots they're being, and then they learn to live together in a really open and spontaneous way.

The function of a Zen teacher is to put his students in all kinds of situations where, in the normal course of social relations, they would get stuck. By asking nonsensical questions, by making absurd remarks, by always unhinging things, and above all, keeping them stirred up with impossible demands: to hear the sound of one hand, to—without moving—stop a ship sailing out to the water, or to stop the sound of a train whistle in the distance. Magic. To touch the ceiling without getting up from one's chair, to take the four divisions of Tokyo out of your sleeve, to take Mount Fuji out of a pillbox; all these impossible questions are asked, and in the ordinary way of interpreting these questions we think, Well, now—gee, how could we do that? See? That's a very difficult question that's been asked. And you have to think, What would I do to do that?

Because we are caught up in a certain way of discourse which the language-game that we play—and the social games, the production games, and the survival games that we play—are good games. But we take them so seriously that we think that that is the only important thing. And this is to unstick us from that notion and realize that it would be just as good a game to drop dead now as to go on living.

Is a lightning flash 'bad' because it lives for a second, as compared with the sun that goes on for billions of years? You can't make that sort of

comparison, because a world of lighting goes also with a world where there's a sun—and vice versa. So, long-lived creatures and short-lived go together; that's the meaning of that saying: Flowering branches grow naturally. Some short, some long.

So this, then, is a scene in a Zen community where spontaneous behavior is encouraged within certain limits. And as the student becomes more and more used to it, those limits are expanded. Until, eventually, he can be trusted to go out on the street and behave like a true Zen character, and get by perfectly well. You know what occasionally happens on the street when two people are walking down the sidewalk straight at each other, and they both decide to move to the right together and then to the left together, and they somehow get stuck and they can't pass each other. Zen teachers will pull just exactly that sort of stunt, when going down a path, and meet one of their students—to see if they can get him in a tangle, and can he escape from it?

And you will find, in everyday life, that there is a very clear distinction between people who always seem to be self-possessed, and people who are dithering and nervous and don't quite know how to react in any given situation; always getting embarrassed because they have their life too strongly programmed. You said—I mean, this is a common marriage argument—You said you would do such-and-such a thing at such-and-such a time! And now you've changed your plans! Not that the change of plans really caused any inconvenience, but just the feeling that when you say you will do something at a certain time, you ought to do it at that time come hell or high water! Well, that's being very unadaptable. That's being a stone—kind of sticky—thing. If it, after all, doesn't matter when we do it and somebody is offended because the time has been changed, that's simply because they are attached to punctuality as a fetish.

And this is one of the great problems. This causes many automobile accidents. Men rushing home to be on time for dinner, when they stayed late either working, or they had to stop for a drink at some bar, or when a girl feels that she has a fussy husband and she feels she has to have the dinner ready at exactly a certain moment, she ruins the cooking. He'd rather have a faithful wife and a bad cook. I hope I'm not treading on any toes.

So, you see, we spend an awful lot of energy trying to make our lives fit images of what life is or should be which they could never possibly fit. So Zen practice is in getting rid of these images. But it's so explosive, socially, to do that, and it so worries people they get vertigo, they get dizzy, they don't know which end is up. And this happens, you know, if you've ever been in one of those Blab-Lab sessions, where they call them 'tea groups'—I think, or something like that—where people gather together without any clear idea of what this gathering is about. They know it's somehow self-exploration, but just how do you begin on that? And so, somebody starts to push his idea, and then somebody else says, Well, why are you trying to push your idea on us? And then they all get into an argument about the argument, and the most amazing confusions come about—but sometimes they all see what idiots they're being, and then they learn to live together in a really open and spontaneous way.

There was a very interesting dinner party once where a Zen master was present, and there was a geisha girl who served so beautifully and had such style that he suspected she must have some Zen training. And after a while, when she pours to fill his sake cup, he bowed to her and said, I'd like to give you a present. And she said, I would be most honored. And he took the iron chopsticks that are used for the hibachi—the charcoal brazier; moving the charcoal around—he picked up a piece of red-hot charcoal and gave it to her. Well, she instantly—she had very long sleeves on her kimono—she whirled the sleeves around her hands and took the hot charcoal, withdrew to the kitchen, dumped it, and changed her kimono because it was burnt through. Then she came back into the room, and after a suitable interval she stopped before the Zen master and bowed to him and said, I would like to give you, sir, a present. And he said, I would be very much honored. Of course, he was wearing a kimono, or something like this. And so she picked up a piece of coal and offered it to him. He immediately produced a cigarette and said, Thank you, that's just what I needed.

Now, you know, in the same way that we have this in our culture: certain people who are comedians, who know how to make jokes and gags in a completely unprepared situation. Face them with anything and they somehow come through. So that is exactly the same thing in a special domain as Zen. Only, a master of Zen does this in every life situation. But

the important thing is to be able to do this—this is the secret—you must remember: you can't make a mistake.

Now, that's a very difficult thing to do, because from childhood up we have had to conform to a certain social game. And if you are going to conform to this game you can make mistakes or not make mistakes. And so this thing has gone into us all the time. You must do the right thing! There's certain conduct appropriate here. There's certain conduct appropriate there. And that sticks in us and gives us a double-self all our lives long, because we never grow up.

Do you realize that the whole of life plays a game, which is a childhood game? There are three kinds of people: top people, middle people, and bottom people. And there can't be any middle people unless there are bottom people and top people. And there can't be any top people unless there are middle and bottom people, and so it goes. And everybody is trying to be in a top set. Well, if they are going to be there there's gotta be people in the bottom set. And there are people who do the 'right' thing and people who do the 'wrong' thing. Here in Sausalito—we have this very, very plainly—there are the 'right' people, the nice people who live up on the hill. Then there are the 'nasty' people who live down here on the waterfront, and they grow beards and they wear blue jeans and they smoke marijuana. And whereas the other people on the top of the hill drive Cadillacs, and have wall-to-wall carpeting, and nicely mowed lawns, and their particular kind of poison is alcohol. Now, the people who live on the top of the hill know that they are nice people, but they wouldn't know they were nice people unless they had some nasty people to compare themselves with.

Every in-group requires an out-group. Whereas the nasty people think they are the real far-out people, whereas those people, those hillbillies, are squares. And they wouldn't be able to feel far-out unless there were squares. See? These things simply go together. But when that is not seen we play the games of 'getting on top of things' all the time, and so we are in a constant state of competition. As to—if it's not I'm stronger than you, it's I'm wiser than you, I'm more loving than you, I'm more tolerant than you, I'm more sophisticated than you. It doesn't matter what it is, but this constant competition is going on.

In terms of that competition we can, of course, lose place and—in that sense—make mistakes. But what a Zen student is, is a person who is not involved in the status game. That's the real meaning of a monk. He is not 'keeping up with the Jones,' and to be a master he must get to the point where he's not trying to be a master. The whole idea of your being better than anybody else simply doesn't make any sense at all; it is totally meaningless. Because, you see, everybody manifesting the marvel of the universe in the same way as the stars do, and the water, and the winds, and the animals. And you see them all as being in their right places and not being able, really, to make mistakes—although they may think they are making mistakes or not making mistakes, and playing all these competitive games. But that's their game!

Now, I only say if that game begins to bore you, and it begins to trouble you and give you ulcers and all kinds of things, then you raise the problem of getting out of it, and therefore you start to become interested in things like Zen. That is simply a symptom of your growing in a certain direction where you are tired of playing a certain kind of game. You are as naturally flowing in another direction as if a tree were putting out a new branch. So because you say, Oh well, we people are interested in higher things—you see, that depends, still, on the differentiation of rank between the superior and the inferior people. But when you begin to see through that and grow out of that, you don't think any more of this 'superior' and 'inferior' classification. You don't think, We are spiritual people who attend to higher things as distinct from these morons who are only interested in beer and television. This is simply our particular form of life. Like there are crabs, and there are spiders, and there are sharks, and there are sparrows, and so on.

The trouble with the human being is like the trouble with certain animals. Like the dinosaur, who evolved to the point where he was so big that he'd have to have two brains—a higher self in the head and a lower self in the rump. And the difficulty was to get these two brains coordinated. But we have exactly the same trouble, and we are suffering from a kind of 'jitters' that comes from being two-brained. Now, you see, I'm not saying that that jitters is bad—it's a potential step in evolution and an opportunity of

growth. But remember, in the process of growth, the oak is not better than the acorn; because what does it do? It produces acorns.

Or you could say—just like I sometimes love to say—that a chicken is one egg’s way of becoming others. So an oak is an acorn’s way of becoming other acorns. Where is the point of superiority? The first verse of the poem I just quoted—The flowering branches grow naturally. Some short, some long—the first verse is,

In the landscape of spring

there is nothing superior

and nothing inferior.

The flowering branches are naturally

some short some long.

So that’s the point of view of being an outcast, in the sense of being outside the ‘taking seriously’ of being involved in the social game, and therefore being threatened by making mistakes, of doing the wrong thing—that is to say, of carrying into adult life one’s childhood conditioning where somebody is constantly yammering at you to play the game.

So therefore, the preachers and the teachers take the same attitude towards their adult congregations that parents take to children, and lecture them and tell them what they should do. And judges in courts feel also entitled to give people lectures because they say those criminal-types haven’t grown up—but neither have the judges. It takes two to make a quarrel. So one can begin to think in a new way—in polarity-thinking. Instead of being stuck with the competitive thinking of the good guys and the bad guys, the cops and robbers, the capitalists and the communists, all these things which are simply childishness.

Now, of course, you recognize that the moment I say that it’s like talking in English in order to show that the English language has limitations. And I am talking in a language that seems competitive to show that the

competitive game has limitations. As if I were saying to all you cats here, Look, I have something to tell you. And if you get this, you will be in a better position than you were before you heard it. But I cannot speak to this group—or to society, or this language-speaking culture—without using the language, the gestures, the customs, et cetera, that you have.

The Zen masters try to get around this by doing things—suddenly—that people just don't get. Well, what is this? Therefore, that is the reason why—this is the real reason why—Zen cannot be explained. You have to make, as it were, a jump from the valuation game of 'better people' and 'worse people,' 'in-groups' and 'out-groups,' and you can only make it by seeing that they all are mutually interdependent. So if we take this situation—let's say I would be talking to you and saying, Look, I have some very special thing that you've got to take notice of. Therefore I am the in-group, and I'm the teacher and you are the out-group. I know perfectly well that I cannot be the teacher unless you come here, and so that my status and my position is totally dependent on you. It isn't something, you see, therefore I have first and then you get. These things arise mutually. So if you wouldn't come, I wouldn't talk. I wouldn't know what to say, because I borrowed your language.

So that is the insight: that things go together. Then, when you see that—and aren't in competition—then you don't make a mistake. Because you don't dither. When I first learned the piano and played these wretched scales, the teacher beside me had a pencil in her hand and she hit my fingers every time I made a wrong note. The consequence was, I never learned to read music because I hesitated too long to play the note on time. Because I was always, Is this pencil going to land? See? And that gets built into your psyche. And so, people are always—although they are adults, and nobody is clubbing them around and screaming at them any longer—they hear the echoes of that screaming mama—or that bombinating papa—in the back of their heads all their life long. And so they adopt the same attitudes to their own children, and the farce continues.

Because there is no—I mean, I don't say that you shouldn't lay down the law to children if you want them to play the social game. But if you lay down the law to your children, you must make provisions later in life for

them to be 'liberated.' To go through a process of curing them from the bad effects of education. But you can't do that unless you, too, grow up, you see? As we grow up. Says I, including myself.

So that is the thing. Now, therefore, in the Zen scene, you would think that the master as we know him and we read about him is an extremely authoritative figure. That's the way he deliberately comes on at the beginning. He puts up a terrific show of being an awful dragon. And this screens out all sorts of people who don't have, somehow, the nerve to get into the work. But once you are in, a very strange change takes place: the master becomes the brother; he becomes the affectionate helper of all those students, and they love him as they would a brother, rather than respect him as they would a father. And therefore, the students and masters, they make jokes about each other; they have a very curious kind of social relationship which has all of the outward trappings of authoritarian, but everybody knows on the inside that that's a joke.

Liberated people have to be very cool. Otherwise, in a society which doesn't believe in equality and cannot possibly practice it, they would be considered extremely subversive. And therefore, great Zen masters wear purple and gold and carry scepters and sit in thrones, and all this is carried on to cool it. The outside world knows, They're alright, they have discipline, they have order, they are perfectly fine.

Taoism

Swimming Headless

This morning, I was giving you a talk on the fundamental basic attitudes expressed in Lao Tzu's Tao Te Ching. The title of the book Tao, Te, Ching, introduces now the second word in the title. I've been dwelling this morning on the first word which is Tao. And so comes up the second word. And this word, again is, faces us with some serious problems of translation. Ordinarily translated virtue. Ordinarily translated virtue, but virtue as we understand it today isn't at all appropriate. The nearest kind of... When we speak of the healing virtues of a plant that's nearer to the meaning of this word death. The Japanese pronounce it toku, the Cantonese duk and the Northern mandarins approximately 'duh'. And in the section of the Lao Tzu where this is really introduced, the text says something like this. The superior virtue, not virtue, that's it has virtue. Inferior virtue can't let go of virtue, thus not virtue. And we more or less paraphrase that by translating superior virtue is not conscious of itself as a virtue and therefore it is virtue but inferior virtue is so hooked up with being virtuous, or hooked on being virtuous, that it's not virtue.

Now then therefore, this word is a connection of virtue and magic. It means the Superior, the excellence of things, in the sense that. A tree excels at being a tree. And nobody really knows how it does it. There is no way of imitating a tree except, the only way is to be one. And so in the same way when a human being shows extraordinary skill something, it seems that it comes natural to him. It seems that he doesn't achieve it, by any kind of artificiality. If there is some discipline in it, it's concealed. So excelling in something naturally, and yet it's something that is so difficult to understand that it seems that it has been done by magic, is the meaning of this word. So what Te is is, the state of affairs, a way of talking about, particularly a human being, who has learned to live in harmony with the Tao. Now of course, everything is fundamentally in harmony with the Tao. In the book called The Journey on, or the unwobbling pivot, it is said the dollar is that

from which nothing can depart. That from which things can depart is not the Tao. Fundamentally you see, you can't get away from it it's like a situation in which we are all floating. In a tremendous river. And the river carries you along, anyhow. Now some of the people in the river of swimming against it, but they're still being carried along. Others have learned that the art of the of the thing, is to swim with it. And they are carried along too, but they know it, you see they know they are carried along, whereas the people who are swimming against it think they're going in the opposite direction. But they're not really. So that was a sort of discussion we were having this morning when I find invariably whenever I talk about these things, Americans raise moral issues. Because we are a people incredibly bamboozled by preachers. And so this always comes up. Bamboozled, preachers Yes. And have chronic guilty consciences, and so those questions are always raised. For this you see explains, part of the situation that you you have to flow with the river. There is no other way. But that you can swim against it and pretend not to be flowing with it, but you still are. So, but a person who is not making that pretense anymore, who knows that you have to go with the river and swim with it, suddenly he acquires behind everything that he does the power of the river. The person swimming against the river you see, does not by his action express the force of the river the person swimming with it he goes along and he has that whole river behind him but he subtly directing it because you can change direction in the course of the river you can go to the left or to the right as a ship can use a rudder and still go along with the current, or more skillful still, as a sail boat can tack, because when a sailboat tacks and goes in a direction contrary to the wind. It still is using the wind to blow it along and that is the most highly skillful art of all that is Taoism in perfection. The art of sailing. Very intelligent.

I remember once, I was looking in the open air, and one of those glorious little thistle-down things came and I picked it up like that and brought it down. And it looked as if it was struggling to get away just as if you caught an insect by one leg. Like a daddy longlegs or something of that kind. It seemed to be struggling to get away and I first I thought well it's not doing that that's just the wind blowing. Then I thought again. Really? Only the wind blowing? Surely, it is the structure of this thing which in cooperation with the existence of wind, enables it to move like an animal. But using the

wind's effort. Not its own. It is more intelligent being than an insect in a way because. Insect uses effort like a person who rows a boat uses effort but the man who puts up a sail is using magic. He lets nature do it for him, with the intelligence to use a sail. So in just this way there is the meaning of Te, is that kind of intelligence, which, without your using very much effort, gets everything to cooperate with you. You, for example, never force other people to agree with you but you give them the notion that the idea you wanted them to have was their own. This is a feminine art, preeminently. A woman, who really wants a lover does not pursued him. Because then most men feel that she's aggressive and if she's aggressive she obviously is a woman who has had difficulty in finding lovers, and therefore there must be some undesirably secret thing about her. But if she as it were, makes a void, then and this is slightly difficult to get, then people get excited they know she is a highly prized object, and so they pursue. The same way when you want to teach a baby to swim. You could, a thing you can do is to put the baby in the water and then move backwards in the water and create a vacuum and this pulls the baby along. It helps it to learn the feel of the water and how to swim it's the same principle.

So also, clever difficult to-get-ness is one of the very best means. Acquiring immense publicity. To take the case of T.E. Lawrence. Who published the Seven Pillars of Wisdom in a limited edition. And this was, it became an extraordinarily celebrated book, costs hundreds of dollars a copy to find one on the market and they waited and waited and built this up and built this up and built it up and finally they published a general edition, and it was a knockout, because the first the first one had been sort of secret and difficult to find and if you have patience, you see, you can always do this. There's so. The whole art of the ruler you see that the Tao Te Ching is a book written, for several purposes. You may take it as a guide to mystical understanding of the universe you may take it as a dissertation on the principles of nature, almost a naturalistic, a handbook of natural law, we would say. Or you may also take it as a political book. A book of wisdom for governors. And, the principle which it advocates, basically, is the virtue of governing by not ruling. Look at it in this way. Supposing the president of the United States were as unknown to you by name as the local sanitary inspector. The man who looks after the drains and the sewage disposal and all that kind of thing. This is not a glamorous figure, you see, but for that

very reason, he probably does his job more efficiently than the president, because the president wastes enormous amount of time in interviewing various groups from the Elks and the Girl Scouts, conferring honors and all this kind of thing. The poor man's life must be an utter torment because he's so well known and therefore has absolutely no time to give to the government of the country. I mean think of his mail. And all the people who have to be employed sifting that out, and assessing it, so that if he were someone quite anonymous, and that we didn't have to think about, he would be a very very good ruler. In just the same way, for example, you don't have to attend, unless you're sick, to the government of your own body. It happens automatically This is this expression ziran, of itself, and it goes on day after day after day and the better it is the less you have to think about it. When you see well, you do not see your eyes. If there is something wrong with your eyes, you start seeing spots, and those spots are spots in your eyes. When you hear well, you never hear your ears. But when they start singing, you know? Then you are starting to hear your ears and your ears are getting in the way of their own hearing.

So on the deepest level, a person as a whole, can get in the way of his own existence. By becoming too aware of himself. And then he lacks this quality, Te. Now, the Taoists then propose that there be something to help people get back to Tao, and be able to be in the state of Te. So that they wouldn't get in their own way. And, this is connected with the idea of being empty. The emptiness being somehow vacant, was the secret of the thing. The highest kind of knowledge is not know-how, but no-how, and no hyphen H.-O. W. to be able to do it no how. Without any method. To achieve this, something is practiced which is called fasting the heart. The heart. In Chinese, is a word which doesn't mean heart in the physiological sense. You see, it's part of the Te character. Shin. It's usually located about here. And it means heart and mind it's equivalent to translated as mind and in all the Zen texts where the word mind is used, no mind, Musha in it is this character. The psychic center. Now the best kind of heart is absence of heart. In English, the word heartless has a very bad connotation, as does the word mindless. A heartless person is an inconsiderate, unfeeling person, a mindless person is an idiot. But a person who has mushin, or no mind or no heart in Chinese, is a very high order of person. It means that his psychic center doesn't get in its own way. It operates as if it wasn't there. Chuang-

Tzu says that the highest form of man uses his shin like a mirror. It grasps nothing, it refuses nothing it receives but does not keep.

And the poem says when the geese fly over the water and there are reflected in the water that the geese do not intend to cast their reflection and the water has no mind to retain their image. So, the whole thing is you see to operate in the world as if you were absent. Now this is built into us physiologically, fundamentally, let me ask you simply: what is the color of your head from the standpoint of your eyes? Your eyes don't see your head, do they? You look all around you see everything else but your head you don't see. Do you feel that your head is black. No, hasn't any color at all. Outside, you see, all field of vision is an oval two eyes and this creates two centers of an ellipse so there's this whole field of vision now experiment what is beyond the field of vision. What color is it where you can't see. It isn't black. This is an important point. It's no color at all. Beyond that and in this way you can get an idea of what is meant by that character that I discussed this morning Schwann which although it formally has a meaning of darkness this one. Although it formally has the meaning of darkness and the Deep and the obscure, it actually refers to this kind of no color, which is the color of your head so far as your eyes are concerned.

Now, so in this sense, the invisibility of one's head, almost the not having of any head at all, is the secret of being alive. To be headless, you might say, to have no head. In just the sense I'm talking about, is our way of talking about the Chinese expression mushin, no-mind. Now, as a matter of fact if you want to see the inside of your head all you have to do is keep your eyes open. Because everything that you're experiencing in the external visual field is a state of your brain. All these colors and shapes are the way in which the brain nerves translate the electrical impulses in the external world. Being in the world outside the envelope of skin.

So, they translate all what is going on outside into impulses which are to us shape and color. But shape and color are states of the nerves, so what you see when your eyes are open is how it feels inside your head. You think your head is a blank. But actually, it's being a blank. You don't see your brain as an external, undulating, corrugated structure, you see your brain as everything outside. So, in this way, the emptiness of one's head, is the

condition of seeing. The transparency of the eye lens is the condition of seeing colors it has no color itself. Eckart said this, because my eye has no color it is able to discern color. This is in Germany in the Thirteenth century. That this is fundamental Taoist idea of being absent, as a condition of being present. Being not there. So, Chuang Tzu says, 'when your belt is comfortable you don't feel it.' When your shoes are comfortable, it is as if you want wearing any. Likewise, your clothes you see the more you are aware of these things, the less properly they are made. Or, the less properly they fit.

But, we raise an objection to this, a very simple objection. If I don't know I'm there, I seem to be missing everything. We want to know that we know. If we're happy and we don't know we're happy. We might just as well not be happy to be happy. And to know that you're happy is really the overflowing of the couple's life. Of course the penalty for that is to be miserable and to know that you're miserable. Some people are miserable without knowing it. But, you know my Limerick, 'There was a young man who said though it seems that I know that I know what I would like to see is the eye that knows me, when I know that I know that I know.'

And this is the great human predicament the development of self-consciousness the development of the possibility of reflecting upon one's own knowledge. And this is simultaneously a blessing and a curse. And Taoism does not escape this problem, I mean it doesn't, it doesn't avoid this problem, it deals with it. But it doesn't deal with it obviously. So we get back to this fundamental verse about the nature of Te. What is highly virtuous is a virtue that is not conscious of itself as virtue. The moment it's conscious of itself as such you see it it fails. So in this way, we love to see a child dancing all by itself. Lost in the dance and not performing for an audience, and we say oh oh if only I could dance like that. If only I could become like a child again: innocent. But then soon, when I went parents notice how beautifully a child dances and they all approve of it and say to this child, 'Dance for us,' the child begins to lose this power. And it puts on as it knows its notice. And we don't like that and say that's affectation that showing off that's phony. What we want you to do is to dance as if you had no audience. Not even yourself. Which of course puts the child in a double bind, because it says to the child we require you to do something that will

be acceptable only if you do it as if it wasn't required. We do that all the time to our children and to each other. You must love me. After all, you promised to do so when we got married to you and so on. So, this is the difficulty. But somehow, a very great artist in the maturity of his life somehow is able. At least to give the impression. That he does what he does without playing to the gallery. Without self-consciousness. It seems perfectly natural. So how does he get there? There was a Taoist sage later that Lao Tzu. His name was Lieh Tzu We Romanize that as LIEH. Lieh. And he had a reputation for being able to ride on the wind. So light. And says in one place it's easy enough to stand still the difficulty is to walk without touching the ground. Because in the state of being in accord with the Tao, there is a certain feeling of weightlessness, parallel to the weightlessness that people feel when they get into outer space, or when they go deep into the ocean. This is of course connected with the sensation that you're not carrying your body around. I described this morning the sensation that an expert driver has, when he really is with it on a car. That the hill lifts him up and drops him down the other side. That he and the road are all one process. And that's equivalent to the sense of weightlessness. And so this is connected, this is inner meaning of riding on the wind when Suzuki was asked what is it like to have such tare he said it's just like ordinary everyday experience except about two inches off the ground. And so we say in our own songs, 'Walking on air and never a care, something is making me sing Tralalala, like a little bird in spring. A person who has mushin on no mind or no heart in Chinese, is a very high order of person. It means that his psychic center doesn't get in its own way. It operates as if it wasn't there. Chuang Tzu says that the highest form of man uses his shin like a mirror it grasps nothing it refuses nothing it receives but does not keep. And the poem says when the geese fly over the water and they are not reflected in the water, that the geese do not intend to cast the reflection and the water has no mind to retain their image.

So, the whole thing is you see to operate in the world as if you were absent. That this is fundamental dollars idea of. Being absent. As a condition of being present. Being not there. Chuang Tzu Says, 'When your belt is comfortable you don't feel it.' When your shoes a comfortable it is as if you want wearing any. Likewise, your clothes you see the more you are aware of these things. The less properly they are made. Or the less probably they

fit. But we raise an objection to this very simple objection. If I don't know I'm there, I seem to be missing everything. We want to know that we know. If we're happy and we don't know we're happy, we might just as well not be happy. To be happy and to know that you're happy is really the overflowing of the cup of life. Of course, the penalty for that is to be miserable and to know that your miserable some people are miserable without knowing it. But, you know, my Limerick there was a young man said though, 'It seems that I know that I know what I would like to see is the I that knows me when I know that I know that I know.' And this is the great human predicament the development of self-consciousness, the development of the possibility of reflecting upon one's own knowledge. And this is simultaneously a blessing and a curse.

So, when the human being developed the power to be aware of himself. To know that he knows. In other words, when the cortex was formed over the original brain. He fell from grace. That was the fall of man. Because, when he felt he had the sensation of being in charge of being in control of himself and you could only have that sensation when you are aware of what you're doing, he got anxious. Am I aware enough of myself? Have I taken enough factors into consideration? Have I done all that should be done? And then he started trembling. This was the fall of man, of course, this is what is meant. Lao Tzu says, 'When the great Tao is lost there came a duty to man and right conduct.' In other words nobody talks about how you ought to behave. Unless things have gone radically wrong. There wouldn't be any conception of faith for ministers of the of the state unless there are a lot of lousy politicians around. No one would talk about filial piety, unless there were wayward sons and daughters.

So there is constantly in the tradition of Taoism, the idea that all moral preaching is confusion. There's a marvelous case of this in the Chuang Tzu's book. Where there's an alleged conversation between Confucius and Lao Tze, in which allowed SAS Confucius to explain to him what is charity and duty to one's neighbor. And Confucius gives him a little sermon on being, giving up one's self interest and working for others and Lao Tzu says, 'What stuff.' So regard the universe. He says, 'The stars come out invariably every night. The sun rises and sets the birds flock and migrate. Without exception all flowers and trees grow up words without exception.'

You, by or talk of charity and duty to one's neighbor you're just introducing confusion into the empire you already attempt to eliminate self is a positive manifestation of selfishness. You are like a person beating a drum in search of a fugitive. The modern equivalent of that would be the police car. About to raid a bad night club and coming with that siren full on its name. And everybody in the club gets out. So, they all talk about selfishness. All talk about, success in becoming virtuous, or enlightened or integrated on non neurotic or self actualized that's used all the terms that are being used, all this talk. Attests to the fact that it hasn't happened. And will in fact get in the way of it's happening. Well to go back to Lieh Tzu, who succeeded in riding the wind what happened? Lieh Tzu found a very great master, and went to study with him and the master lived in a small heart. And sat outside the heart. And the master paid absolutely no attention to him. This is sort of the way with Taoist masters, because why would they want students. They have nothing to teach. So, after a year sitting outside, Lieh Tzu went away. Then he just fed up with waiting so long. Then he sort of got regretful about this and thought he really should make a try. So we went back to the master who said why the ceaseless coming and going. So he sat there and tried to control his mind, in such a way that he would not think of the differences between gain and loss. In other words, try to live in such a way that nothing is either an advantage or a disadvantage.

Once upon a time, there was a Chinese farmer, whose horse ran away. And all the neighbors came around to commiserate that evening so sorry to hear your horse has run away that's too bad and he said maybe. The next day the horse came back bringing seven wild horses with it and everybody came around in the evening and said 'Oh isn't that lucky. What a great turn of events you've now got eight horses' and he said 'Maybe.' The next day, his son tried to break one of these horses and ride it and was thrown and broke his leg and they all said Oh dear that's too bad and he said 'Maybe.' The following day the conscription officers came around to recruit to force people into the army and they rejected his son, because he had a broken leg and all the people came around and said Isn't that great and he said 'Maybe.' You see, that is the attitude of not thinking of things in terms of gain or loss, advantage or disadvantage, because you don't really know. The fact that you might get a letter from a solicitor I mean from a law office tomorrow. Saying that some distant relative of yours that left you a million

dollars. Might be something you would feel very very happy about but the disasters that it could lead to what are believable. [crowd] Internal Revenue. To mention only one possibility.

So you never really know. Where the something is fortune or misfortune. But we only know the momentary changes and it as it alters our sense of hope about things. That Tao is wise enough eventually you see to understand that there isn't any fixed good or bad. And so his point of view is what is called non choosing. Well anyway he attempted to keep his mind in a state of non choosing, and this was a very difficult thing to do, to overcome one's habits of feeling and thinking in this respect, and after he had practiced this for a year the master looked at him. And you know sort of recognized he was there. After another years practice, he invited him to come and sit inside his hut. And then, however something changed and Lieh Tzu didn't try anymore to control his mind what he did was he put it in this way. 'I let my ears hear whatever they wanted to hear. I let my eyes see whatever they wanted to see. I let my feet move wherever they wanted to go, and I let my mind think of whatever it wanted to think.' And then he said it was a very strange sensation because all my bodily existence seemed to melt and become transparent. And to have no weight, and I didn't know whether I was walking on the window the wind was walking on me. Now that's the fasting of the heart. In the ordinary way, you see, you say, well that made quite an impression on me. As if you were a slate. Or a blackboard upon which life makes an impression, as the chalk does on the slate on the blackboard. And so we say 'Well here are these events and I'm the observer of all these events, and I remember them and they make an impression on me.'

But in the psychology of Taoism, there is no difference between you as observer. And whatever it is that you observe. The only thing that is you, is the observation of life from a certain point of view. I said a little while ago you think your heads are empty and blank. But the actual inside of your head is felt in terms of everything you see on the outside. We make an opposition, you see between the thinker and the thought the experiencer and the experience the knower and the known. Because we think about knowledge in terms of certain metaphors, the metaphor of the Stylus on the writing sheet. The reflection on the mirror. All those sort of images come

into our idea of knowledge. But in the Taoist theory of knowledge, it's quite different. There isn't a knower facing the known. It would be more like saying that if there is any knower at all it contains the known. Your mind if you have one is not in your head, your head is in your mind. Because your mind. Understood from the standpoint of vision is space.

The Chinese use this word Hoo. Which means sky, space and sometimes emptiness. And there is a saying. That form. Or you know shape and color was of this is one word in Chinese that means really both shape and color. And this and this are said to be identical. Space or emptiness is precisely shape color and shape color is precisely emptiness. This is actually a Buddhist saying from the Tridarya Sutra. So that, all that we call space contains the myriads of shapes and colors and bodies and weights and so on. It doesn't reflect them as a mirror. But it is the absence, which guarantees their presence, and it's their presence which guarantees its absence. So there's this mutual relationship again the book the mutual arising expression between voidness and form, between existence and nonexistence being and nonbeing. These are never felt as alternatives or things, that are in the some kind of contest.

So then, when it is said that there is not any thinker behind thoughts not any experiencer who has experiences, this is a way of saying. That experiencing, knowing is not an encounter, between strangers. Western thought concentrates very much on knowledge as an encounter and it is thus that we talk about facing facts. Facing reality. As if somehow or other the know and the known came from two completely different worlds and met each other like that. Whereas actually, the phenomenon of knowledge is almost the precise opposite of that. Instead of being a collision between the two wandering bodies in space, knowledge is much more like the expansion of a flower from the stem in the bud. Where the opposite points of the flower are the knower and the known. They are the terms of something which as it were, lies between them. Let me repeat. We tend in all our letters and common speech to think of life as an encounter between the knowing human being, the knowing mind and the world. They think of it not as an encounter but as an expression. Not an impression. An expression. Of a process that has polarized itself coming out from the center and expressed itself in terms of opposites but of course this is the basis of

the whole young un principle of. You know this jolly old thing. And where you've got two interlocked. What are they, fishes? Commas. Fascinating emblem. You call it a monad. Yes but there it is. This is a helix essentially, this grip. And this is the formation of spiral nebulae. And it's the position of sexual intercourse.

I here, this is my I and you with your I. I'm trying to get to the middle of you you're trying to get in the middle of me. And neither one of us exists without the other. This is yang, and yang the white in the in the dark. Yang the word young originally means. Or is associated with the south side of a mountain which is sunny yet in the north side which is dark. Yang is the north bank of a river which gets the sun yet as the south bank of a river which is in the shade. Now you see, you don't get a mountain with only one side. The mountain if it's a mountain a tall goes up and down. It's like the wave you don't get a wave which has a crest with no trough, or a trough with no crest, you can't have half a wave.

So, yang and yin are quite different from each other. But just because they are different, they're identical. And this is the important idea of the identical difference the saying goes in both dollars and Buddhism difference is identity, identity is difference. The Chinese word for is, is not quite the same as our word. This word which is usually used has rather the meaning of that, that. So they say would say difference that identity, identity that difference. And so this doesn't mean quite, is exactly the same as, it means rather is in relation to. Or goes with. Necessarily involves. Difference necessarily involves identity, identity necessarily involves difference.

So yang and yin. There is no Yang without yin, no yin without yang. When I was first studying these things I was terribly bothered by how on earth I was going to see this multiple differentiated world as a unity. What what was going to happen? What would it be like to see that all things are one? The sages keep saying all things are one. And they all look to me so different. Because here was all this teacher ch-ch-ch-ch, going on around one and it was doing it in different ways all these people came on in different ways and they had all their houses and all their cars and all that this and that and the whole world book full of the most bony prickly differences. And I thought well I was supposed to happen is a supposed to

be a kind of as if your eyesight got blurred and all these things I went blahhh and flowed together. What is it what does this experience of Nirvana, liberation and cetera supposed to be? Because so many of these especially Hindu sages write about as if he was just this kind of dissolution of everything. They said it all becomes like a slug with a small salt on it. Well I it took me a long time. And suddenly one day I realized, that the difference that I saw between things was the same thing as their unity. Because differences. Borders. Lines, surfaces, boundaries. Don't really divide things from each other at all they join them together. Because all boundaries are held in common. It's like, let's think of a reversal of territory which is all been divided up into property. Your property my property etc etc No the fences but we hold that if I live next to you your fence is my fence. We hold the boundary in common. We may make up silly arrangements as to who is responsible for the maintenance of this fence, but nevertheless, we hold our boundaries in common. And we wouldn't know what my plot of land was or where it was, unless we knew the definition of your plot of land in your plot of land that is adjoining. So boundaries are held in common. And I could see then that it, that my sense of being me. Was exactly the same thing as my sensation of being one with the whole cosmos. I didn't need to get some other weird sort of different odd kind of experience to feel in total connection with everything. Once you get the clue, you see, that the sense of unity is inseparable from the sense of difference. You wouldn't know yourself or what you meant by self, unless at the same time you have the feeling of something other.

Now it's, the secret is that other eventually turns out to be you. I mean that's the element of surprise and life. When suddenly you you find the thing most alien. We say now what is most alien to us. Go out at night and look at the stars and realize that they are millions and millions and billions of miles away. Vast conflagrations out in space, and you can lie back and look at that. Say, Well surely I hardly matter. I'm just a tiny tiny little peekaboo. On this weird spot of dust called Earth, and all that going on out there. Billions of years before I was born billions of years after I will die and nothing seems stranger to you that more different from me. But there comes a point if you watch long enough when you'll say, 'Why that's mean. It's the other. That is the condition of your being yourself. As the back is the condition of

being the front. And when you know that. You know, you know you never die.

Wisdom of the Ridiculous

During the last two sessions, I've been talking to principally about the philosophy of the Lao Tzu book The Tao Te Ching. And now I want to shift today over to Chuang Tzu. This Chuang Tzu, so far as we know. Lived about three hundred B.C.. Maybe a little earlier than that. And he is a very very remarkable person because the Chuang Tzu book he's also more exactly his name is. Chuang Tzu. But his book, sometimes called simply The Chuang Tzu book is quite unique in the whole history of philosophy, because he's almost the only philosopher from the whole of antiquity, who has real humor. And therefore he's an immensely encouraging person to read. But part of his humor is the art of exaggeration. And you always have to allow for that. You always have to realise that he's slightly pulling his own leg he is that as in a group of people who are enthusiasts for something it but have humans who very often find that when they're talking among themselves, they carry their own ideas to ludicrous extremes and roar with laughter about it. And Chuang Tzu does that.

Now for example, he has a great deal to say about the value of the useless life. The whole notion of something of life any moment in life or any event in life being useful, that is to say serving the end of some future event in life is to a Taoist absurd. Because nothing is useful at all, the universe is viewed as purposeless and useless, through and through because it's a game. More than that game. Doesn't really convey the sense of this. When a Taoist sage wandering through the forest, he isn't going anywhere. He is just wondering when he watches the clouds he loves them because they have no special destination. He watches birds moving around he watches the waves lapping on the shore, and just because all this is not busy in the way that human beings are busy. Because it serves no end other than being what it is now it is for that reason that he admires it, and it is for that reason that you get the peculiar styles of Chinese painting in the Tan Son and later dynasties, where nature in its wayward wandering nature is the main subject.

When we say that something is without purpose and that's a put down phrase and say well it's no future and what's the use now we say what's the use? And, we need very much to realise that that question. Reflects our insanity. What's the future in it? What's the use? The joy for the Darwinist is that things have no use and the future is not important. Now, you can exaggerate this and Chuang Tzu does, in a very humorous way by describing the ideal useless man he's a hunchback. And he's so deformed that his chin rests on his navel and so on and, but he says now this man is very admirable. He has found the secret of life because when the social service workers come around he's the first to get a free hand out. And when the military officers come around to conscript people for the army, he's the first to be rejected. Therefore, he lives long. And he also describes a case of some travelers came across an enormous tree, fantastic thing. And they said never did anyone see such a tree, so they went up and looked at it and first they tested the leaves and found that they were rough and disagreeable and no good to eat. Then they looked at the branches, and found that they were all twisted and absolutely no good for using as sticks. Then they examined the wood and found it was full of pity and absolutely useless for a carpenter. So nobody had disturbed this tree. It was not used for cutting down any purpose whatsoever and so it grew to an enormous size and was of great age. Chuang Tzu is here pulling our legs. He is not exactly asking us to take all that literally but this is his way of doing things then also he describes the behavior of the higher form of man and he says, the man of character that is. In this case the word we were discussing yesterday the man of character lives at home without exercising his mind and performs actions without worry. The notions of right and wrong and the praise and blame of others do not disturb him. When within the four seas, all people can enjoy themselves that is happiness for him when all people are well provided, that is peace for him. Sorrowful in countenance, he looks like a baby who has lost its mother appearing stupid he goes about like one who has lost his way. He has plenty of money to spend and does not know where it comes from he drinks and eats just enough, and does not know where the food comes from. This is the demeanor of the man of character. Then

By contrast, the hypocrites are those people who regard as good whatever the world claims as good and regard as right of whatever the world claims as right. When you tell them that they are man of Tao, then that

countenance countenances change with satisfaction when you call them hypocrites then they look displeased. All their lives they call themselves men of Tao, and all their lives they remain hypocrites. They know how to give a good speech and tell appropriate anecdotes in order to attract the crowd, but from the very beginning to the very end they do not know what it's all about. They put on the proper garb, and dress in the proper colors and put on a decorous experience in order to make themselves popular, but refuse to admit that they're hypocrites. But this explanation of the man. Who is stupid, in countenance in appearance and is wandering about as if he had lost his way and doesn't know anything across it based on the text and Lao Tzu, where he says the people of the world are merry making as if partaking of the sacrificial feasts as if mounting the terrace in spring I alone am mild like one unemployed. Like a newborn baby that cannot yet smile, unattached like one without a home. The people of the world have enough and to spare, but I am like one left out I heart must be that of a fool, being muddled nebulous. The vulgar are knowing Luminous. I alone am confused the Volga are clever selfish assured I alone depressed patient as the sea adrift seemingly aimless the people of the world all have a purpose I alone appear stubborn and them kooks I alone differ from the other people value of drawing sustenance from the Mother, capital M that's Mother Nature.

So, there is about Taoist sage, you see the can the character of the Taoist sage as depicted by to answer something of the fool. Because, the fool is the person. Who doesn't know enough to come in out of the rain doesn't compete. Everybody else gets before him to the prizes the material prizes of life and even to the spiritual prizes. The fool, you see, is the person who isn't going anywhere. He sits by the road and go to be able to be a little bit even to be the fool is like a Mongolian idiot child who isn't interested in survival. Who will take a plate of food and run his finger around in it and make a wonderful slosh with the stew, you and then watch it drip from the tip of this thing where he won't eat for quite a while of the neo play with it in all sorts of ways then his attention will be distracted by something else and he will chase after that, you see. So long as you don't cross him this is the case of the Mongolian idiot he remains the most wonderfully friendly swinging kind of a cat, but he has no ambition, he doesn't fight for himself. And nobody can ever get him to. So, the fool has always been used as a kind of analog of the sage. As a Hindu verse which says sometimes naked

sometimes mad, now as a scholar, now as a fool thus they appear on Earth the free men. And if you read the biographies of the early life of Sri Ramakrishna. They are absolutely wild.

Now, not all of this you see again just as in reading Chuang Tzu, you mustn't take it too literally. These things are said by way of a kind of over stress to correct. Another kind of over stress in the opposite direction. When a Japanese scholar many years ago explained the teaching of Buddhism to me, he said something I had never heard anybody else say, that the Buddha taught for example that life is suffering in order to correct the wrong view that it ought to be pleasure. He said that everything is impermanent. In order to correct the wrong view that reality lasts forever in time. So, the idea of the Middle Way is set to correct another. This is a very common Asian technique and it is found especially in Zen where teachers when they are asked about something sacred will always answer in terms of something secular. What is the Buddha? The tree in the Guard. Then when you ask about something secular they answer in terms of something sacred see. As there's a master and his student working in the field and they are using a knife to prune, and the student suddenly says to the Master give me the knife and he gives it to him point first. And so he says, but please let me have the other end the teacher says What would you do with the other end? see the question immediately it turns into a kind of a metaphysical thing.

So this play back and forth between the extremes has as its interior design. The awakening of the mind to polarity. That I was talking to you about yesterday. This thing of mutual arising. Chuang Tzu tells a story about this. He says a certain keeper of monkeys said with regard to their ration of nuts that each monkey should have three in the morning and four at night. But at this the monkeys were very angry so the keeper said they might have four in the morning and three at night, with which arrangement they were all well pleased. Now the number of nuts was the same, he goes on to say, but there was an adaptation to the likes and dislikes of those concerned. But this there is the way of conduct of the sage.

That basically Chuang Tzu's philosophy is a philosophy of relativity. He makes a great deal of the point that there is no absolute standard of great or small. Of important or unimportant. There is a story, for example, of a sort

of off on telly bill at a banquet, and the speeches are being made after dinner. And somebody gets up and says that the human being is the highest of all human, of all creatures, that the whole world serves humanity and a lot of pompous nonsense. And the small boy gets up and says that since Tigers feed on human beings it's quite obvious therefore that human beings exist for the service of tigers. For Chuang Tzu, you must get the point of view that small things are as big as big things can be, and big things are as small a small things can be everything can be looked at as great or small, important and unimportant. And all the steps between. Because his conception of the world is essentially cyclic. In his idea of the circle and Taoist and Zen teachers have a whole method of teaching by circles and drawing circles. The center of a circle, is any point on the circumference.

You can begin anywhere. There's a koan in Zen Buddhism which asked the question. Indra built the seamless tower. Where did he start? Now, a seamless tower is like a sleeve with no no seam on it. It's a continuous cylinder of cloth. So the continuous cylindrical tower, is the seamless tower where you start?

So, in the same way where does the circle start? At the Circle of Life the cycle of life the interdependence of. The bees and the flowers the into dependence of long and short you see it's all circular. And so, there is there is no where and there is everywhere that it can begin. In the same way, when he discusses the organs of the body, he makes a catalogue of all these organs and says 'Now which do you prefer?' Which one comes first and which one follows? Which one rules and which ones are serves? he said it seems that there may be a governor in all this but nobody could ever find it. This is a very strange passage in Chuang Tzu, which I have seen translated in many different ways there is an absolutely absurd translation of drunks on the market now published in mentor books by a professor of Chinese at Harvard, and it is absolutely ridiculous. The whole thing is made by a man who is I'm sure in an ex-missionary and keeps talking about God. Well there is no expression in Chuang Tzu for God. There is this expression. Which has almost the same meaning as spontaneity of itself so. This means such that something is so through the power of heaven.

Now heaven. Tien. Mean simply the universe. As you look out from Earth which is as it were the center of the base. Of everything else the whole expanse of the cosmos is tien, heaven. And there is no. Connection in the idea of heaven was some sort of personal ruler of the universe. So, the notion of God you see as we understand it is really very foreign indeed to Taoist thought. And when you see somebody translating this as God it gives a very wrong impression of this teaching for example there is a passage in which. Shun asked Jun, Can one get the Tao, so as to have it for one's own. And they say age and says. Your body is not your own. It is the delegated image of. John. And you know missionaries translate God, because they read in the Bible man is made in the image of God. Your life is not your own it is the delegated adaptability of heaven. Your offspring are not your own They're the delegated seeds of heaven. You move you know not how you are at rest, you know not why. These are the operations of the ways of Tao so how could you get Taos so as to have it for your own.

Similarly, there's a passage that says when a drunk man falls out of a cot though he may suffer he does not die. Because his spirit is in a condition of security he does not suffer from contact with objects of resistances. If such security may be got from wine how much more from. Can run. From being in accordance with the spontaneous rhythm of the universe. That's really what it means. But in the anxiety of missionaries and missionaries have been you see the great Western, they've been the foundation of Chinese scholarship in the West. To translate the Scriptures into Chinese they studied Chinese they were the first people to study Chinese and they have constantly therefore had an interest in slipping Chinese. Christian ideas into Chinese classics just in the same way as when you read Monya Williams's Sanskrit dictionary, which is the base dictionary for Sanskrit study for centuries, it's all made up with a missionary bias. But this the notion you see, of God in the sense of the person or ruler of the world, is totally foreign to Chinese thought. There isn't even an idea in Chinese thought of the law of nature as we have it. See the the motions of the body, the harmony of the organism, is not what it is in obedience to a law.

The Chinese do have an idea of law. This is the word tze. This is an interesting character. Nowadays written this way. But originally written like this. Because it's or this is a drawing of a sacrificial cauldron, with a knife

beside it. And it comes from a time when the laws were inscribed on the sacrificial cauldrons, so that when people came to offer their sacrifices, they would read the laws. Certain sages objected to this, and said that if the people know what the laws are, in the fixed terms of writing, they will develop a litigious spirit. That is to say, they'll start haggling about what it really says, and as you know that is the principal occupation of lawyers. And they said that the thing is that you mustn't write it down like that. And so, the Tao is described. As wutze. That we would translate literally Lawless. But it means of course transcending this kind of law which is a specific law, positive law, I think is the correct legal term.

So there is no notion in the Taoist philosophy, or if one might almost say in Chinese philosophy as a whole for there certainly includes Confucianism, no notion whatsoever of the world as responding to a boss. So the body, in other words, does not have in it a ruling organ its order is the consequence of, or the operation of every part of it existing together simultaneously arising mutually. There's no governor. Now the difficulty, you see, in Chuang Tzu's philosophy the difficulty with human beings is they begin to think in terms of governing. And ruling and they set out to dominate themselves and their surroundings. And invariably, this leads to a mess. He tells the story of an ancient man by the name of Polo. Polo was a great horse trainer. This is where we get the word polo from. But he said Polo absolutely ruined the nature of horses. Horses were nice charming creatures like Dean Swift's winners, before polo interfered and ruined their nature. Then he says in other places a good carpenter doesn't need a square or a compass. He works without it. And this is fantastically true of Japanese carpenters. You should see, one of the fascinating things in going to Japan is these old style carpenters, working from the roughest architectural plans you would imagine. And with the strangest instruments, but they have an uncanny knack, by fitting things by feel and by eye. A great story is told of the ceremonial raising of the ridgepole of a new temple. And it was being done by a certain Guild of carpenters and there was a rival guild in town which had not got the contract and they were very sore about it so during the night one of the members of the rival guild came and he chopped off six feet or so, of the ridgepole. And so when the master craftsman came in the morning and all the priests that arrived for the ceremony of raising the roof beam. He looked at it and said, 'Somebody has interfered with us. It must

be our enemy guild. They've cut off six feet of the roof beam anyway he said 'Never mind I will put it right.' And he took his hammer and ceremonially struck to be then said 'raise it and it was raised and it fitted exactly. So, the story, of course, is that the master carpenter knew that this would happen and he made the beam too long. That those sort of stories are always associated with the art of carpentry. He needs no square you see because. His sense of skill, that is in his organism, in his nerves, in his senses, is much more subtle than anything that can be made with instruments. There are all kinds of stories about the artists of the Far East excelling in this sort of thing, of knowing with tremendous precision exactly where something should go.

So, a master is decorating a ceremonial tea room and he's with his student and the student wants to know where to put a hook for hanging a bamboo vase for flowers on the wall. And the master says there, and the student makes a little mark somewhat later a student rubs up the mark, gets rid of it. But he remembers by a tiny little secret prick in the cloth where it should go. And then he says to the teacher, 'Excuse me sir but I forgot where you said that things should go,' and the teacher says it was there and he put his finger exactly on the same spot. That's the sort of thing that is admired. Without the slightest calculation you see.

Now he goes on and says. The Chuang Tzu explains at length that music has been ruined by the five notes. Says the five notes will make a man deaf and the five colors will make a man blind. And what does this mean. It's. Well it's the think is that if you think there are only five notes you can't hear. If you think there are only five colors you can't see. The moment you say this is a problem we have in music. That we've got a notation. Which is our chromatic scale. And the staff the way we can write music is limited to that possibility. But there are all kinds of subtleties between every one of our notes. The same way in writing our rhythm we have to go in steps from whole note, half note, quarter note, eighth note, sixteenth note, and so on and we can increase the value of each by one half by dotting it. But that's the limit of our rhythmic expression, whereas in all Oriental music, you have an infinite continuum both of tone and of rhythm. They make the most extraordinarily complicated rhythms, and the way you learn music is not

from notation, not from measures, but from the living body of your teacher demonstrating the ways of playing instruments.

So you follow the teacher, the man, instead of what it says in a book. So, the whole principle then is one of, not a success in life, through not pushing it around, through not trying to govern it. He tells a story as a matter of fact Chuang Tzu has a very funny trick a lot of his wisdom he puts into the mouth of Confucius. And he said to Confucius was one day doing this and he ran into Lao Tzu and they had an argument and loud so one but then the next time he talks about Confucius teaching Lao Tzu's doctrines. And this to the immense confusion of everybody but it said one day Confucius was standing by a river where there was a tremendous cataract plunging down, and he suddenly saw an old man coming out of the forest, who fell into the river and suddenly disappeared into the Cataract. And he said, 'Oh dear too bad, probably some old fellow tired of life who want to put an end to it all the next moment way down stream the old man gets out of the water and starts bouncing along and Confucius is amazed, and he sends one of his disciples at to catch this fellow for you disappears he said sir I was thinking that you would be going to commit suicide and I suddenly find that you came out of that cataract alive. Do you have some special method by which you do this? No, I have no special method said the old man I just go in with the world and come out with this well because I don't resist the water I entirely identify myself with water. So you see, here he is utterly utterly relaxed, just rolling around in the torrent and not resisting in any way, and so he has preserved. He goes with the stream rolls with the punch, or whatever you want to call it. Again, of course, there is exaggeration in a story of this kind. Just as the exaggeration in the story of the hunchback in the tree and so on. Because true Wu-wei, or letting go, noninterference, doesn't mean, for example, flabbiness. A lot of people when they think they're relaxing merely become flabby. And if that is so, you know, you would. The perfectly relaxed person would slowly become Jell-O. and would spread out on the floor and finally drip through into the basement. Relaxation you see is simply something that happens when there's too much yang in you, too much of the Positive. You need to balance after the yin. And the trouble is that human beings in their anxiety to control things exhibit too much again too much aggressiveness too much of the male principle, they need the balance of the female. And so, all these

exaggerations in the direction of let things go, let things happen, don't interfere. Stressing the yin point of view to compensate for the excessive yang. And furthermore the difficulty always comes I remember reading a book called You Must Relax, The difficulty always arises when one feels, I must relax. I've got to let go and let things happen. How on earth do I do it. I, even in trying to relax I'm all tense because I'm anxious that it must happen and maybe it won't and how do you do it you see. If you can't achieve wu wei like that. What you have to understand is that you don't you don't have to do anything there is no method as the old man said. That the meaning of wu tze, sir when you call the Taoist will sir or lawless it means there is no method in it. That you can master and do it what you have it's all based on understanding of what our psychologists call insight. You have to find out that there is nothing that you do. As a source and cause of action separate from everything else. When you know that, that there is no separate acting you, then there is no need to try to relax. The thing you have to see is that the flow of the Tao, as I said yesterday with the illustration of the people swimming in a strong stream that the flow of the Tao goes on anyway. Just like the flow of time for example, you can get out of the present moment. You can think about the past, and you can think about the future. But since you do that thinking now. The present is inescapable. All right now, the present moment does, doesn't it has a sense of flow. Time is going along, life is going along time actually the clock time is simply a measure of flow, a way of going to tick tick tick and counting the ticks and say well we've lived through so many ticks.

But nevertheless this is the real time as distinct from this ticking thing is it is a flowing, and yet it still isn't that fascinating. If it moves but you're always there it's always now. You never get out of now. All right now if you can feel that see that you can't get out of nothing. And you never will. I think now realize that what we call now is the same thing as Tao. The Tao, the course of things the eternal now the presence of God. Anything you want to call it see that's now, and you can't get out of it. So there's no need to get with it, because you can't get out. See, that's beautiful you just to relax and you're there.

So that's the principle of flowing. You can make all kinds of there are a clever ways of postponing finding this out. It's terribly simple, but you can

say well this is a very spiritual matter and I'm an evolved person and it'll take me a great deal of time to realize this in a more than an intellectual way. That's an excuse, for playing your own game. And not finding this out. There are all sorts of elaborate ways of doing that and you can put it off by indulging in the most complicated systems, of spiritual culture and yoga, and so on and so forth and that's all right I have no objection to your putting it off of that's what you want to do. But actually, it's always here now just as you can't get away from now you can't get out of the Tao. That's the humor of the whole thing. And that's why Chuang Tzu has this beautiful light touch. He says, 'The Heron is white without a daily bath. The crow is black without being painted in ink.' And this is the same as saying, you know, as in Zen. In this spring landscape, there is nothing superior, nothing inferior Flowering branches grow naturally. Some short, some long. Or they say a long thing is the long body of Buddha, short thing is the short body of Buddha. There are therefore you see blogs and brunettes. Fat people and skinny people tall people and shot people. Cultured people involved or people.

Even the Christian hymns there's the rich man in his castle the poor man it is gate. God made them high and lowly and order their estate you know? We don't sing that now because we've got too much social conscience. In fact, in I think time I probably read this passage yesterday maybe I didn't, but Chuang Tzu has this to say about it. Those who say that they would have right without its correlate wrong, or good government without its correlate misrule do not apprehend the great principles of the universe or the nature of all creation one might as well talk of the existence of heaven without that of earth or of the negative principle even without the positive which is clearly impossible if people keep on discussing it without stop. Such people must be either fools or knaves. Of course, one could always reply to Chuang Tzu, that there have to be fools and knaves so that we can recognize the existence of sages.

Yes, he has it in another way here. Speech is not mere blowing of breath it is intended to say something only what it is intended to say cannot yet be determined. Is their speech indeed? Or is there not can we or can we not distinguish it from the chirping of young birds? How can Tao be so obscured should be a distinction of true and false? How can speech be so

obscured that there should be a distinction of right and wrong? Where can you go and find Tao not to exist? Where can you go and find that words cannot be proved? The Tao is obscured by an inadequate understanding, and words are obscured by flowery expressions hence the affirmations and deny. Aisles of the Confucian and the modes in schools each denying what the other firms in the firm in what the other denies each denying what the other firms in affirming what the other denies brings us only confusion. There is nothing which is not this there is nothing which is not that. What cannot be seen by that, the other person, can be known by myself. Hence I say, this emanates from that that also derives from this this is the theory of the interdependence of this and that. Nevertheless, life arises from death and vice versa, the possibility arises remember possibility and vice versa affirmation is based upon denial, and vice versa. Which being the case the true sage rejects all distinctions and takes his refuge in heaven. That's in the universe.

For one may base it on this yet this is also that and that is also this this also has its right and wrong and that has its right and wrong does then the distinction between this and that really exist or not? When this the subjective, and that the object of are both without their correlates. That is the very axis of Tao and when that axis passes through the center at which all infinities converge affirmations and denials alike blend into the infinite one and so it is said that there is nothing like using the light. And see the axis of the opposites is the perception of that polarity. The difference between them is explicit but the unity of them is implicit. The difference the Expos it difference between two ends of the stick but the implicit unity that they are ends of the same stick you see? So that's the axis the axis of Tao, is the what you might call it the secret conspiracy. That it lies between all poles and all opposites which is implicit. Esoteric, or whatever you want to call it that they're fundamentally one.

So that unity, whether it's between you and the universe. Or whatever polarity you want to take is not something that has to be brought into being. If one brings it into being one assumes that it doesn't exist that's called in Zen, putting legs on a snake, or a beard on a eunuch. There's something unnecessary, you see? So it exists, it is always there and you can see it so vividly and actually put your almost almost put your finger on it and sense

it, if you understand that the movement of the Tao, is exactly the same thing as the present moment. Now because if you try to grab the present moment. And get to get ready, get ready, with the art of the written Clapper and say now. It's gone. [laughs] The finer and finer you draw the hairline on the watch, to know exactly where now is you can venture get the point where you can see it all the. But if you leave it alone and you don't try to grab the moment as it flies but it's always there so you don't have to mark it, and have to put your finger on it. Because it's everything that there is and so the present moment suddenly expands, and it contains the whole of time all past or future everything you never have to hold on to it.

It is believed generally in India. That when a person sets out on the way of liberation, his first problem. Is to become free from his past karma. The popular theory of karma the word that literally means action or doing, in Sanskrit, so that when we say that something that happens to you is your karma It's like saying in English it's your own doing. But in, the popular Indian belief, karma is a sort of built in moral law or a law of retribution, such that all the bad things you do and all the good things you do have consequences which you have to inherit, and so long as karmic energy remains stored up, you have to work it out. And what the sage endeavors to do is a kind of action which in Sanskrit is called Nishkama karma. Nish come out means without passion or without attachment karma, action. And so, whether he is whatever action he does, he renounces the fruits of the action, so that he acts in a way that doesn't generate future karma because future karma continues you in the wheel of becoming Samsara, the round and keeps you being reincarnated. Now then, in that case, when the time comes that you start to get out of the chain of karma, all the creditors that you have start presenting themselves for payment. In other words, a person who begins say to study yoga, has felt that he will suddenly get sick or that his children will die, or that he loses money, or all sorts of catastrophes will occur because the karmic debt is being cleared up, and it is in no hurry to be cleared up, if you're just living along like anybody, but if you embark on the spiritual life, a certain hurry occurs, and therefore since this is known it's rather discouraging to start these things.

The Christian way of saying the same thing is that if you plan to be, to change your life. Shall we say to turn over a new leaf, you mustn't let the

devil know. Because he will oppose you with all his might if he suddenly discovers that you're going to escape from his power. So for example, if you have a bad habit say you drink too much, and you make a New Year's resolution that during this coming year you'll stop drinking. That's a very very dangerous thing to do, because the devil will immediately know about it. And what will happen will be this. He will confront you with the prospect of three hundred sixty five drinkless days. And that will be awful, you know, just overwhelming and you won't be able to make much more than three days on the wagon.

So in that case you compromise with the devil and say just today I'm not going to drink you see but tomorrow maybe you will go back. Then when tomorrow comes you say, Oh just another day and it's trial that's all and the next day you say a one more day won't make much difference so you only do it for the moment and you don't let the devil know that you have a secret intention of going on day after day after day after day. But of course, there's something still better than that. And that is not to let the devil know anything. And that means of course. not to let yourself know. One of the many meanings of that saying Let not your left hand know what your right hand is doing is just this. And that was why, in the Zen discipline, a great deal of it centers around acting without premeditation. As those of you know, who read Harigal's book Zen in the Art of Archery. It was necessary to release the bowstring without first saying now. There's a wonderful story it may also have read by a German writer Von Kyss, about them a boxing match with a bear. The man can never defeat this bear because the bear always knows his plans in advance, and is ready to deal with any situation. The only way to get through to the bear would be to hit the bear without having first intended to do so. That would catch him.

And so this is one of the great great problems in the spiritual life or whatever you want to call it. Is to be able to have intention and act simultaneous. By this means, you escape karma and you escape the devil. So you might say that the Taoist is exemplary in this respect. That this is getting free from karma without making any previous announcement. Of simply, supposing we have a train and we want to unload the train of its freight cars. You go to the back end, and you can unload them one by one, and shunt them into the siding, but the simplest of all ways of unloading is

to uncouple between the engine and the first car, and that gets rid of the whole bunch at once. And it is in that sort of way you see that the Taoist gets rid of karma without challenging it. And so it has the reputation you see, of being the easy way. There are all kinds of yogas and ways for people who want to be difficult. And one of the great gambits of a man like Gurdjieff, was to make it all seem as difficult as possible, because that challenged the vanity of his students. If some teacher some good to says, Really this isn't difficult at all it's perfectly easy. Some people will say oh he's not really the real thing. We want something tough and difficult when when we see somebody starts out giving you a discipline that's very very weird and rigid people think now there is a thing, that man means business see, and so they flatter themselves by going to such a guy that they are serious students, whereas the other people are only dabblers and so on. All right if you have to do it that way, that's the way you have to do it. But the Taoist is the kind of person who shows you the shortcut. And shows you how to do it. By intelligence rather than effort because that's what it is.

In so many athletic and artistic skills, you'll find a teacher, who teaches you how to do it without forcing it. I once started the piano. I'm absolutely no good at it now because I don't practice. Involved in other things but I had an absolutely superb teacher. For a while. He was a very very great musicologist you know there was nothing sloppy about his standards. They were of the highest perfection. But when I first went to him, he said Let me see what you can do so I played him a scholarly Sonata. He said, 'Yeah but the trouble with you is you're trying too hard. You're hitting the piano and you should never hit a piano.' He said, 'actually, all you've got to do in order to play a piano is to drop your hands on it' and you need to have relaxed arms so he made me practice for a while he felt my muscles to see what I was relaxed or not and he's not just dropping out on the piano I don't care what notes you get but just drop your hand let it fall so there's enough energy in the weight of your arm to play as loud as you will. Or a soft as you will But just let it drop, you so that's all you have to do is drop your hands and you kept feeling my arms he said no no you're getting too tense you must pretend you are Lao Tzu. And he was there were a very educated man he knew about these things and, then he said Now after dropping your hands all you've got to do is hit the right notes. I'm and he said you know. The same thing is involved in making a very complex trill and he

demonstrated he has dropped his hand on the piano and at the same time his fingers went for a look like that and there was this magnificent ornamentation. And then we went on with practice this for some time he said Now let's get around it in the right notes and, he found immediately I had a block on reading music, because when I was a small boy and started piano, at the age of roughly eight, I had a pestiferous teacher, who was the mistress in this private school I went to in England. And she used to sit beside you would hit your fingers with a pencil every time you made a wrong note. Gregory Bateson, I think was taught piano and as a child in such a way and he has a total block on reading music. He really has got a brilliant mind, you know, he's a mathematician and great anthropologist, ethnologist and so on the other total block to reading music. And so this man had to teach me to overcome my block. And he said now, first of all, feel perfectly free to make mistakes. Everybody is going to make some mistakes, and it doesn't matter if you make a mistake, and if you do make a mistake, don't don't go back and do it over again but just go on.

So play as slowly as you, like don't hurry it just so long as you keep the relative rhythm, the relative values of the thing, go slow and take it easy. Another thing is to not to pay so much attention to the notes, but to the distances or in intervals between them, because that is the significant jump. And this sort of overcomes to the difficulty of key signatures, where we start out with is it learned we started out learning music with this weird system, that the lines on the staff really represent the major scale of C.. And that therefore, when you put a key signature at the beginning, you remember that every time you... Supposing you're playing an F. every time you hit B. It should be B. flat. While that's extremely tedious way of learning music, and you just have to think in different keys that's the only way to adjust to a key signature and play in the thing according to the intervals appropriate for that key. But you see, in this instance, this man although he was a great perfectionist and was highly skilled in music, he used intelligence first of all, to give you a shortcut, and then he also used relaxation to enter into a difficult thing by the easiest route.

Did I tell you yesterday that incident about the seed? Catching the seed by its hairs I did, yeah? Well, see I was making the point there about intelligence that, when the wind blows and the seed responds like a living

animal. You can say that it's not a living animal that it's only a seed with whiskers on because those whiskers on the seed are a manifestation of the intelligence of the seed, in the same way as the sail manifests the intelligence of the sailor.

So, Taoism is in that sense what everybody's looking for. The easy way in, the shortcut, using cleverness instead of muscle. So the question naturally arises, isn't it cheating? When in any game, somebody really starts using his intelligence, he will very likely be accused of cheating. And to draw the line between skill and cheating is a very difficult thing to do. And I'm sure if you've read Life magazine recently or aware of the tremendous controversy going on in the bridge world, because a champion team. A couple of partners, has been accused before the whole bridge world of cheating. And what they did I mean after all in bridge bidding is a way of letting your partner know what's in your hand.

Philosophy of the Tao

The subject of this seminar is going to be Taoism as contained in the teachings of Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu, who Lived approximately four hundred years or more before Christ. Separated probably by one hundred years from each other, as is often repeated. Lao Tzu started out. By explaining that which can be explained is not the eternal Tao. And then went on to write a book about it. Also saying, those who say do not know, those who know, do not say. Because there's nothing to be explained. You must remember that the word explain means to lay out in a plane. That is to put it on a flat sheet of paper. All mathematics is done on a flat sheet of paper, until very recent times. But it makes a great deal of difference because this world isn't flat. If you draw a circle on a flat sheet of paper, it has an inside, and an outside which are different. On the other hand if you draw a circle around a donut, the inside and the outside of the same.

So, what we are first of all saying, is that the Tao, whatever that is, cannot be explained in that sense. So it's important, first of all, to experience it, so we know what we're talking about. And, in order to go into Taoism at all, we must begin by being in the frame of mind, which can understand it. You cannot force yourself into this frame of mind. Any more than you can

smooth disturbed water with your hand. But let's say that our starting point is that we forget what we know, or think we know. That we suspend judgment, about practically everything. Returning to what we were when we were babies. When we have not yet learned the names, or language. And although we have extreme this sensitive bodies, very alive senses, we have no means of making an intellectual or verbal commentary on what is going on. Now can you consider that as your state? Just plain ignorant. But still very much alive. And in this state you just feel what is without calling it anything at all. You know nothing at all about anything call the next world in relation to an internal world. You don't know who you are, you haven't even got the idea of the word you or I. It's before all that. Nobody has taught you self-control.

So, you don't know the difference. Between the noise of a car outside. And the wandering thought that enters your mind they're both something that happens. You don't identify. The presence of the thought which might be just an image. Of a passing cloud in your mind's eye. Or the passing automobile they happen. Your breath happens. Light all around you happen. Your response to it by blinking happens. So you simply are really unable to do anything. There's nothing that you're supposed to do, nobody has told you anything new, you're unable completely to do anything. But be aware of the buzz. The visual buzz, the audible buzz, the tangible buzz. The smell of all bugs it's gone. Watch it. Don't ask who's watching it you know information about. That it requires a watcher for something to be watched, that's somebody's idea. You don't know that. And loud so says the scholar learn something every day the amount of Tao unlearns something every day. Until he gets back. To non-doing. And that's what we're in at the moment. Just simply. Without comment. Without idea in your head. Be aware of. What else can you do? Don't try to be aware, you are.

You will find of course, that you can't stop the commentary going on in your head. But at least you can regard it as interior noise. Listen to your chattering thoughts as you listen to the singing of a kettle. We don't know what it is we're aware of. Especially when you take it all together. And there's this sense of something going on. I want to even say that this is what I said, it was going on. That's an idea. It's a form of words. Obviously I

wouldn't know if anything was going on unless I could say something else wasn't. I know motion by contrast with the rest.

So while I am aware of motion, I'm also aware of rest so maybe what's at rest isn't going on and what's motion is going on, so I won't use that concept because I've got to include both. And if I say Well here it is, that excludes what isn't, like space. And if I say this it, it excludes that. I'm reduced to silence. But you can feel what I'm talking about. That's what's called Tao in Chinese. That's where we begin.

Tao means basically that way. And so course. The course of nature. Of which allowed Lao Tzu says, Which means. That Tao means. The way of functioning of the Tao is a yawn is all of itself so. That is to say is spontaneous. Watch again what's going on. If you approach it with this wise ignorant. You will see that you are witnessing it happening. In other words, in this primal way of looking at things, there is no difference between what you do on the one hand, and what happens to you on the other. It's all the same process. Just as your thoughts happen, the car happens outside. The clouds, the stars. When a Westerner hears that, he thinks of fatalism, or determinism. That's because he still preserves in the back of his mind, two illusions. One is, that what is happening is happening to him. And therefore he is the victim of circumstances. But when you are in primal ignorance there is no you different from what's happening, and therefore it's not happening to you. It's just happening. So is you ,you know, what you call you what you later call you was part of a happening. You're part of the universe, although the universe strictly speaking has no parts. We only cause certain features of the universe possibly you but you can't disconnect them from the rest without causing them to be not only nonexistent, but never to have existed.

So, when you have this happening the other illusion that Westerner is liable to have, is that it's determined in the sense that what is happening now follows necessarily from what happened in the past. But you don't know anything about that in your primal ignorance. Cause and effect. Why, obviously not. Because if you are really naive you see. that the past is the result of what's happening now. It goes backwards into the past. Like a wake goes backwards from a ship. All the echoes are disappearing finally,

go away and away in away, and it's all starting now. What we call the future, is nothing. The great void, and everything comes out of the great void. Thus the way a naive person. As I explained if any of you were at my lecture last night. If you shut your eyes and contemplate reality only with your ears, you'll find there's a background of silence, and all sounds are coming out of that. They stop out of silence if you close your eyes listen just listen. You see the Bell came out of nothing floated off off off off and then stopped being a sonic echo and became a memory, which is another kind of echo. Awake, it's very simple. It all begins now. And therefore it spontaneous. Isn't determined. That's a philosophical notion. Nor is it capricious. That's another philosophical notion, as we distinguish between what is orderly and what is random. Because we don't really know what randomness is. If you talk to a mathematician about randomness he'll make you feel quite weird.

What is so of itself sui generis in Latin. That means coming into being spontaneously on its own accord the real meaning of virgin birth sui generis. That's the world that is the Tao. That makes us feel scared, perhaps, because we say well of all this is happening spontaneously who's in charge? I'm not and that's pretty obvious. But I hope with God all somebody's looking after all this. Well why should there be? Someone looking after him, because then there's a new worry that human other thought of. Like who takes care of the caretakers daughter while the caretakers visit taking care. Who guards the guards? Who supervises the police? Who looks after God? God doesn't need looking after. Oh, well then nor does the Earth. Tao, because Tao is a certain kind of order. And this kind of order is not quite what we call order, when we arrange everything geometrically in boxes or in rows. That's a very crude kind of order. But when you look at a plant it's perfectly obvious that this plant has order. We recognize at once that that is not a mess. But it is not symmetrical. And it is not geometrical looking. It looks like a Chinese drawing. Because the Chinese appreciated this kind of order so much. That they put it into their painting non-symmetric or. In the Chinese language this is called Li. And the character. For Li means originally the markings in Jade also means the grain in wood and the fiber in muscles. We could say too, that clouds have Li, marble has Li. The human body has Li. And we all recognize it. And the artist copies it, whether he is a landscape painter or a portrait painter or an

abstract painter, or a nonobjective painter. They all are trying for Li. And the interesting thing is that although we all know what it is there's no way of defining it.

But because Tao is the course. We can also call Li the watercourse. Because the patterns of Li are patterns of flowing water. And we see those patterns of flow memorialized as it were, in sculpture. In the grain and wood which is the flow of sap. In marble. In bones. In muscles. All these things are patterned according to the basic principles that is the Taoist principle of flow. There is a book called sensitive chaos by Theodore Shrank with many many photographs and studies of flow patterns. And there in the patterns of flowing water you will see all kinds of motifs from Chinese art. Immediately recognizable, including the S-curve in the circle the yang-yin. Like this.

So Li means then, the order of flow. The wonderful dancing pattern of liquid. Because Lao Tzu likens the Tao to water. The Great Tao, He says flows everywhere to the left and to the right. Like water I'm contemplating that it loves the nourish is ALL THINGS. But does not lord it over them. Because he says elsewhere water always seeks the lowest level which men abhor. Because we are always trying to play games of one upmanship and be on top of each other. Lao Tzu explains that the top position is the most insecure. Everybody wants to get to the top of the tree, but then if they do, the tree will collapse. The fallacy of American democracy. You too might be president. The answer is no one but a maniac would want to be president. Who wants to be put in charge of a runaway truck?

So Lao Tzu says the basic position is the most powerful. And this we can see it once in Judo. Or in Aikido. Which are, wrestling arts, or self-defense of Arts where you always get underneath the opponent. And so he falls over you. If he attacks you, the moment he moves to be aggressive, you go either lower than he is, or in a smaller circle than he is moving. And you have spin if you know aikido. You're always spinning, and you know how something rapidly spinning exercises centrifugal force So somebody comes into your field of centrifugal force you get flung out. But by his own bounce.

It's very curious. So for the watercourse way is the Way of the Tao. Now, that seems to light Anglo-Saxon Protestant into Irish Catholics. Lazy.

Spineless, passive. And I'm always being asked when I talk about things, if people did what you suggest, wouldn't they become terribly passive? Well from a superficial part of you, I would suggest that a certain amount of passivity would be an excellent corrective for our kind of culture. Because we are always creating trouble. By doing good to other people. You know we wage wars for people's benefit. And. Educate the poor. For their benefit. So that they desire more things which they can get. I mean that sounds rather callous. About our rich people are not happy. Whereas the poor people of height are. To judge by the way they live. And we think. We're sorry really not for the poor but for ourselves. Guilty. So a certain amount of doing nothing and stopping rushing around would cool everything. But also it must be remembered that passive it is the root of action. Where do you suppose you're going to get energy from just by being in a Jedi. No you can't get energy that way. That is exhausting yourself. To have energy you must sleep. But also much more important than sleep is what I showed you at the beginning. Passive a theory of mind mental silence. Not you come as I try to explain be passive as an exercise that's good for you. You can only get to that point by realizing there's nothing else you can do. So for God's sake don't cultivate passivity as a form of progress. That's like playing because it's good for your work. You never get to play.

So in the same way to try and force the issues wears you out. And when you force a lock, you usually bend the key. So you jiggle gently, until you find the right opening. So in the same way, anybody who knows how to conduct business always jiggles the key to find the right moment to turn the lock, and then it all happens as if it were natural and none of it will forced. So therefore, the watercourse will give you the sense that your life is a flowing. The flowing is equally you and what is not you. Or called not you. It's the process that's happening. And when you understand, that you'll stop asking questions about it. You will see that all asking of questions about it is so, shall I say tautological. You get explanations, but don't explain. All explanations of what's happening call for further explanations, because big explanations have little explanations upon their backs to bite them, and little explanations have lesser explanations and so ad infinitum. This is the analytical process that produces the atomic universe. The electronic universe the protonic universe and so on and so on. And if you go the other direction, you will find the solar system in a galaxy, the galaxy in a system of galaxies and then goodness knows what. Because obviously the universe,

as it seeks to know itself, must run away from itself. As your eyes revolve when you turn to look at them. You are the universe. You are apertures through which it is aware of itself. Holes in the wall, as it were. And so as you look. Now you see it, now you don't. It's very simple. So you will find, therefore that the big quest. What is it? What am I supposed to do? What is human destiny? Why are we here? These questions will slowly disappear and that itself will be the answer. The answer will be this is why. And this is what is going on that cannot be described the Tao. The Tao is simultaneously departing and arriving. Always. That's the meaning of the eternal Tao, the eternal Tao.

Well then, to go with the water course, is called by a Lao Tzu wu-wei. Wu means not. Wei has a complex of meanings. Which can be action. Striving. Straining. Doing. Or best, forcing. Not forcing is wu wei. So he says Tao or wu wei does nothing but nothing is left undone. In other words, Tao accomplishes all things without forcing them. So therefore when you master. That's the wrong word, because it has the idea of superiority. When you come to wu wei, by as it were coming down. You are working on the same principle as the Tao. And so this is likened poetically to the difference between a willow and a pine when it snows. The pine is a rigid tree and the snow and ice piles up on the branches until they crack. The willow is a springy tree, and when the weight of the snow is on the branch the branch drops in the snow falls off on the branch comes up again that's wu wei.

Chuang Tzu tells a lovely tale that a sage was wandering along the bank of a river near an enormous cataract. And suddenly, way up beyond the cataract he saw an old man roll off the bank into the cataract. And he thought that's too bad, he must be old and ill, and is making an end of himself. But a few minutes later, the old man jumped out of the stream way down beyond the Cataract, and went running along the bank so the sage and his disciples went scooting after him and said This is the most amazing thing we ever saw how did you survive? Well he said there's no special way, I just went in with the swirl and came up with a whirl. I made myself like the water so there was no conflict between myself and water. So, in the same way, when a baby is in an automobile accident you find often that the baby isn't uninjured, because the baby didn't go rigid to protect itself. So likewise when you learn to fall in Judo, you learn to curl up limply, and yet

make your arms very heavy so that they flop with an immense thud on the floor and that making heavy is again like water. And this absorbs the shock.

So, it isn't you see, you must realize that the watercourse is not complete limpness, because water has weight and therefore strength. And that really all energy, the secret of wuwei is that all energy is gravity. We, as a planet, would if we encountered some obstacle in space. There would be an enormous release of energy. The obstacle would feel that it was being hit by some colossal force. But the planet is falling around the sun. And the sun is falling around something else, the whole universe is falling. But since there's nowhere for it to drop it's sort of not falling at anything, just falling around itself. Sometimes there are collisions, but everything's got so much space that the very rare. Maybe the ones that didn't have space have been eliminated. And became all the dust that's in the sky. But, all energy is gravity, that's the secret of judo, it's really the secret outlay of the puzzle of the relationship of gravity to energy. It's the real secret of $E=MC^2$.

So now if you want to see to find an intelligent solution to a problem be. The work is done with your brain. You have all the necessary intelligence inside this bone. Only most people never use their brains, they use their minds instead. And think that they use their minds like they use their muscles, that you can strain your head, and work very hard with it as if it were a muscle to achieve a result, but that doesn't work that way. When you want to find out the answer to something, what you do is you contemplate it. You visualize your problem, your questions as well as you can, and then simply look at it. Because you don't try to find a solution, because any solution that comes in that way is liable to be wrong. But when you have watched it for a while, the solution comes of itself. And that is the way to use your brain, it works for you, in the same way as your stomach to just steal food. Without your having to supervise it consciously. But all our attempts to supervise everything consciously have led to things that aren't too good for our stomachs and so forth you know how it goes.

The reason for that is quite simple. That conscious attention, employing words. Can not think of very much. We ignore almost everything while we're thinking. We think along a single track. But the world isn't going on along a single track, but the world is everything all together everywhere.

And you just can't take that into consideration, there isn't time but your brain can because the brain is capable of handling innumerable variables at once, whereas your conscious attention is not or rather small strictly speaking verbal symbols are not capable of handling any more than one very very crudely simple track. That's why we have to trust our brains. Because you see, we are much more intelligent than our understanding of ourselves. When a neurologist admits that he has only begun to scratch the surface of understanding the nervous system, he is actually saying that his own nervous system is smarter than he is. It's outwitted him so far. And that's remarkable, isn't it. So you see, what you are, is necessarily more art than anything you can understand. For the simple reason that an organism which completely understands itself would be comparable to lifting yourself up by your own bootstraps. Or kissing your own lips.

So, there's always this element of the nothing or unknown in any process of consciousness or knowledge. And if that irritates you, remember you are really addressing yourself to a stupid problem. Because fire doesn't need to burn itself. Any more than a light needs to shine on itself. So for light to ask, what am I? Although it sounds like a sensible question, isn't. Because how could you answer it? Let me demonstrate this to you in another simpler way. For many many hundreds of years, human beings have wanted to know what is-ness. What is matter. Substance. Obviously, it seems there must be a basis, for all the shapes that we see. After all, clay is the basis of vessels. Iron is the basis of tools, wood is the basis of furniture. But what is the basis of that? What is the substance common to everything? Well we tried to find out and that was the reason at least in the beginning of things why physicists try to find out what matter energy is.

Well, when you consider the problem, consider the question. Ask yourself, what sort of answer you're looking for? Supposing you found out what matter is, in what sort of language would you be able to describe it? And you realize that you couldn't. Because all that language can describe, whether the language be of words or of numbers, is pattern, form. We can measure form. We can outline it. We can explain it. But we couldn't possibly explain stuff. Just basic oomph. There would be no way of talking about it. Therefore we're asking a silly question. We're asking for a

question to be answered in terms which couldn't answer that kind of question.

So therefore we might say, you don't need to relive the idea of stuff, of matter, because what you've got is form and I could say it's the form that matters. In anything. And you know you take a double take on that. When you look at the world as form you will not ask questions about what is it made of. What are the shapes made of there because they're not made it says Tao WuWei and Wu Wei way means also not making. Making is different from growing. When a plant grows, it is not patched or put together. All the so-called parts of the plant grow out of it, whereas when you construct a machine, you assemble the parts and put them together. This is not the way a plant works, it's not the way you work. When you eat your food, it is ridiculous to suppose that this is the raw material of parts which are going to be one hundred manufactured in a factory and distributed to screw on different parts of your body. It's a silly image.

So, you don't ask therefore what are things made of? The next thing you don't ask is how do they go together? Because here becomes a very very fascinating thing, that what we are unaware of is that so-called separate things are joined by space. We always think of space as separating. But that which separates also joins, that was why the word cleaves is so important. It means to stick to and to divide. So we are cleft by space. When you look at a distant galaxy we call it a nebula. Because we are seeing it from a long way away. When however, we get close to it, the nebula disappears, and we see individual stars. We are living in the middle of one. From a long way away, all the stars in our galaxy appear to be a thing. But right close up, we don't see that thing. What is it that keeps all these stars together? Oh, we say gravity. Gravity is a word for something that means simply we don't know what it is. Like the ether, that was once supposed to be the fluid through which light was transmitted, and was discovered not to exist. That we could somehow do without it, that light went through nothing, through space. Marvelous. Apparently.

So, here are all sorts of things not joined to each other by strings, and yet they constitute a thing. And so, when we get down to our own atomic structure, we are, if we were looked at closely enough, we would be like

galaxies. With our atoms vastly distant from each other. What holds us together? Isn't that the wrong question. Because what is what matters is the form. It is your shape. Now, if I saw you, sometime again and I meet you again, how do I know you? It's I recognize your shape. If I haven't seen you for some time, when I meet you the second time. There is nothing of you that I knew before. All your so-called substances changed. Just as if I visit a waterfall, a few seconds later, you know, it's not the same water. It's falling the same way, the same style, and so in the same way when I meet you today yesterday the day before you were doing you were the same style of the same pattern. But it's all different.

So, that pattern can come to an end. And then after a while it can happen again. Just as if you take a newspaper photograph and look at it under a magnifying glass. What you saw with the naked eye as a clean line will appear to be a series of dots. And the dots are like one another. And there's no strings joining them. Change or level of magnification and there's a line. You can magnify in time, as well as in space. Only you do it a different way, to magnify anything in time, you speed up the time. So we take a fast motion picture of a bean. And we put the bean in on us. And we expose one frame per day. And then when we run the movie we suddenly see the bean moving. It puts out a little feeler and the feeler goes , And all the stalks, and leaves open. Out comes a bean, and it eventually crumbles. Fades out why we saw it just. We saw happening which we would never notice with the naked eye to slow. Now that is using magnifying time.

Now therefore, let us suppose, we had human faces, thousands of faces. Which suddenly began as a little fetus cells. And we got some rapidly into baby face into child adolescent adult old first and skull and dust,going you're a little a little all these faces coming and going to making their gesture of going through the whole lifespan. Well we would watch and we would begin to see patterns of continuity. Which, things are moving much too slowly to see these and things are moving too complicated to see them but stand off at a distance as it were and you would see the same rhythms occurring again again and again and again. So that they would appear from that distance off from time that speeded up to be a simple continuity, back to continuity from here to care. Which looked at closely as follows traits. So you would get what we call a naive language the reincarnation of forms.

You consider there's this kind of a wiggle that is recognizable as me, would happen again and again and again. With no spook traveling from one happening to the next, that wouldn't be necessary, anymore than it's necessary to have a line joining one dot in the press photograph with another dot so that they will make continuous sense of the do. From level. You know, when you watch television, you are actually watching a moving dot. It moves so fast that it creates the image. Now let's supposing you had a different kind of vibe altogether that had no memory and that. You would look at the television screen and you would see this dot dancing walk all across and leaving no trace. You say well kind of the funny thing is that doesn't make any sense. But seen another way you see all that picture makes sense. So you see you don't have to all these mysteries like our reincarnation. You don't need any spooky knowledge to understand them. It's all right out in front of you, and you will discover that as I talk to you I'm not going to tell you were saying that you didn't already know. All this was plain to you, all I would do is put it into words and such a way that you would be able to say well that's what I thought but I could never explain it. Yesterday I talked to you about the three basic principles of Taoist philosophy. Namely Tao itself, the course of nature. Wu wei, not forcing, in other words, the watercourse character of the course of nature. Te, which is virtue, of the seemingly magical power. Which comes. Of hollowing the water cost. Of taking the line of least resistance, which argues always, a higher order of intelligence, because it's more intelligent to sail a boat than to row. Even though it's a lazier way of doing it. Use the wind, use the, it's like in the same way for technology. We haven't really walking up to the fact that it would be much more intelligent to use the sun, the wind, and the tides as a source of energy rather than fossil fuel.

But once again, to understand anything about this philosophy, you really need to be in a state of wise ignorance. I am often cast among people, who are frantically conceptualizing, and defending their frameworks of conceptualization. Who have a very fixed, elaborate theory, of the nature of the universe, of man's destiny, and of the way to its fulfillment. And you will find too that these conceptions of man's destiny are very ambitious. But once you're in that framework of conceptualization. You become increasingly abstracted from the natural world, as if you were a person who lives in books, rather than in life or lives in the movies rather than with

People. Because you begin to fall into the fundamental fallacy of civilization, which is to value the world of symbol above the world which symbols represent. And of course we in our culture have taken that to the wildest extremes. So that you don't exist unless you possess a birth certificate or a passport, which is a piece of paper. So that the record of what happens is far more important than what happens, therefore we waste incalculable energy on recording. On filling out income tax forms. On seeing that in a university, the registrar's records are properly protected books a bit and the library can go to hell. But they keep safes for the students records.

So in the same way, a lot of people don't believe that they are real, unless they can read about themselves in the newspaper. And a lot of people feel uncomfortable if something fantastic occurs and there's nobody there with a camera to take a picture of it. And so children commit crimes in order to get their names in the newspaper. So that they know they're there, because their parents all the time are using appearance in the newspaper as a standard of importance and so obviously you are not important unless you too appear in the newspapers. In the record, you will go down to history. And so too, we are making records on films, and all sorts of tapes of what we call vanishing civilizations, vanishing cultures, vanishing art, vanishing species. And we seem to think, well it's all right, they can vanish, just so long as we have been recorded. Now now anyway all anymore but you can read about them in the Encyclopedia Britannica. And this confusion of the world of representations with the world of nature is just disastrous. So therefore, it's tremendously important for us to get back to the world of nature. You may have a concept that the world of nature is unspiritual. A lot of people too. And a lot of people are at odds with their bodies. But what they are at odds with, as I think I tried to point out yesterday. Is not this. But their idea of this. A lot of people resent physical change. They resent the idea of the dissolution process that is involved in physical change. That you get older. And therefore, from a conceptual point of view, you get uglier. And that just isn't true. If you are alive and alert old people are not arguing at all. Just by virtue of being old. Only you see we have very very rigid concepts of where in physical beauty consists.

So, it's important to abandon those ideas. At least occasionally. Because, if you are very attached to them, you can always take them up again later. But you see, if you think all the time it's like talking all the time. I am found by you as a very talkative person. But I assure you that I'm a good listener. In social gatherings I'll often hold the floor, only because. Somebody hasn't yet produced something more interesting than the minute some of the does I'm very silent and attentive. Because if I talk all the time I won't hear what anyone else has to say.

Likewise, if I think all the time, I won't have anything to think about except thoughts. And that leaves me high and dry. I become like a library, and all the books that are constantly added to it are about the books already in it. And that is pretty much what our big libraries are doing. So, it would be as if a painter never saw anything but art galleries. As if a musician listened to nothing but concerts. And so, very simply, this is being out of touch with the world that is naturally with us. I won't even say presented to our senses, that is too conceptual. Lao Tzu said, the five colors may command blind. The five tones make a man deaf. Because if you think there are only five colors, you are blind, and if you think there are only five tones are there. There is as we know an infinite continuum of sound colors. And the spectrum is merely a matter of convenience and classification.

So, likewise, when you read in ancient texts of mysticism that it's necessary to go beyond the senses, that's very easily misunderstood. It is not so much the senses, that is to say the eyes the ears and cetera, which falsify. It's our conceptions of what the eyes and ears bring to us. In other words it is not the percept, but the concept wherein we find the root of Maya, Illusion or of course magic. Because you can use conceptualization creatively if you know what you're doing. That's very important. But if you don't know what you're doing, your concept of reality can completely delude you.

So begin again with seeing what happens if you are just generally aware of yourself and your surroundings. Without taking any idea whatsoever about it seriously. And using no words you see. And using no words. Because of the time being you listen to my words as if they had no meaning. As if I were just making noises at you. And in this marvelous state of ignorance, there will be nothing called time. Nothing called space. Nothing call self

and nothing called other. There is just that happening. And it's not supposed to be anything particular. Whatever state of feeling you find yourself in. That is the way it's going. That's this. And you have no standards whereby to criticize it, to approve of it or disapprove of. It's quite simply what there is. And sometimes it's delightful. I won't make a discipline out of it, because that would put you off.

Sometimes it's delightful simply to sit. And be that. Of course in the fancy world it's called meditation.

See It's awfully important that we know what we're talking about. That I cannot only tell you about Tao, but show it to you. And that's the way to show it. See that's extraordinarily simple. And because of our concepts, what makes this difficult to understand, is that our minds are caught up. In two questions. Why we are doing it, and what's the use of it. It's amazing how we are conditioned to turn everything into profit. And feel guilty if we're not, now that's a very dangerous thing to say to children.

We all have a kind of a conscience in us. I'll call it the commercial conscience. Which is saying in what way is this bettering your situation? If not financially, are you improving your mind? Are you becoming more spiritual? Whatever that is. And so we don't understand, that any state that we could truly cause meditation, or I prefer the the word contemplation rather than meditation. You cannot be in that state for a purpose. Or, in a state of mind that is expecting a result to flow from it because the moment you do that, you are not in that state, you are bothering about concepts instead. This is as it were the one thing that, the one science as it were that has no goal, in the sense of objective in the future.

The stream begins in the mountains and runs down to the ocean and we are apt to say the stream is moving to the ocean as its goal. But when it gets to the ocean the water is again evaporated by the sun's heat, and it returns to the mountains, and it comes down again. Because the stream has no purpose to reach the ocean. Indeed, the stream is simultaneously in the sky, in the mountains on its course, and in the ocean, it's in all places at once. And therefore it is not going anywhere. It is simply going.

So when a Zen master was asked the question. What is Tao, he said walk on. And really nothing will stop that. One cannot not walk on. The flow is there whether you resist it or whether you don't. And when you resist it, you're like somebody swimming against the current. Which is a fast way to drown. And the skill of it lies in sailing, is to go intelligently with the current. Steering it and using it. But it bothers us, us especially Western industrial people very much indeed to consider a philosophy of no purpose, because when we say of something it has no future in it, that's equivalent to saying it's bad. But people use the word purpose of the word meaning in different ways. And often when we speak of a meaningless life or a purposeless lives, in a negative, derogatory way. We are meaning actually a person who lives life for extremely short-term purposes. The same sort of restlessness that is encouraged in you by turning over the pages of such a magazine as Life. Now you realize that a magazine of that character is designed, really, to keep you away from any sort of serenity. No article in it is satisfactory in the sense of giving you anything to chew on. It ends too soon it. Gives you just a flip here, a flip there, never goes into anything deeply it gives you a set of impressions. And you get pictures in it that are exciting or sensational or unusual which might momentarily entertain you, and you go through a whole issue and remember nothing. But it keeps you in a state of pacified agitation while you're flying on an airplane waiting in an office. Thumbing through something before breakfast sort of thing. And this is the entire characteristic of a person who lives for short-term purposes. And that normally is what one would call the meaningless life. In contrast to that, a meaningful life is generally understood to be one devoted to long term purposes. But, you know what we call serious things. But the Taoist standpoint, is neither of those. Because probably a Taoist will have thought through. The question what do I want, very carefully, and have realized there's something spurious, about most of our long term purposes. Because when you think realistically, and long termishly about the state of human civilization. You see not much more than muddling through a mess. You will then say, 'Well, what are we talking about then when we talk about a meaningful life?'

I think we should have a little bit more precision here than we usually do. In a very strict sense, words have meaning. And reality is meaning. And therefore has none. The word, the idea, which is a complex of words, or

other symbols. The functions as a pointer to something other than itself. And that other is its meaning. So when you asked the question, what do trees and rivers mean, the answer is they don't, because they're not words, because they're not signs. Unless you say, a river is a sign of rain. This is a kind of redundant statement because a river is rain a raining off the earth.

So a river, the splendor of the river is that it is the meaning and has none. And therefore, there is a quality of meaninglessness of having no meaning, and yet of being meaning, to all nature. Wittgenstein makes the remark that it is curious that. When after a long questing, there are people who feel that they understand the sense of life. Nevertheless, they cannot say wherein that sense consist. I experience something, some human being, or some quality of light. Or tree or flower, or work of art, that I find is important. And I might use the word it has tremendous meaning for me and yet when I asked what that is, I am at a loss for words. Because actually, in a very high sense, nature is nonsense. And in this way also, music is nonsense. Especially classical music. Whether it be the classical music of the West, or the classical music of India or China. Because all classical music is nonrepresentative. Not symbolic. It does not represent anything other than itself, it is happening of sound. And it is like ferns which are vegetable paddlings like crystals which are chemical patterns. And like animals, you see, with their marvelous routines. And when we look at the routines of the animals and the plants. We with our purpose of minds say, all this is for the purpose of survival. Now for the survival of what? We have already defined the entire organism in terms of the purpose for survival. All the parts of a plant are shown to have roles in the survival process so the survival process has as its fundamental purpose the continuation of the survival process. We, with our purposive minds say, 'All this is for the purpose of survival.' Now for the survival of what? We have already defined the entire organism in terms of a purpose for survival. All the parts of a plant are shown to have roles in the survival process. So, the survival process has as its fundamental purpose the continuation of the survival process. And is it not. Nothing has been said. It's purely tautological. We're going on so as to go on. And this is a purely I would call it an engineering approach to nature, where the engineer looks at the situation in standpoint of efficiency. And there has no *raison d'être* in his thinking for inefficient processes.

So therefore, if I would be going from here to there, the engineer wants me to go in the shortest possible distance and the quickest possible time. And will take a straight route rather than a wiggly one. And one goes wiggly however, not merely to say fit better to the contours of the land, but to enjoy wiggling. Enjoyment of wiggling is really fundamental to life. It isn't wiggly just because that's the easiest way for it to be. It is wiggly for the pure love of wiggling. Why do we wear shirts like you're wearing covered with interesting floral wiggles? Somehow those Wiggles please the eye, and are restful. Whereas, plain surfaces and straight lines are not always restful, and that's very skillfully handled. Because they make the I go...see. Whereas in a floral setting they are I could wander. Cos the let's over do it like Victorian wallpaper. Because that kills everything with too much of it. The Japanese do it so skillfully by using the emptiness and displaying against this a very clear wiggle, as in a flower arrangement or a calligraphic painting.

So the space and the wiggle complement each other. So, likewise if you are running, the engineering mentalities go-jogging. And they plod plod plod crowd crowd glug glug glug. Chunking along a course. But one who really understands running, dances the course. Who and he will be swerving and. Just on his toes, delightfully going. And, he will really be a more effective runner than a jogger. Because he's not doing it out of a sense of duty, and he doesn't have getting there in mind. And if you have getting there in mind, the whole journey is a chore. That's why when you're travelling in a car or by any other means. You wear yourself out by being in a hurry to get there. Absolutely arrive exhausted. Because all along you've been pushing at it. And there was no need to. You would be amazed if you set out to go somewhere in no hurry. How astonishingly soon you seem to arrive. If you go out in a hurry, it'll take forever to get there.

So what is, to understand the Chinese and Japanese appreciation of natural form which they derive essentially from Taoism. Secondarily from Zen. Because Zen is Buddhism as influenced by Taoism. You find increasingly that what characterizes their whole approach to art is the purposelessness of nature. In other forms of religious art, you find very symbolic style figures paintings, sculpture. And these figures are normally symmetrical. But what you find in the Taoist and the Zen feeling for nature is that the focal point of

reverence, of fascination, will be the unsymmetrical. It could be simply a rock of peculiar shape that has been set in space in a certain way. The rock, the bamboo etc, is not intended to have any symbolic meaning whatsoever.

It's the same, likewise with the Zen stories. When somebody asks what is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism. And the master says, 'I didn't feel like wearing shoes today.' I know very well that ignorant Chinese people will look for symbolism in this, and will explain it by some sort of allegorical performance, but that is not the meaning of it at all. This is not the sense of a Zen remark. You cannot understand the sense of the Zen remark without being rather stupid. That is to say being, taking it simply for what it is. He wasn't talking about not wearing any shoes. To lead you around. Through a kind of symbol that is a code known only to the initiates. Will be no point in such a thing. But simply talking quite directly. That's the reason, that is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism. Because, the fundamental meaning is again the Tao, and I've shown you what the Tao is. The happening. Get with it. How can you not?

So those works of art give the feeling. So supposing a wall such a favorite scene is painted as a mountain landscape. And somewhere in a tiny little human figures. It's a poet wandering along. Through pine trees beside a stream. Where is he going? Where is the stream going? Where the clouds going? Where are the birds going? We don't know, really. They are wandering on. And so you get the quality which the Japanese call Yugen. Yugen is made of two characters. Which mean mysterious and deep. But the Japanese dramatist Soami said 'Now Yugen is when you are watching wild geese and they are suddenly hidden by a cloud. When you are looking at ships far out to sea. And they are hidden by a far off island. Yugen is to wander on and on in a great forest without for a return.'

Now, in these poetic expressions, you get a feel of a certain kind. I got plenty for nothing, nothing got plenty for me. so this is the same sort of thing. Another Chinese poem that starts out my thoughts will wander in the great void. This is Yugen. Yugen therefore, is the sensation of life. Of nature, going but going nowhere. But it's not the sort of nowhere that we imagine when we see a sign which says. No thru road. Or when we come to what we call a blank wall. Going nowhere is going into pregnant space

where we do not know as it were, what will come of it. It's when space is used to let your imagination flow into it without being specific. When a certain kind of music hints at something, but never spoils it subtly by explaining it. It is for the same reason that a joke is funny when a joke is not explained. And you do not even explain to yourself why you laugh. Because that would spoil it.

And so, in the same way there is this mysterious, which is not defined. But which you understand and see the beauty of it just as you see the humor of the joke. Without defining it, and that is winds eventually there is no adequate philosophy of humor. And certainly no funny philosophy if you know. A lot of philosophers and psychologists written about the psychology of Laughter in an extremely boring way. And in a way it is as futile to discuss aesthetics in a kind of philosophical way as if we were trying to find out the formula for creating the beautiful object. But the poets, the Japanese and Chinese. Repeatedly bring up images which evoke the model of purposelessness. Now let me give you an illustration. In Japan and in China. They love building temples on the sides of mountains. And especially forested mountains in Japan. You'll get a it's a tree very like the Sequoia It's called a Cryptomeria. And there are vast cathedral-like forests on the sides of mountains Well you see a great gate at the bottom of the mountain. And all kinds of ornate carvings in the gate, because it's in the ancient Ton Dynasty Chinese style which is the style of Japanese temple architecture and there are clouds and dragons and up sort of girls of all sorts of wonders in this gate, and you go through and there's a ground set of stone steps, flanked by guardian dogs and bronze lanterns going up up up marvelous approach and at the top of it is another such gate with maybe a great sliding doors in it, and you go beyond that and there is a courtyard surrounded with maple trees in front of the Cryptomerias. And there is the temple. Splendid great building you go inside and there is a marvelous golden altar. With borders and incense and golden lotus flowers and candles and very very splendid butter. Sitting on his Lotus throat smiling down at you. Well after that somehow or other these things are all rigged so that you find yourself behind the temple have lowered bellow there's another flight of steps going up not perhaps quite so grand. And you go up and up and up and up. And at last a different kind of Temple confronts you this may be a Shinto temple. And this will be very simple construction. Or it might be, the Hermitage,

the personal house of the chief priest. The gate to this is more rustic. And there may be a small garden round it, leading you to a further ascent of steps beyond. And you go up and up and up once again. And, here is a graveyard. They don't have sort of ugly tombstones like we do, they have simply square pillar with the name of the deceased written on in Chinese characters, sometimes they're wooden And there's the sense of the graveyard, somehow it's not quite as depressing. Because somehow the graveyard simply says it all flows away. And right at the back of the graveyard. There's another shrine. And you get to that. And what is in it in the place of honor. A mirror. And then oh my goodness, there's still another flight, going up. Just, very crude, small steps going get higher into the trees. And suddenly, the trail vanishes, into the bushes. And a Haiku poem says, this is all there is. The path comes to an end among the parsley. And don't remember that as a child? Of exploring around somebody's garden and there are all sorts that we look at things you see from the low down and you don't look over the top of everything like an adult. So you explore a little ways that go around through bushes, and here's a trail and finally it just vanishes. Into, it might very well be parsley. And I, so vividly remember that, how magical. That was. I felt I could disappear at that point and never be discovered. That there were all sorts of secrets hidden in those bushes. I never specify what they were. That was the whole point.

We cannot conceive the real thing that we want. It would spoil it to do it, because then it would become a mere conception. What we're looking for is the great surprise. You see, and to the degree that we preconceived it, it will fall flat. The whole principle of the universe, you see. If Taoist principle is spontaneity. It is to accomplish, a miracle without doing anything. Without planning it. And you will see here a coincidentia oppositorum. As you can find out for example by exploring, the relationship between doing and happening, you can explore the relationship of freedom and necessity. And you can see that, as you can't visualize one without the other, that there could be a state in which you can see all process, as simultaneously free and necessary. That's a contradiction in ordinary logic. But when we say of something that it happens necessarily, we are separating this happening from a cause. And that is a purely conceptual separation. Strictly speaking, everything that happens is part of the same event as its cause. Like I was showing you that the river is all one event, you can't say that the river is

caused by its source. And if it wasn't flowing, there would be no water in the ocean to pick up. That sort of thing.

So, you can get to a point where you understand that it's only you look at your behavior at the Tao, from one point of view and you can see it's free that is to say it is emerging now from the void. Quite freely, quite spontaneously. For look at it from another point of view, and you can see that everything that happens happens necessarily. Actually, the truth is neither one nor the other These are just different ways of classifying, ways of looking at it. It's like what you call in mathematics finding a limit. That is to say if I have a magnet has North Pole and South Pole must start at the North Pole. Chopping cut off sections cut off sections approaching the South Pole. At every point that I cut off a piece, I will have an off power. It will still be enough all the way until I get right to the end when the whole magnet has been chopped up. And it disappears Okay, let's do the other way I begin from the South Pole every time I chop getting closer to the north a piece left is still south. That's the idea of a limit. So in the same way, if you approach the world from the end called necessity, and you'd start chopping chopping chopping to get to the end called freedom. It will always be a necessity if you approach it that way you'll see everything is happening necessarily then if you turn it round to begin at the end called freedom it will always be freedom until you get to necessity and the thing disappears. For this reason, now then, the poet who speaks next to the musician most eloquently about Tao, doesn't philosophize. The poet merely gives the image. This is all there is, the path comes to an end in the parsley. That one could say. Enough said.

Way Beyond Seeking

One of the first things which everybody should understand. Is that every creature in the universe that is in any way sensitive and in any manner of speaking conscious regards itself as a human being. That is to say. It knows and is aware of a hierarchy of beings above it and a hierarchy of beings below it. If you take such a tiny creature as a fruit fly which lives only a few days. It is aware of all sorts of weird little animals and objects and spores floating in the atmosphere which we don't even notice unless we've got a microscope around very few people have. And it criticizes them as

being inferior animals and all that sort of thing whereas human beings are things that it doesn't comprehend and that it is as much outside its. Intellect as a question is outside ours. And we see these far off objects floating in the heavens and we have only the vaguest idea of what they may be actually we may all be some kind of. Atoms within the hair on somebody's nose. In another dimension, and all these galaxies being the constituent elements who knows? But there is, I think, a fundamental principle that everybody must understand in order to know what is the meaning of the Tao, or the Chinese sense of the course of nature and that is the principle of relativity. It's absolutely fundamental to an understanding of Taoist philosophy of relativity. That is to say that wherever you are, and whoever you are and whatever. But you are you're in the middle. You know pig-in-the-middle, that's the game. And you have you see just in the same way as when you stand say on the deck of a ship and you can see a horizon all around you to exactly the same distance you're in the center of a circle because your senses extend a certain direction in all directions and therefore give you the impression of being in the middle. Everything in the world feels like that, and also it has its own kind which look natural to it you see spiders and hydras, and sea urchins and so on don't look very natural to us. We say well, I wouldn't want to look like that. But they say when they see us. Well what kind of an awful thing is that and what a lot of nonsense it does. You see if your dog watches you when your typewriting. Look at you and... Human beings, especially cats. Dogs are dogs have tried to catch on to human beings in a sort of a funny way, but cats look at you and think you are out of your mind You're absolutely crazy what do you sit there all day for feverish Lee pecking away at a typewriter say or doing something busy like that when you could sit in the car up and and purr. You just, from the cats, cats point of view you don't understand what life's about all.

But all cats and cat company cats in cat company they feel that they are people. Because the definition of a person is where you look from. And of course that is the meaning of the very interesting Buddhist idea. You can only become a Buddha, that is to say you can only become enlightened, liberated and aware of your unity with the universe, from the human position. And Buddhism calls itself the Middle Way, because it is the way for someone in the middle and that's everyone. So there is believe it or not, a form of yoga, ways of liberation, for worms, for fruit flies for snails, for

spiders, for birds, for everything. And they you see in their situation. Feel just as cultured as we can possibly think. And they have their distinctions and their snobberies, just in the same way that we do. Because you see, they dig all sorts of things that we don't even notice. We think a person is cultured because they play the piano or the violin or they read poetry and they have a lot of big library and they have paintings all around, and they have a fancy house and so on and we say well there's a person of culture and we can see at once that this is really some rather elegant human being. But when you get down into the world of fishes, they have exactly the same thing only instead of depending on collecting a lot of books and things like that it is the precise way, the very subtle wiggles of the tail. That little tremors of vibration that makes one fish a very superior fish as compared with other fish and all the other fish look at that one and say oh by to be like that what a genius. To be able to do just that little extra thing see because they're very sensitive, even airplanes in formation can't begin to do what birds and fish can do in in the communal swirling dances that they do. Now, let me just interject something here that is rather important. Biological existence is such that you have the klil to live. And vegetarians have no way out because plants also are forms of life and in to the degree that they are aware and they are aware to a certain degree they think they're human. And when you chew up plants, you are making a bit very painful experience for cabbages and carrots and things like that, and you can't get out of it.

And the only possible solution of the dilemma that we are in ethically, that we have to eat in order to to live, that being is killing. The only possible solution to this dilemma is to reverence food and to cook it as well as possible and enjoy it to the fore there is no other ethical response that is in any way across the situation and also you must as a human being remember that you aren't the only pebble on the beach. That you belong just as much as the fish and the cows and the apples. You belong to a mutual eating society. And something in the end is going to eat you.

Now, human beings are not as a rule eaten by large creatures we've got rid of them. Things like lions and tigers that chew up on human beings and not many of them around we are eaten instead by tiny creatures, and that the morticians are a very vicious group of people because they are trying to deprive all those microorganisms of the proper human food. When they

bury them in formaldehyde and encase them in concrete things with complicated bronze caskets where instead of giving the worms a ball, they just do nothing, they just rot there. Becoming, becoming slowly more and more sort of attenuated and parchment like. Instead of. Continuing into the flow of the course of life, which is the proper thing to do to make an act of respect to the earth from which you have gained all these life, and give yourself back to it when you die. After all, it's only courteous. And this keeps the thing the thing running.

So we should start a campaign at once to abolish the whole mortician business and put it in an entirely new lines, where dead human beings are buried in a great fields, about three feet underground which are left for a long time until all stinks and everything and vanished and this is the most beautiful soil for growing corn and lettuce and artichokes and vines and everything beautiful. So you go back into the cycle.

But now, here is a very strange thing. That every creature therefore, which feels that it is human. And which knows that it's there in the same way as you know your here. Experiences being here as constituting a sort of blockage. Now, practically there are very few human beings that don't feel this. And I'm sure there are very few creatures that don't feel it in some way too. The sensation of a certain tension, which constitutes the feeling of I-ness, of thereness, of being here. Because after all every creature is a particular form. Everything is individual. Not only you as a turtle organism standing here but all the components cells of your body. Each one of them has some sort of a feeling of its own. And it is individual. You can look at a microscope at the right level of magnification and you can see that thing there. With its own little life, and if you examine the stream of your blood you'll find it full of all kinds of organisms that are having all sorts of conspiracies and games and plots and eating each other and doing these things that like we do. Only, we really realize that we wouldn't be healthy as a total organism unless there were all these wars and fights and plots and politics going on between the various cells in our blood. But from their point of view, you see, they feel a little bit put-out. Because they're being organized. And we're in the same situation because very slowly, the human beings on the surface of the planet are realizing themselves into a total planetary organism with an electronic nervous system. You see, in science

fiction which was published round about the 1920s. It was always expected future human beings would have enormous heads because they would have very big brains and they would be very wise.

It didn't work that way. What happens is that the human race is building a brain outside its body. That is to say an interlocking electronic network of telephonic, television, radionic communications, which is rapidly being interlocked with computers, so that you will, within a few years, be able to plug your own brain into a computer. You will have a little gadget here, behind the hearing aid and that will be integrated with your brain in such a way that you can plug in right here. That will only be an intermediate stage, because just in the same way as when we thought that all communications by electricity had to go through wires and then we got rid of the wires and got radio and television.

So in exactly the same way we will eventually get rid of telephones and radio and television and we'll communicate by some entirely new method that is at present called E.S.P.. But that will mean, that absolutely nobody has a private life anymore. Everybody will read automatically everybody else's thoughts you won't be able to defend you'll have no defenses everybody else will see right through you. And some people will protest and say well this is terrible there's no privacy anymore that means there's no me. Well that's what's happening to your own selves in your own neurons and they objected at some time in the course of the evolution we're getting our private life taken away we're being organized into a body. And we're doing the same thing. Only we got to try and see if we can be clever about it, and that is to say to do two things at once. To have this tremendous openness to each other whereby I don't care if you read my thoughts and you don't care if I read yours, but at the same time nevertheless each one of us retains a peculiar individuality. Almost in the same way as nothing could be more unlike a stomach than a heart. And nothing could be more unlike a kidney than pituitary gland. And nothing could be more unlike intestines than a rib cage. You see, there's a lot of differentiation inside the body. Despite the fact that it is a completely. An organism functioning all together.

So then, the problem though, as I said is that for each individual which is outlined which is a separate thing, or rather I would instead of using the word separate I would like to use the word distinct separate as I use the word means disjointed cut off from, distinct, means a feature of something where an absolutely distinguishable pattern is part of a larger pattern of a whole. So something can be distinct without being separate, in just the same way as back and front can be very different and yet inseparable.

So then, there is then this this sensation of a practically every living being of constituting. A center of tension and of resistance. That is to say, of being a little bit blocked or shall I say of being in the way. Being in one's own way. Imagine the opposite. Let us suppose for example that you got up in the morning with a feeling of total transparency. There's no resistance in your organism to the external world. You just float through it. You're part of it, it's part of you and just in the same way for example that when you seen if you see well. We were aren't aware of your arms but if there's something wrong with your eyes when you see spots in front of you. Then you are looking at your eyes and your eyes are getting in your own way.

So, the Taoist sage Chuang Tzu says, that when clothes fit well. You are not aware of them when your girdle or belt fits properly you are not aware of it good shoes your unconscious thoughts and so in exactly the same way the perfect form of man is unaware of self because he doesn't get in his own way he is sus in this sense completely transparent. Now, you are thinking I'm trying to sell you a bill of goods. That I'm going to teach you some technique so that you can feel perfectly transparent. And that this is the proper way to feel this is the way you ought to feel I was not that simple.

Point is, to begin with, if you do in and really rather natural way feel alone. And feel a little bit vulnerable. That you've got a soft skin and you've got a weak heart and you've got you know, all those ills that the human body is ere to, going on inside you let's begin with that. Let's begin with the way in which we do in fact constitute a sort of block in the middle of things and that fact we heard a bit and through hurting a bit we know we're here. See, people go very often to extreme measures to know that they're there. I was in Mexico two years ago, and I trying to find out what was really behind all the blood and gore in Mexican Catholicism. Why they love pictures of

Christ that is sold in the little shops where he's green, and his face is contorted with horror and blood pouring down a crown of thorns with the longest spiky a strong you ever saw sticking in and these crucifixes where they have carefully modeled sauce on them and all that kind of thing and then that Guadalupe these girls. Kneeling walking for a mile right down the avenue to the altar in that thing what is it all about why the answer is quite simply if you hurt, you know you are there. And this is part of the whole meaning of penances, and all sorts of trials that people go through and all kinds of adventures and all sorts of very very difficult massage experiences and so on is that as a result of this, it becomes quite apparent that you do not truly exist. You are there. You are a kind of an obstacle to the flow of life, and as life impinges upon you Wammo, you rebound and you hurt a bit and so you you are there.

Now then, although people cultivate this, they say are in general they rather it would be not that way. We would like to forget our selfs. And so ever so many people say well I want somebody to lose myself in. I want something to belong to. I want to join a religion where I can sort of feel that I take part. I mean something, or I go to the movies to forget myself. I read a mystery story to forget myself. I get drunk to forget myself. Because the peculiar quality of the drug called alcohol is that it turns you off. It makes you increasingly insensitive to pain and to being, and so on, so that you can get a certain vague sense, a rather misty sense of floating. When Gurdjieff had a boy he was training, he was making him wait table one evening and he suddenly before dinner filled him with an enormous amount of vodka. And the boy went around all evening in the sort of floating state and a Gurdjieff said to him afterwards, 'Now listen. When you can feel like that naturally all the time you've learned my discipline.' But here it, is so as things stand. One ordinarily doesn't feel that way and therefore takes alcohol or something in order to disappear in order to feel less, this sensation of resisting the world.

Do you know if you study your body and its dynamics, you will find that you are fighting all the time? Most people are some aren't but most people are fighting the external world all the time. My friend Charlotte Silva often tries an experiment where she makes a person lie down on the floor and says to the now look. The floor is solid and it will hold you up. You don't

have to do anything to stay where you are just lie on the floor. And then. She looks at the person or may touch them slightly and say Do you realize you're making all sorts of efforts to hold yourself together. Because you're basically afraid that if you don't do that you will just go blue there and disappear into a kind of formalist all over the floor but you won't see your skin your bones your muscle tone us and everything is all there naturally, and it will hold you together there's nothing to worry about and all you have to do is lie on the floor. And you don't have to make any special efforts to stay together. But very many people are afraid that they will fall apart or somehow disintegrate if they don't make efforts to hold themselves together, or else that they will be disintegrated by some outside agency if they're not constantly on the alert like this particularly if it's better all around you see to protect themselves.

Now, I'm not a preacher. That's the most important thing to understand about me. I'm not saying you shouldn't do that. But I'm inviting you to become immensely aware of the fact that if you do that at all, that you do it. And that you have therefore that sense of being alone, of being a particular separate form that is unlike any other form on Earth. That's just you. And concentrate on that. After all, for many people, they define this as their problem. So you ought to be able to feel it without the slightest difficulty because of the driver asking you to feel some transcendental sensation or something of that kind, and it is just a very ordinary sense of being you and being alone.

Now, as you focus on that sensation of distinctness, we'll even call this one separateness because we do. We have been brought up to feel separate, we have been brought up to feel actually disjoined from the external world although that is pure mythology and doesn't exist at all. You are as much part of the external world as a whirlpool is part of a stream. But we are brought up not to notice that. But if you've been brought up that way, and you don't notice that you're as much part of the world as a whirlpool is of a stream, you feel this intense separateness. The thing to do with all feelings that you don't like, is to experience them as deeply as possible. And go into the inmost depths of loneliness, and indeed that are say the inmost depths of selfishness. Are you selfish? You know, lots of people try to pretend they aren't. And say well I try not to be but I guess I don't succeed all the time.

And so, Krishnamurti you know is a very devil because he always roots it out he shows all the people who are very good and have the highest ideals and who are doing everything that they are really doing it for the most the same sort of motivation as other people are robbing banks. And only they're giving it a name so as to conceal it better. See, that's like culture. Culture is a way of more clever way of concealing the fact that you have to eat. You like the Queen of Spain who are into debt is. The here eight hundred sixty is came in with these enormous skirts and floated in the room. And, you know was sort of coming on like she was an angel. And somebody when they were first invented gave her a present of beautiful silk stockings. A dozen pairs and sent them to the Queen and I magisters Chamberlain replied with a better returning the stocking thing Her 'Majesty, the Queen of Spades does not have legs.' light Look ma no legs. I managed to float along as the same because I'm an angel.

So you see it that way in which all kinds of high culture are subtle ways of concealing, and pretending that we do without the sings that the lower classes whether of humans or of animals do see we pretend that we don't just like you don't go around crudely taking a bull and banging it on the head with a mallet or sticking a knife through it and tearing it apart and eating it. All the dung from way off from the stockyard. And it comes to us in the butcher shop as a completely neutral looking thing called a steak. Steak has absolutely nothing to do with a cow or steak or something wrapped up packaged like that and they all t-t-t-t down like that and over here they pick up a steak and test it think thinks poor Cow. Like a cow, it doesn't remind you of one in any way. So that's culture.

But you see however much you mask it under lofty ideals. I mean that the most religious people in the world the greatest saints are the various rascals. I've known lots of them. I'll tell you in confidence I've known a lot of clergyman. And the filthiest stories I have ever heard in my life were totally.

So, in Hebrew theology incidentally. That there is a thing called the yetzer harah. And in the beginning of time when God created Adam he implanted in him the yetzer hara and the yetzer hara means that wayward spirit. He put something funny in man so that man would be a little odd and it was a result of the yetzer hara that Adam was tempted by Eve who was tempted

by the serpent to eat that famous fruit. And, but the Hebrew believes that everything that God created is good. Including the Yetzer Hara. Because if it hadn't been for the yetzer hara, there would have nothing ever happened. Everybody would have obeyed God and God would have said well this is kind of a bore. Now that you see, you can't you can't just get up to someone and say disobey me, because if they do there are varying you. See that's a double bind. Say to somebody disobey me but God is much more subtle than that. He didn't tell Adam to disobey he told him to obey. But suddenly he put this yetzer hara thing in like that so that, God would say well I'm not responsible. For this thing's going to happen on its own because what everybody wants is something to happen on its own. And everybody wants that. Because you see, this sensation of being you. This curious lonely center of awkward sensitivity, subject to the most peculiar feelings and pains and anxieties and all that sort of thing all that. Is an essential prerequisite for feeling something else. These two experiences go together.

If you want to... In other words if you want to be omnipotent and you want to live in a universe where nothing happens except what you exactly what you will to happen. In other words you say I would like to be God if you think that's the way God is and everything is there for totally under my control. Everything is absolutely transparent to my intelligence. I have no problems. A lot of people coming on like they think they have attained the state, and that's a lot of bunk nobody wants to be in that position. Because it wouldn't be anything to it. Because once everything is under your central control, what is nothing is happening. It's a bore from beginning to end. So what any one, or any being whatsoever, who has a sense of centrality, who has a sense of self who has a sense of identity that sense of identity is inseparable from something else going on. That is defined as not being me. As not being under my control, and that may jump at any time. It might even eat me.

So, what I want to first of all to understand is that these two sensations. One, of being the lonely central sensitive vulnerable self, living in the midst of a world that feels other. That is not under your control. I want to try and show you that these two sensations are really one sensation, or rather two aspects of one sensation. You couldn't have the one experience without the other experience. Now this is a rather good thing to know. Because it means

that you won't panic if you discover this people who suffer from chronic anxiety are always in Doubt, you see, about this relationship between what I feel as myself and what I feel or something else.

Let's suppose you are anxious about your relationship with other people. You walk into a room like this restaurant here, and you sit down at dinner and some stranger opposite to you. You know nothing about the stranger, and you begin maybe you feel a little reluctant to open conversation. You don't know what kind of a whether this person is going to be sane or some kind of a crackpot, or some kind of awful stuffy square, or you don't know what it is. So you start dancing around a little but you get the feeling you see. And now I better watch myself because I do after all want to make a good impression. I don't want to make an enemy. So you watch yourself, and, this is a funny thing then begins called self-consciousness. And people say sort of Ha-Ha to each other and the usual way in which strangers come on.

And, there is also there are there is there is involved in this encounter the secret game is that people are playing all the time. To defend themselves by putting other people down. This is really a very wicked game but, every cretin see every every living being, if the truth be told is a manifestation of everything that there is an art of what it is what we call God in old fashioned language. Every human being is, and every one I as I look around I can see every one of you as the the Divine Being coming at me in a different way. Crazy.

But the thing is that what we do is to try and prevent people from realizing that this is so by pointing out to them in the most subtle ways their limitations. And seeing if we can phase them. Put a person off a little bit, make the man uncertain, make them unsteady. It's like all sorts of games that you can play where if a person wavers he loses. But people play that with each other all the time. And the reason they do it is not the reason they think. It is that the game if everybody were perfectly clear that they were a manifestation of the Divine Being, nothing very much would happen. But so as to keep everybody a little bit unclear about it, the whole thing bugs itself and creates these little doubts. So what we are beginning with this is little doubts, you see, these sensations of blockage of not being very sure of

yourself, but knowing very much indeed that you are yourself and that you're alone and it's all up to you. That terrible feeling of responsibility.

So but, what I'm trying to point out to you is if you intensify that feeling, and bring it to its highest pitch, you will immediately realize that you are aware of it only by virtue of the entire sensation of something else. Something defined as not you. So, the feeling of not you and the feeling of you, are relative. They go together, and you can't have the one without the other, and if you can't have the one without the other that means there's a secret conspiracy between the two. They're really the same, but pretending to be different. Because the whole idea is, if there wasn't a difference you wouldn't know anything was happening. I mean if it was all the same it's like that song of Bob Dylan's which says something like, 'Well I'm just like Guy Like you I was like anybody else no use me talking to you, because you just like me.'

So, the whole point is that of everybody of us all but the same and all share the same ideas exactly and so on, there'd be no nothing to talk about, because everybody would be a bore. There'd be just yourself echoing back at you. You would feel like a madman and a hall of mirrors where everything you went as was just yourself seeing in all directions that you well that's not fun. But, you may think that I'm speaking in favor of some kind of schizoid pluralistic universe. No, the whole point is this that a difference. And every kind of variety of differentiation is the way through which unity is discovered. I mean this business about. [french] is very important. And the fact that men and women, for example, as a primordial kind of difference, never can really understand each other is tremendously exciting. Because of that and that's a way by which something happens. If it makes a difference then it's there. If it doesn't make a difference it doesn't matter and what doesn't matter doesn't exist because it has no matter.

So however, it is, wherever you notice a difference, the difference has two sides. What it is, and what it's not. And these two sides, since you can't have the one side without the other side, they're really one. Because they go together inseparably. So, when you get this extreme sense of your own existence as a rather painful fact in the middle everything else. The everything else feeling and the you feeling, are two poles of one and the

same process so that the real you is what lies between these poles and includes both of them. Now this is the fundamental principle of the whole way in which ancient Chinese thought developed. The philosophy of the yang and the yin. This is one of the oldest ideas in the universe. I mean, no that's a rather too big language. On this planet. And, the philosophy which I shall have occasion to speak of a little bit more later of the Book of Changes, the I Ching, is based entirely on this. That the universe, is the interplay of difference, and the primordial difference is between up and down., band front black and whitee. Is and isn't, male and female, positive and negative. So the word yang in Chinese means or refers to the south side of a mountain, which is the sunny side. The word yin refers to the north side of the mountain, which is the shady side. Did you ever see a South-sided mountain only, with no north side. Or in it may also young may refer to the north bank of a river which gets the sun and you into the south bank of the river, which gets the shade. And so, you will remember this. And one half of course is colors, dark. As it were, two fishes interlocked. And they are chasing each other. They actually form now you see more complicated symbols in which they form a helix. This is a helix. And the Spiral Nebulae are shaped this way, in the form of a helix and this is the position of man and woman making love fundamentally. Where I am trying to get inside you, and you're trying to get inside me, and we're trying to get into the middle of each other, but somehow or other a difference and we can never quite get there. Just like if I want to see the back of my head I can go around and around and I can chase it but I never quite catch up with it. But that's what makes everything work. It is said in the the Vedanta sutras without. The Lord of the supreme no of all things who is the knower in all of us doesn't know itself. In the same way that fire doesn't burn itself and a knife doesn't cut itself.

So, nothing to God even, you see, would be more mysterious than God. Do you know somehow how you surprise yourself. For example, when you feel your own pulse. And you suddenly feel this life going on in, which you're not willing. Are all sorts of ways in which you can say you have the belly rumbles and you didn't intend to have the bed around bills and suddenly it happened or you had hiccups. And now are you having hiccups or not? Is this something you're doing, or is it merely something that's happening to you, as if it was raining in the rain was happening to you. This is a very

debatable question. Consider breathing. Are you breathing, or is it breathing you. Well you can feel it either way you can decide to breathe and feel that you're breathing in just the same way that you walk when you want to on the other hand when you forget about breathing altogether it still goes on and so it seems to be something that happens to you which is it? Do you grow your hair or does your hair just grow by itself? What enables you to make a decision. When you decide, do you first decide to decide, or do you just decide. Now how do you do that nobody knows you see.

When Chuang Tzu tells a story that one philosopher asked, another how can one get the Tao which is the power of nature so as to have it for one's own. And the other philosopher answers. Your life is not your own it is the delegated adaptability of Tao. Your offspring are not your own, they are the outputs of Tao. You move you know not how, you are addressed you know not why. These are the operations of Tao. So how could you have it for your own. And there's a funny thing then. We can experience ourselves through and through, as something that just happens. Look look, at it this way. If you feel your body, your skin, your solidity our view. And regard what marvelous eyes you have, which are the power which generate light and color. Out of all these electrical quanta in the external world. And these ears. These beautiful shells that you wear on the side of your head. With their little spiral bones, cochlea inside you know all that marvelous. But you really don't you don't feel responsible for this. You don't know how it's made it is made. But it's you. That's what you are. That extraordinary pattern, beautiful, gorgeous. Wonderful arabesque of tubes and bones and cartilage and myriads of interconnecting electronics and nervous systems and everything wonderful to see.

But the point, most people, don't don't notice they don't say this is me they say well it's some kind of very clever machine which a lot God made out of his infinite wisdom and put me in it. And this is a very limited view. Because the extraordinary thing is you see, that this is you. This extraordinary marvelous goes on, you see, but you can feel it all of it as if it was just happening to you. But if you want to feel it that way then you've got to go the whole way and you've got to feel that your decisions just happened to you. And that the thing that you call yourself to which things happen is just something that happens. You're going to you don't know how

you managed to be and you go how you happen to be conscious. That just happened too. So happenings happen to happening. So you can really yourself completely irresponsible like that so. There's nowhere. Or, when you get that way. That's a very interesting road to run. But you can try the other way. You can extend it and say, now look here. If, I really am my eyes, and although I don't understand them I mean that is sad I can't describe it in lines and words. This is mean. Extraordinary thing, but it is.

Well I don't understand how it happens. But then, you see, that's the whole point as I made a little while ago that the very Lord God Himself doesn't understand how he happens, because if he did. What would be the point? There would be no mystery we no possibility of surprises. That's why there has to be young and human Yang is bright and it understands everything yin is dark and damned if she will be understood. But there are two phases of the same being so your yang side is your conscious attention, all the bright things you know, and all the information you have and all the know-how and that you know what to do and your yin side is the other side of the young which enables the young to function because you don't know why the young inside of you function that is the conscious, bright, intelligent side of you. It all depends on something you don't understand at all. Because if it didn't, it wouldn't be there. Just like you wouldn't be here unless there was something else. So they move together.

And therefore, if you will accept the idea that you are your own eyes and your own heart and your own ears with that wonderful little spiral cochlear inside and all these amazing gadgets where you are all that. But you don't know anything about it, but you are it. Now therefore, by a little extension of the imagination you can very well see that if all those the bones and subtleties inside you feel other than your conscious ego. But nevertheless are one with it the same argument will go for all the other things going on around you. The sun shining, the stars twinkling, the wind blowing, and the great ocean restlessly pounding against these clips. That's you too. You don't control it of course, because it has to be something about you you don't control or you wouldn't you. Now see that all all that is a lesson elementary in relativity. And relativity, I've talked about it in this way which is kind of unscholarly and so on, but I want to get the message across the idea across because to understand the principle of relativity is the

absolute foundation of the philosophy of the Tao. Lao Tzu takes it up in a second chapter, when he says when all the world understands beauty to be beautiful, there is already arguments when all the world understands goodness to be good there is already evil. Thus to be and not to be, arise mutually. High and Low are posited mutually. Long and short are compared mutually. And he goes through a whole list of opposites, and show how they create each other.

It's like that wonderful little parable. The Chinese character of a man looks more or less like an upturned V. And Lafcadio Hearn in one of his books tells the story of a Japanese girl telling our little sister the meaning of the character of a man by taking two sticks of wood and balancing them together on the ground, two sticks of firewood, so that they form the upturned V. and she says to her little sister this is the character from man. Because neither stick will stand up unless it has the other to help it. And so you know we we must dig up the other. About the profound meaning underneath this is there is no self without other. And no man and ever don't create get back the original plan every creature in the world feels it's a man I don't mean a male, but a human. And that is because it is in the Situation, where the thing it feels as itself as it separate identity is supported by the equal and opposite sensation of other. Center, periphery. Here, there now, then. Is, isn't. Or whatever. These two, the yang and the in the yin, two poles that hold each other up. So the sand poem says. When misfortune comes, treat it as a blessing. When fortune comes treat it as a disaster. Once upon a time there was a Chinese farmer, who lost a horse, ran away and all the neighbors came around that evening and said, 'That's too bad.' And he said, 'Maybe.' The next day the horse came back and brought seven wild horses with it. And all the neighbors came around and said, 'Why that's great isn't it?' and he said, 'Maybe.' The next day his son was attempting to tame one of these horses and was riding it and was thrown and broke his leg. And all the neighbors came round in the evening and said, 'Well that's too bad isn't it?' and the farmer said maybe. And next day the conscription officers came around looking for people for the army and they rejected his son because he had a broken leg and all the neighbors came around that evening and said Isn't that wonderful and he said, 'Maybe.'

This in a way in a certain sense reflects a fundamentally Taoistic attitude, which is that the whole process of nature is an integrated process of immense complexity. And it is really impossible to tell whether anything that happens in it is good or bad. Because you never know what will be the consequences of a misfortune. Or, you never know what will be the consequences of good fortune. I know a woman who was quite happy until she inherited two million dollars. And then she became absolutely miserable because she was afflicted with paranoia that everybody was going to take it away from her, especially the government. And on the other hand, you've all known cases where some sort of ridiculous inconvenience or accident, served to preserve you from a worse one or else it was an occasion on which you met someone you fell in love with or formed a fast friendship with, you never know what is the chain the pattern the connection between events and it is for this reason that the Taoist has been a critical of two things. One, of words, and two, of interference. He criticizes words because among the confusions who were always literary people they had a thing going all the rectification of names.

Now I have to introduce this a little observation about confusions in general because they have their positive and their negative side but their negative side, but their rather exclusive interest in matters literary. In the history of Chinese civilization, no kind of rigorous scientific advance came through Confucian studies. Because they were scholastics, they were, that is to say. A scholastic is one who knows what's in the book and believes what the ancient texts of the ancient scriptures say and he studies them and becomes proficient like a rabbi or a Christian theologian. But mystics are not interested very much in theology. All mystics have been interested in direct experience, and therefore although you may laugh at them as mystics and say they are not scientific, they are empirical in their approach, and the Taoists, being mystics were the only great group of ancient Chinese people who seriously studied nature. They were interested in it from the beginning, and their books are full of analogies between the principles of a Taoist way of life and the behavior of natural forces of water, of wind, of plants and rocks. In many many passages, Lao Tzu likens the Tao to water, in the fact that it doesn't resist and yet nothing is stronger in the fact that it always takes the line of least resistance that it always seeks the lowest level which men abhor, and many many things are said about water many things are

said about plants many things are said about the processes of growth, about wind, how wind plays music with all the orifices and openings in nature, and blows through them, and makes and brings out their particular hum.

So it was strangely enough, from the Taoists that Chinese people developed as much science as they did develop. But you know, they never developed anything like Western technology. And this is because, or in part because, there are many many reasons, some of them purely geographical. But one of the reasons why the Chinese did not go on to develop an advanced technology, had to do with names and it had to do with a certain attitude to nature.

Now, so far as names are concerned, the Taoists always laughed at the idea of the rectification of names, because they said, 'Now look, when you compile a dictionary, you define your words with other words.' Now, with what other words you go to define the words with which you define the words. So as to be sure you've got them straight. I remember when I was a small boy I wanted to write a book which would preserve for ever the fundamentals of human knowledge. And so the first thing I wrote down in it was the alphabet, and then I scratch my head, as how I would write down how to pronounce each of these letters. And I tried to spell out in letters how to pronounce letters, not realizing of course that this was a completely vicious circle. You have to have something in order to understand words, you have to have something else. And that is a very mysterious matter, the kind of understanding that we have of things, which we then go on to describe in words. And one realizes how much one learns as a child especially from other people which is never explicitly stated. How do you know for example, whether somebody who says something to you is serious or kidding? A great deal of confusion is caused by that even among adults. And how, the processes have been examined and analyzed and studied which are required for understanding the simple sentence. And we don't yet know how the brain of a child accomplishes this extraordinary task. Which when an analyst looks at it, is extremely complicated. But of course you must realize that analysis is a way of making things complicated that we're not complicated in the first place and it was like my task that I set myself as a child the amazingly complicated task of how to write down how the letters were pronounced.

Now, a great deal of academic energy goes into this task, of proving things that everybody knows. But they want to say precisely what thing is it that you know. How can delimit it, how can we pin it down exactly and this of course there's very much involved also with law. And that's why you devised bequeath. You know you got a whole long list of words I devised because we give cetera etc So that can be absolutely no doubt about what you mean, but as a matter of fact the trouble is the more definite you become with words in describing something the more doubt you create. And so the Taoists took a profoundly humorous attitude to the, to the Confucians interest in spelling things out. Because they said you can never do it. Do you ever play a game any of you called Vish? What the rules of this game. You get say there are five people playing and you appoint a referee and each person has a copy of the same dictionary say Webster's Collegiate Dictionary and then you have many words in a hat or something and the referee draws out a word and he says. Escalator. And then, you turn it up in the dictionary and then you get a definition and you look up an absolutely key word in the definition has to be a really crucial word not the or a or something and then you look at up and then you take a key word in that definition and then when you get back to the word escalator you raise your hand and call out Vish, which is short for a vicious circle. And thereby you have won the round and the referee is there to decide that you played fair and that you did take key words from each definition and so on and you didn't cheat.

So, this shows you see how a dictionary unless it has little pictures in it. Which give you another way of understanding things a dictionary is an entirely circular process as simply a self defining affair. So that when you encounter, say I pick up a Chinese dictionary. Or better still for my purposes Supposing I pick up a Finnish dictionary which has nothing in it but Finnish language, it doesn't tell me a thing. Because I haven't got the key and the key to this language is not altogether communicable in language. So for this reason then, the Taoists being thoroughly skeptical of the power of words to describe the processes of the physical world.

Now, the Chinese language as such is a rather peculiar language unlike most other languages in that it neither declines its nouns, nor conjugates its verbs. There are certain ways sometimes of showing whether a verb

indicates the future or whether it indicates the past but in general literally translated Chinese reads like a telegram. And so, the opening of the chapter of the Lao Tzu book on Te, that is to say on power, or virtue. Says in literal English. Superior Te. Not Te, thus this has. Inferior or of virtue not let go of virtue. Thus this not virtue. And this says it so succinctly.. And we have to go away bubbling around and saying, The superior form of virtue is not conscious of itself as virtue, and thus truly is virtue. But the inferior form of virtue so insists on being virtuous that it's not virtue. And that's a very complicated way of saying things as the Chinese says it's so pithily. And so, but on the other hand, the the Chinese language which is not specific in this way that we can be, by declining nouns and conjugating verbs exactly what how and to whom we are have a better language and so do the Japanese, because they have an arrangement for using Chinese in such a way as to decline the nouns and conjugate the verbs. We have a better language for describing technological processes. You know how it is when you get a set of instructions to put something together. First do this, then do that, then do the other things well boy you should get some kind of a Chinese product from Hong Kong we've put together instructions and you just know where, you have to know how it's done before you read it. Oh yes. So. You mean on these sort of emergency instructions yes?

But at the the compensatory delight of this language is that you can say several things at once and mean them all. And, however the point now that we go on to, is the second one. With this realization that language is a net which will never succeed in capturing the world, goes a reluctance to interfere with the processes of nature. Because what you think may be a good thing to do may be good only in the short run. It may turn out to be disastrous in the long run, to give the very simple example which is very close to the hearts of all Chinese and Asian people: the problem of population. What on earth are we going to do about that? Because, in times past the huge populations of India and China were pruned by perennial outbreaks of cholera and other diseases which wiped out millions of people famines and so the population was proved. Now however, with the methods of modern medicine, we begin to stamp out these plagues. But then a new plague turns up in the form of human beings. Too many of them. Well, you mustn't you can't just can't go around in cold blood shooting down people are getting rid of people you regard as not making up to certain standards. It

was somehow better if the cholera did it, because that was impersonal and it bore you know spite. But when human beings have to decide to get rid of each other then there's real trouble.

So a Taoist would be on the whole inclined not to interfere with the course of events, because he feels that they are of a complexity so great that he, with his verbal interpretations, because all that we call scientific knowledge is a verbal interpretation of what's going on, and of certain selection of things that we call good and the selection of certain things that we call bad. Well, he feels that he doesn't really know in terms of words whether a given event is good or bad. He may feel badly about it but he may feel that this is the proper and appropriate way to feel in such circumstances, and that it will go over, it will pass for as Lao Tzu said, 'The fierce gale does not last the whole morning. Nor does pelting rain go on all day.' Maybe you haven't lived in Big Sur. But still in general then he goes on to say if heaven and earth cannot keep up these things along how much less can mankind.

So this then is a basic attitude in Taoist philosophy which goes by the name of Wu Wei. And that is this. That means Wu, that means. Negative. And wei, wei means, doing, interfering, business. Poking into things. So Wu Wei means don't interfere, don't strive, don't, don't really the best meaning of Wu Wei is don't force it. As when for example you're opening a lock and the key doesn't seem to turn if you force it, you'll just bend the key so what you have to do is jiggle pull back and forth jiggle jiggle jiggle until you find the place where the key turns. And that's Wu Wei. Wu Wei doesn't mean total passivity, because you see, on the other side of the picture about interfering with nature. Is that you must interfere, there is no way of not interfering even when you look at something you interfere with it. It is your very existence is an interference with the environment, from a certain point of view.

So, there you are, you're stuck with it. Everything you do alters the balance even if you sit perfectly still you're still breathing, and that alters the, the nature of things going on around you. You're exuding temperature and that changes something. And then when you start eating and doing all sorts of things like that you really do start changing things. So you can't avoid

interfering, and yet the the maxim is don't interfere but it means best that translated don't force it.

So then, what do you do? Well you have to interfere as wisely as possible. That is to say, you have to find out, how to interfere along the lines in which things are already developing. This is like sailing a boat. It is a much smarter to sail than to row, because it takes less energy. You simply use the wind by putting up a sheet. But then, supposing the wind isn't going where you want to go. Then you learn to tack. But you keep the wind in your sails all the time and you use the wind to go against the wind. And therefrom comes the idea of Judo. Judo is the Japanese way of saying the gentle Tao, the gentle way. And, in Judo, the basic principle of the whole thing. Is that. You are not an attacker that underneath judo is a deeper philosophy called Aikido. The way of. And Aikido is that you can never be attacked, because when somebody attacks you, you are not there. Or, you are there, but in the form of a vacuum. So that the attacker get sucked in. So fast by his own force that he falls over. So, in Judo one always uses the strength of the opponent to bring about his downfall. You may add your own strength at a certain point. In other words, when you are throwing someone in Judo. There is a point where his own strength has taken him beyond the peak. You know, when a thing is falling over it reaches a certain peak where it's gone you see, it's all it's on the way down. It is at this moment that you add your strength and saying wowiee see, when there's a curious throw in judo where you are you get a solid you get holding him and you get him up on your foot like this you see and then he is moving in this direction. So, just when he is off balance you go woops, like that and so anyway over on the floor that direction. But he has to be beyond the falling point you see and then only do you use your strength. Because all you have done now in executing this throw, was that you fell backwards with your own weight and he was pushing at you. You see at a moment when he was pushing at you like that it is entirely opportune to put your foot up and fall over backwards and. Because way over. And that's quite a throw to get involved in I can assure you. But Judo, you see is a development out of the Taoist philosophy, by probably, Japanese people. Judo is relatively modern. But, it comes out of all sorts of understandings going back to Chinese ways of doing things and gradually amalgamated into the form in which we know it today. But it is a

basic demonstration of this principle of wu wei, which Jafu has written now in cursive characters.

So, it isn't an attitude of total passivity. It isn't just doing nothing, as it literally says, not do. But it's really not force. So you need always in every situation to find out which way the wind is blowing. Trim your sails to the wind. This is the meaning of it. Well now then, now how do you know which way the wind is blowing? Obviously a scientist would say to you Well we have to make a very careful analysis of the situation and find out just what's going on. And then, this becomes extremely interesting because now scientists are doing this very seriously. And they have devised very important science that we call ecology. And in ecology we study the whole complex of relationships which lie between any organism and its environment. And when we get to the ecology of mankind it is simply fantastic. When you study, for example, the ecology between man and the world of microbes, and you try to decide what are good guys and bad guys among the microbes how to get rid of the bad guys without getting rid of the good guys and then realizing you need some of the bad guys otherwise the good guys fall apart. And some of the killers we use are on the, the level of medicine very much like what D.D.T. is on the level of agriculture it's too indiscriminate. And it gets too many of the good guys along with the bad guys that you become after time very doubtful as to the precise definition of a good guy and a bad guy because you see every group every species has to have an enemy. That's part of the whole mutual eating society arrangement of life. If you don't have an enemy, then you start multiplying too much. Nothing prunes you. Then you start getting in your own way because there are too many of you you start eating up your all your own supplies of food stuff also you get soft. You're not on the . You develop flabby muscles because you never get involved in a fight. And so gradually, the successful group fails. The group which managed to obliterate all its enemies will fall apart. But that's the way things run. And the question is can we run the human race without awful bloodshed and murders and talkers and all that kind of thing can we somehow introduce a new kind of gamesmanship as a substitute for war.

Also you get soft. You're not on the qui vive. If you develop flabby muscles because you never get involved in a fight. And so gradually the successful group fails. With the group which managed to obliterate all its enemies will

fall apart. So, what are we to do about that? See, part of the whole joke of present day international politics is that the United States in order with its vast prosperity and enormous facilities for living the lazy life must have an external enemy to get excited about. And so, even though the Cold War is in a way, total nonsense, and everybody who is in the know about anything knows it. That for example, an atomic war between Russia and the United States will simply end of the human race. But the populace has to be kept bamboozled. And we keep fighting wars like in Vietnam in order to keep everybody excited and in order to make a frackas out and to give the soldiers practice. It's a horrible business, but but that's the way things run. And the question is, can we run the human race? Without the awful bloodshed and murders and tortures and all that kind of thing can we somehow introduce a new kind of gamesmanship as a substitute for war. It's the same thing in business. Exactly. If you wipe out your competitor, then you have no reason to produce anything but a lousy product. And then you may make lots of money, because then you've wiped out your competitors. You've got the whole market, and then you've got this money what you're going to buy with it. Well you know there's nothing to buy said other people's lousy products you wiped out their competitors. Or who cheated the public by packaging the thing to look elegant, but it was nothing inside that's all you got to buy.

So naturally, if you're a success in General Motors you go and buy a Rolls Royce remained. Or you go buy a Mercedes, from Germany because I happen to be better cars. Or if you want to make a lot of money in the clothing industry here making wretched prints and you want some good clothes what do you do when you have to go to Mexico and buy the things peasants wear, because they're still substantial solid, damn good clothes. So you see, there's something always self defeating in these attempts to succeed. Because say nothing fails like success. So, for this reason then, the Taoist always had an attitude of caution. Cautious Lao Tzu says, as one who crosses a river in spring. That means either because of the spring floods or because the ice is still there and you're not quite sure how strong it is. Because it's beginning to thaw.

So, the, what the Taoist tries to develop is a sensibility to the situation. He tries to feel out intuitively what kind of action is required under these

circumstances, because he feels that he can never discover it analytically. With his conscious attention alone. Well now, to talk in modern western terms about how this is done, we must realize of course that we are equipped inside our heads with an absolutely fantastic thing called the brain. With its millions and millions of neurons cells it is as it were, the most amazing computer ever devised. Basic to the Taoist attitude to life is that you have that within you and you may if you don't know anything about brains very much call it intuition or something of that kind but you have within you the most amazing logical analyzer that exists in the known world. And the point is to get it to work for you. And instead of trying with conscious attention alone, which can only think of about three things at a time without using a pencil. That is to say, keep three variables in mind at once. Very few people can do four without using a pencil. You can do four if you're a trained musician where you got for your playing for different lines of a fugue, say you're keeping four variables in mind at once with an organist you can go from four to six because you've got your two feet and they're playing too. But that requires a higher amount of training to be able, with conscious attention to keep these many variables in mind. But the world around us has infinitely many variables going in it, and you can reason out something with your conscious verbal thinking. Say you want to make a contract in business and you figure out how to make it. Whether it will be a good contract, whether it will work but cetera et cetera and you think of all these things and write them down and you make the contract you think that's fine but one of the variables that you couldn't possibly include in the contract was that your partner would slip on a banana skin and break his neck. All sorts of things I mean the contract might make provisions and if your lawyer was thoughtful of what was to be done on the case of the disability of any of the part is there to cetera but eventually there are so many possibilities that can occur that you cannot think of them all.

So then the question arises, is it within the power of the human brain to comprehend, because of its immense complexity, in a kind of are un or subconscious way what the surface consciousness can never grasp and that the Taoist would say certainly it can. But you've got to learn to use your brain. By allowing it. To go to work on your problems without interfering with it and then it will deliver you a decision. And this is why, when you get to when you get to the real study of Taoist and Zen Buddhist practice,

you get to the point where you learn to act without making decisions. Or rather, to use a more exact word, without choosing. Krishnamurti talks a great deal about being choicelessly aware. And he says freedom is precisely the state of not having to choose. Now that sounds quite paradoxical, because we're always talking about freedom of choice. Choice is not a form of freedom in the sense of the word what is choice in the sense of the word choice is the act of hesitation that we make before making a decision. It is a mental wobbling. You know some people when they take up a pen to write they don't just write but they jiggle the pen around indecisively like this, and then start writing. Or a person comes into a room and wonders who to talk to and sort of is in doubt you see in that moment he is choosing. Whereas a person who comes into a room and decides who to approach, he doesn't wait to choose. We say, 'He is decisive.' But that's a funny saying, because it means he doesn't stop to decide. So in the training in Zen Buddhism which is simply a Buddhist extension of Taoism I'm it all it was then Buddhism arose out of the marriage of Buddhism and Taoism in the fifth century A.D.. And over the following centuries.

So they have a way of training you so that you always act without choosing. For example, there was one day a leaky roof. And there were a couple of monks attending the Zen master and he said The roof is leaking. One monk disappeared and came back instantly with a sieve. And put it on the drips another month after some time came back with a bucket. And a master praised the one who brought the sieve. Now, the action wasn't exactly appropriate. I mean, you know to catching rain, but the point was that he was in the spirit of the Zen discipline, by acting without choosing. And you'll notice this with certain people. Certain people never hesitate. They always seem, if something needs to be done, they seem somehow simply to grab something and do it. You know, which is a kind of a Zen capacity.

So what happens is this. That, the teacher of Zen constantly throws curves of his students and puts them in Dilemma situations where they have to act immediately. One of the things of course that you mustn't do is rush because rush is a form of hesitation. You, rushing, when a person rushes to get a train he starts to fall over his own feet see so it really holds him up it's like trying to drive at high speed through the water with a blunt-nosed boat. That's rush. But now what he's trying to get is a kind of a smooth

unhesitating flowing action that is the response to the challenge. And it must be done in the what with what is called, another use of this word mu. This is called Wunyin in Chinese on Muyin in Japanese. And this word now in. Is composed of the character meaning now and the character meaning mindheart Shin. And so has the meaning of a thought, but especially for us, it is well translated by the psychological term blocking. Your blocking. You say to someone when they hesitate, when they dither, when they stop to choose

So the attitude of Moonen or Wunyin is the I'm blocked mind. Where it doesn't hesitate ever. Just as the river doesn't hesitate when it flows, and just when you clap your hands the sound comes out without hesitation and when the moon rises, the water doesn't wait to reflect it, it reflects it instantly. So that instant reflection, or it's a kind of resonance, is what is looked for as a response of the individual to his environment. And he does this to the degree that he knows himself to be one with his environment. Then his, his capacity for response increases in according to the way in which he feels that he is simply all of a piece with it and not something that is in it and with a barrier around him through which messages have to get and then those decisions have to be made up and sent out.

So then, you could say that a kind of extremely subtle sensory awareness has to be developed as between the individual and his environment, so that he feels it out. Now today, this sort of talk is very unpopular, because scientifically-minded people, especially academics scientists. Those who teach in universities, are exceedingly suspicious of intuitive reactions. I say oh wah wah wah, you can get into all sorts of trouble that way. But the thing that they neglect to do to realize is that everybody uses it. Even the most meticulously careful, analytical, rigorous sound scientist uses intuitive judgment after a certain point why? Because you may accumulate data forever. And you may decide that this is on the whole, taking all do things into due consideration and proceed as having been worked out that this is the right thing to do why do you decide then? Mostly because time's up. And somebody is pressing for a decision or else you're bored to death with bringing in data. Because you never know much how much data you need to make a certain decision, and therefore you may go on collecting data to all is blue but in the last analysis you'll work on hunch. And so much is

actually in the end decided by flipping coins. And the pity of flipping coins for making decisions gives you only two choices. Heads or tails. One way or the other the Chinese have a more subtle way of flipping coins. They have a method of a sixty four sided coin, to flip. So that instead of just heads or tails there are sixty four possibilities of coming to a decision when you don't know what to do. This is called the I Ching, or the Book of Changes, where the symbols of yang onion that is to say for Yang and yin. The straight line undivided for year in a line broken in the middle there are sixty four ways of combining six of these lines in a hexagram.

And so, there is a complex method, when you have to make a grave decision for the tossing. You do it by tossing sticks or coins and it gives you one of these sixty four figures. Now, if you are very wise and have started the Book of Change for a long time, you don't need to use the book you just look at what the figure is and you can tell what it means because you see these figures are made up of. Each six hexagram figure is made up of two three-fold components. That has two components, of which this one is water and this one is heaven.

So you will have water over heaven, and a person very skilled in the interpretation will feel out the meaning of water over heaven. But actually, if you are not so skilled, there is the book, and for each of these hexagrams, the book has an oracle. And it tells you in a curiously vague and yet curiously precise terms the meaning of this hexagram. And then you, in the light of your own situation make up your mind what it's saying to you in the light of the problem that you've raised the question that you've asked the decision that you had to make you will find invariably that these sixty four choices are one of them or indeed all of them but you have to pick one of them because you are after all tossing a coin. But it has some peculiarly appropriate thing to say to you under your circumstances, and is just like having a conversation with a very very wise old gentleman.

And you must realize that today in Asia, this book is still widely used for making business and political decisions although people who are Westernized wouldn't let on perhaps that they use it and so anybody who does politics or does business with Asia should be completely versed in this book. To know what sort of thinking, what sort of approach might be

expected under any circumstances. If you could ever find out what hexagram had fallen when a certain politician made a decision that would be immensely enlightening as to his future course of action.

In the same way for example in dealing with Hitler, our strategists I don't know if they did should have been students of astrology. Because he was always consulting astrologers. And therefore astrology would be much more easy to penetrate in the evening because you would know Hitler is looking all the time at his own horoscope. Well we have access to Hitler's horoscope, and so we know what he's thinking about it, but you don't have access to what hexagram Mao Zedong threw when he decided to do something or other.

So it's a little bit more subtle. Well then, I'm making the point then that our scientists are very suspicious of the intuitive judgment. But nevertheless they all use it, in the end. And so, it is made, this suspicion, that science has of intuitive judgment has filtered down to the average person in terms of a mistrust of his own intuition. Of the marvelous analytical powers of his own brain. And so, we are always in a dither of doubt as to whether we are behaving the right way doing the right thing and so on and so forth and lack a certain kind of self-confidence. And if you see, you lack self-confidence, you will make mistakes, through sheer fumbling. If you do have self-confidence you may carry away with doing entirely the wrong thing. In the British have an enormous degree of self-confidence. They know they're right, and they don't even question in there there are certain kinds of British types who are absolutely there aplomb is unbelievable. And you can't shake them, but I wouldn't dream of it. They're not even defending themselves they know there's a ride. And therefore, they can allow any kind of political revolution total free speech all sorts of things can go on which make Americans very nervous, because Americans don't have the same degree of aplomb. They're not quite sure. When you're an aristocrat and you've been brought up for generations in the right schools and there's never any doubt whatsoever you don't even have to mention the fact that you're an aristocrat see I mean that's why aristocrats know how to treat servants. But they never take it out on their servants in the sense of having to emphasize their own superiority. Because they know they're superior. They don't even question

it. Well, this is an extraordinary kind of nerve that they've built up and. So the only way. You know, you can do this.

The first of all in in Zen practice the thing that you have to understand is this. You have to regard yourself as a cloud. In the flesh because you see clouds never make mistakes. Did you ever see a cloud that was misshapen. Did you ever see a badly designed wave? Though they always do the right thing. Now so as a matter of fact do we because we are natural beings just like clouds and waves. Only we have complicated games, which cause us to doubt ourselves but if you will treat yourself for a while as a cloud or wave, and realize that you can't make a mistake whatever you do, because even if you do something that seems to be totally disastrous it all come out in the wash somehow or other. Then, through this capacity you will develop a kind of confidence, and through confidence you will be able to trust your own intuition. Only, the thing that you have to be careful about is, and many people who have not understood Zen properly fall into trouble here is, that when they take the attitude that I can't possibly make a mistake, they overdo it. Which shows that they don't really believe it. So a lot of people come on and say well in Zen anything goes, you're naturally with it anyway you are a buddha anyhow and I'm going to prove I'm a Buddha anyhow by breaking all the rules. And so they put on the weirdest filthiest clothes if you're going to steal things and all kinds of things like that that's overdoing it that shows that you haven't learned, you don't, you're overcompensating. Because before you. Told to do this do that now that and watch and be self conscious and was and so on, and so you just go to the other extreme. But this is the middle way, of knowing it has nothing to do with your decision to do this or not whether you decide that you can't make a mistake or whether you don't decide it is true anyway, that you are like cloud in water. And through that that realization, without overcompensating in the other direction you will come to the point where you'll begin to be on good terms with your own being and to be able to trust your own brain.

But at that level, you are supra-personal. That is to say, when you realize that you stand here as a body. It's as if you see, there was a calling to a certain cosmologist cosmological theories today, a primordial explosion which blew up and created the universe. And you know how it is when you take a bottle of ink and you throw it at a white wash wall. Smash, like that

and go splat all over the place. There's a big blob in the center and then as it goes out it gets all sorts of little curlicues and wiggles. So you see the cosmic explosion is still happening. It takes a long time for that big essential bang for the whole thing to go whoosh. Takes billions of years for it to happen and it's still happening and we're the little curlicues out on the edge, see. And we are connected, we are part of the central explosion that originally happened. That, in a certain sense is in you. You're still manifesting it, you see. So when you consider yourself as a physical being consider this and it is very ancient. Just like you pick up a stone to how old is this stone? Well scientists will say well it's about that comes from those the Plasticine age and it's probably, you know, four million years old. Then you say well where would I wait a minute wait a minute you mean four million years old where did it come from what was it before it was a stone? Well it was something or other. And that goes back back back you see so everything you touch including yourself is incredibly ancient. Goes back to the very beginning of time. So if your mind awakens, you suddenly see all your friends sitting around you looking incredibly ancient. I don't mean in the sense of old I'm haggard but like angels, like eternal beings who were always there from the beginning.

Landscape and Soundscape

I once talked to a woman, just a perfectly ordinary nice LOL, little old lady. And she told me about she'd had an accident in an elevator and she'd broken a leg, and got stuck under the elevator. And she was there for half an hour before anybody could get to us. And she said in that moment she realized that in this whole universe, there was not one single grain of sand that was out of place. And that is a curious vision that comes to people occasionally. When you see suddenly, that you've been looking at things in absolutely the wrong way. And it's it's really weird, you daren't talk to other people after this because then you'll be so misunderstood that you see that the most frightful things that can possibly happen. Fit in with this. It's very strange and very odd, but the reason is of course that when you get rid of the idea of the governor and the governed, the Boss and the employee. The King and the subject, there aren't any victims. Every creature that suffers in this world is unbeknownst, perhaps, to itself, doing it to itself no

one else is responsible. There are no victims. Because the whole thing is a unity. It is of itself everything is of itself self so. No one to blame.

So you see when in nowadays when a child is a juvenile delinquent and people come around the social workers and the police and say Now look here the terrible the child has learned a little psychoanalysis, and can say well it was my parents' fault because they brought me up in a traumatic way. And they got divorced or my father was a drunkard and my mother was a prostitute and what can you expect? So, then the public says Well they we should get after the parents when the parents say because they've done a little Freud. It wasn't our fault but it was our parents were neurotic too. And you see, you pass the buck back back back back back just because in the story of Genesis in the Garden of Eden when Adam was accused of having something wrong with him when the last dog saw him after eating the fruit he said this woman that thou gave this me she tempted me and I did eat. And God looked at the woman said, Well now what about it and she said The serpent tempted me and God looked at the serpent and nobody said anything no the serpent didn't pass the buck he didn't make any excuses because he knew. And there.

But in this way, you see, one passes the buck back all the time, and says it wasn't me I just got involved in this because the you my father and were messing around with my mother and you went too far now you've got a baby, isn't my fault. That's a terribly irresponsible attitude. See because you must recognize that you were your father's own desire. That was you, that glint in his eyes. And that, you go back back back, imagine, an explosion. Supposing I make a splash of ink against the thing and you see from the center. All these spray flows out. And so way back in the beginning of time maybe according to Fred Hoyle, there was a colossal explosion which threw out all the galaxies. And as the explosion goes out, the spray get finer and finer and finer and finer and you look at it as all one thing it's reaching out like you would spread your fingers like that and you every one of you a little reach outs on the end of that big explosion push and you see you go right back to the beginning. You you your bodies are the most ancient things that there are. And it goes like that yep takes millions of years to go splat. But you're in it right there you see, him you did it right in the

beginning you blew this thing up. Self-so. Everything happens of itself. It's a very interesting experiment, to let sound come to your ears.

Now why don't you try, why don't you all just close your eyes, and gently become aware of the whole world of sound around you in you. Don't try to identify the sound. And put names on. And just let them happen. Don't feel that you mustn't make any sounds like belly rumble, hiccup coughing song that's all perfectly part of a part of the scene. Just for a moment let all sound. Happen. Even when I talk, don't make any sense of what I'm saying. Just sound. You should listen like that before you go to sleep at night. And realize that you live in a magical musical continuum all the time. But you see ordinarily, we keep trying to correct what we're listening to. Pay attention to this, ignore that. And say to the children shut up, I can hear myself thinking, you see. But if you really know how to listen, you can concentrate on anything you want to in the middle of a complete pandemonium.

But so in the same way, one could give experimental exercises in listening, in using your eyes, in tasting mean feeling things. For example, picking up rocks and feeling them, because all this is letting yourself function just in the same way as I was discussing yesterday letting your brain give you answers. Because this is an act of faith in one's own being. It is allowing the body to be a democracy instead of a tyranny or shall we say, a republic. There's a certain difference between a Republican a democracy republic is rather more efficiently respectable. So that when that when you allow the body in other words to do what it will do, then you say well it will do it for me will it now wait wait a minute wait a minute who are you? Just as the Tao itself is not something other than the universe. Not a boss over it you aren't something other than but this design which is not just the body but the body and all its relationships to the universe. You don't stand apart from that, you don't have it. You're not in a situation where there's a kind of Inspector which is you which watches everything that goes by like you were watching the traffic Obama street. But we think we are that, and indeed seem to have a positive sensation of being the inspector who watches all this happen. Partly because of memory, which seems to give an impression that one is a static mirror, you see, which reflects everything that goes by. We get this from remembering, and on the other hand we get it

because we are trying to fight change. And resist it. You see, we are resisting all the time. If you were on Earth physically aware of all your muscular reactions, you would find you are going around most of the day doing this you know, fighting something. You can get a person to lie on the ground and say, 'Now look, you're completely supported by this floor. You won't fall down so let's go.' But it's very difficult for people because they're afraid that if they don't hold themselves together they will turn into a nasty goo that will all fall apart and rip through the floor. So everybody is trying to use their skin and their muscle of the whole themselves together whether that's. It will all take care of itself you won't fall apart. So, there's a constant resistance going on, and that resistance is experienced you can be aware of it in terms of a sense of strain here, between the eyes. This is its center. And that constant resistance to life, and the sensation of it, is what you actually feel when you think about yourself. I. It's that feeling of resistance.

Now if you let go, there is no necessity whatsoever for an inspector who watches everything that happens. You are what you experience your experience and you are the same. Your thoughts are you, your feelings are you. So, you would it is no necessity whatsoever to try and stand aside from the standoffish and say, you go away. So, if you can trust yourself, in other words, to the flow of what's going on. You won't need to resist it, and you'll find it works very well, just as your eyes work well when you don't try to force them. Just as the clothes are comfortable when you become aware of them. Now, this isn't the same as numbness, you see, it's quite different because you experience your body. In terms of what you ordinarily call everything else in other words as you look around here we are taught to think what I am looking at is out there. Now imagine this look what. The color of your hair from the standpoint of your own vision. Of your head. You know. Nothing. Now watch. It certainly isn't black is it behind your eyes you don't have a sensation of blackness. Nor of whiteness. There seems to be nothing there at all, as if you had no head from your own point of view. But actually, from the what it what it is how it looks inside your head is what you're seeing out here. Because you see, the optical nerves are back here, and your experience of all the shapes and colors around you is a sensation of the state of your brain. So what you are looking at is inside your head. But then, you can't be said to be looking at it because inside

your head is you. So, all this is how you feel. This is you, only it's true for each person. It's not more especially you are not more specially me than I am you. It's mutual It's like the dew drops on the spider's web reflecting one another.

So it is this then this letting. Your mind. Work by itself letting your eyes see for themselves that. is the preliminary to naturalness, in the way that Taoists understand it. Now let's go on from there to see what they how they express natural. They use two images. One is called the uncarved block. And the other, unbleached silk. And these two images lie at the root of all those great art forms of the Far East that are associated with Taoism and Zen Buddhism. And I'm going to show you the tea ceremony after this because that is the best possible demonstration of this particular mood. Because it combines, it is what you might call the art of the controlled accident. Because it combines discipline with spontaneity. But the mind of the uncarved block is this. Do you know there's a Japanese art called bonsaki?. Which is the cultivation of stones. You might call it the art of growing stones. The Japanese national anthem says, 'May our for a rain a thousand years rain ten thousand. Thousand years until little stones grow into mighty Rock six elevated with ancient mass.' Soldiers at the idea first of all that a stone is alive.

Next, there is a love of stones in their natural shape I have a huge series of slides that I took in Japan and nothing but the stone in gardens. And they have a genius for the selection our marvelous stones that they like stones that you will find in a river which had been worked on with the water until they looked almost like clouds, and they'll take one of these stones and hitch it up on a mule cart and bring it down, and then instead of just dumping it in the garden patching some marks on it, they'll take it away to a corner where it's in the damp and it will grow moss naturally. In Japan, moss grows quite quickly naturally, when the mosses grow naturally on the stone they move it into the place where they wanted it exactly in the garden and then they arrange sand around it in such a way that it looks as if it has always been that. You cannot you see there is nothing that's not natural nothing at all the idea that there is something artificial is a completely artificial idea. Because a skyscraper is really as natural as a bird's nest. But, how to demonstrate naturalness. You see, it's like what is called in

mathematics an asymptotic curve. That is, a curve that approaches the axis of a straight line as a straight line now is a curve going to the straight line it's always getting nearer always getting nearer but never touches it. What we call approximation. So the idea is to make a skillful approximation to the natural. But if it were just natural and only natural it wouldn't call attention to what it's doing. It wouldn't point it out.

And so the idea of the artist then, is when he makes a bowl. Or selects Iraq and puts it in place the. Is that the bowl should get the bowl and the rock should get the rock. They should look so much like. Well that rock you're always looking for. So then, this other word I mentioned that is still unbleached silk. You know how nice and leave silk is what we call natural color especially when you get Shantung which has a sort of texture in it. It has a sort of farewell to the I tell you what is the equivalent in our culture of burlap. Especially the smell of it. And burlap with nubbles and if you know and bits of straw. There's a wonderful feeling about that which is what is meant by says. It's primitive, Yes. But, marvelous.

When, well I'll tell you more about this later but the point is when. The great masters of Taoist and Zen Buddhists got their minds uncluttered and working properly, they suddenly discovered that some of the simplest things of everyday life. Simple utensils that were used in the kitchen the cheapest rice bowls that might be used by a peasant, were extraordinarily beautiful. They were unsophisticated. They were natural. In the same sense we have when a child, aged three starts dancing. There's no self-consciousness, no playing to the gallery and not when the child is just dancing. That's. Naturalness. Now the question is you see, for the adult who is all fouled up. How to recapture that? And this is what the greatest artists sweat blood trying to do. To make their work look. As if it had happened by itself. As if it had just grown there. Now, there are exceptions to this. But the exceptions prove the rule. Beethoven, in some of his Sonatas, a range the fingerings to be as unnatural and difficult as possible, so as to achieve the impression in the playing of the immense effort. But that's the exception that proves the rule. In the ordinary way, the expert musician seems to be using no effort at all it just happens through his fingers but if he wants to portray effort for some artistic reason, then this sort of trickery is introduced.

But the artist works and works and works all his life long to get to will become again as a child to regain original in innocence and naturalness. But you see what happens through that work. In doing the work of the artist becomes the master of a tremendously sophisticated technique. He knows exactly how to control his hand his brush his pain his chisels whatever easy using. About. However much you know how to say something how to express something that doesn't necessarily give you something to express and something to say. You can be a master of the English language and yet only have boring ideas. So then somehow you have to put your technique at the do. Supposal. Of what we call inspiration that means the Holy Spirit. And so in the same way the artist. Who practices for years and years and years. With his brush in the Chinese way. In the end finds that he cannot. Buy any stratagem of his own by any technique or any cleverness he cannot paint. And he has to give up. And then it happens. Well this you see then is what lies behind. All what we can definitely recognize as the naturalistic art of the Far East. Now I hope you know what I'm talking about. Because there are very very different kinds of Far Eastern art for example. The finest pottery of the Song Dynasty. Which will take us back to a thousand A.D.. Is completely unlike what most people think of as Chinese possibly. Chinese Postle in one thinks of white egg shell like stuff with very delicate designs of birds and butterflies and fine ladies and children playing battledore and shuttlecock. But the finest song. Is heavy. Jade green. Soft. Very self-effacing in a way. And it has a certain roughness or take Japanese so-called. Rockall where. There is a bow we will see some which is definitely handmade and bows and doesn't looks as if it wasn't even put on a wheel. And the glazes allowed to drool. And the bottom of the bow the clay has been left exposed. But you see that coloration reminds those artists of autumn. And they want to see that it is clay because a good partner does not force clay. To a bay his preconceived ideas. He evokes the spirit in the clay. To do some magic. So then because the clay did that these artists love the clay. They don't want to make the clay look like something else like Ivory they wanted to look like clay. So with that with clothes these clothes. So with everything would. Wood is loved by such artists they love the grain in the world. And therefore deplore paint. Lacquer there's another thing if you sparingly. But by and large wood is beautiful and you get floor like this you see about a nice thing about the flaws you can see it's wood you can see the grain and you some of the you may have been to the cups or a palace in

Kyoto where they have around them with the most gorgeous grain would you ever saw in your life it is today in shunting. I mean it's like looking at someone or some vision and you know you think you're going to go out of your mind looking at this great goddess stuff and so in the same way in the Japanese typical Japanese house tidy edge of the hour. Call the talk on there is almost invariably a wooden pillar which is made from. A plane tree trunk or branch so that you still see the knots in it and the curves and sometimes. They get I think some rubber exaggerated ones that are absurdly knobbly. But in the same way that we'd today have learned to like driftwood that is the thing in line with this Taoist spirit that. We. Appreciate wood as wood and don't try to make it look like marble or metal or some something else the same is true with paper the Chinese don't like our paper they say it has no character. They like paper with little. Threads in them and. With a texture to it. And they feel that that really is paper the paper gets the paper. And so, feel that our paper has some sort of plastic and none substance. And we are in danger of being engulfed by this through not having a love for the UN carved block and the unbelief silk which are fundamental substantial and natural.

Fanciers of Swords could never make up their minds which of the two was better. But certainly they were the on quest and masters. So a group of samurai one day thought, we've got to put this to the test. We think that probably Mr Matsushima is tops. But Mr Yamaguchi comes so close. So they took a sword by each master, and they went to a stream. And they first of all took Mr Yamaguchi sword. And they dipped it in the stream with the edge facing upstream and they set a piece of paper floating downstream. And as it came to the sword, the sword simply without being moved the paper divided itself down the blade joined together and floated on. Well, that's a hard act to follow. Anyway, they took Mr Matsushima sword, and dipped that in the stream and likewise set a piece of paper floated towards it. And what do you suppose happened just as the piece of paper approached the edge of the sword, it moved to one side provided it and then went back into course and continued And so obviously, Mr Matsushima was the better of the two swordsmiths. Why? Because the highest. Accomplishment in fencing is called the no-sword school. To be so good at fencing that you never have to use a sword. And there are all kinds of marvelous tales about great Samurai trained in Zen and swordsmanship. Who never, never had to use a sword. You may have seen a movie called

Samurai which comes in three parts. Takes you three evenings to see it, and it's the life of Miyamoto Musashi, who was one of the greatest of all Japanese history. He doesn't follow his life all the way through it only comes to the point where he had to deal. With another champion who insisted on challenging him, out of vanity. And how Musashi takes him on, fighting him at first only with an oar that has had the blade chopped off. And, but he maneuvers him into a position on the beach where the rising sun dazzles his opponent. And when his opponent makes a terrific swipe at him, he jumps over the sword, draws his own sword, and kills him instantly. But after that he is very hard to happy that he had to kill such assaults and finally he takes the advice of the Zen Master Takuan, who has all along been trying to dissuade him from a military career. So, sometime later. He was on his way to Kyoto. And this meant that he had to cross Lake Biwa in a small ferry boat that was rowed. And when he was on board another Samurai, who was a very volatile fellow who had had too much sake to drink came aboard and saw. What school of swordsmanship do you belong. Musashi said, the no-sword school. By this time the boat started. Ha, no-sword school like a see ya know sort of go and this drunk drew his sword. And Musashi said, now wait a minute, this is a crowded boat and if we start to do it people will get up not just innocent bystanders. Let's go to that island over there, and we can fight it out.

So he said to the ferryman, over that island. And he changed the course of the boat went to the island this drunken swordsman was so eager to get out and fight it he jumped onto the sound and immediately Musashi took the ferryman's oar and pushed the boat back and left him there, and he said You see my no-sword school.

So if I say to you. I'm you say hi. Say how are you, [you] say fine. There you are see. There's your original self. About if I should say in the middle of a conversation you'll find. Where we've been lately. Oh, went to Mexico for a trip. Where did you go? Oh, I went to Acapulco. Did you enjoy yourself. Not so bad. Why is my hand like buddha's hand? How do you handle that one? And a master, in such a situation, said to...[said] his disciple seemed blocked. He said to him so far your ounces of can quite natural and easy why do you feel some obstruction? When I ask you about my hand being like what has happened? Which in other words indicates,

use your brains. And he won't see, because he's used to linear thinking he's used to keeping on one track now this you notice you see we're all on us and they're caught when there's a conversation going on, we are uncomfortable if somebody changes the subject without ritual preparation. We are likewise uncomfortable when we are in the presence of crazy people, who might change the subject altogether too abruptly, and same way with drunks. Who may not observe the amenities of etiquette in the conversation. Rear all hung up on these tracks which is to have a one track mind. You can't jump. When the hands are clapped, the sound issues without hesitation. When Flint is struck with steel, the spark comes out at once. But he goes on to explain that in such a situation, you must not be in a hurry, because that itself would be a block. And blocking in this sense of the word, is exactly what the Buddhists mean by attachment. When they say, have no worldly attachment, it doesn't mean that you're to give up enjoying a dinner. It means giving up blocking. Getting beyond the state where your flow is interrupted, and so proceeds just as if the wheel were made too tight for the axle.

So, we would quite correctly translate attachment with the American slang equivalent hang-up. So it is the hangup, therefore, the attempt to arrive at the solution. To a problem demanding immediate action by reasoning, by calculation. Which must take us along the linear path. Whereas the event itself lies in a non-linear dimension. Never solve it that way. So also, with a curious property we call beauty. Or for that matter, virtue in human behavior. We know very well when we are in the presence of forced virtue.

So this happens. Once upon a time, the great tea master Rikyu went to the ceremony. And the host was very very proud of a new tea-caddy that he had bought made of pottery. And Rikyu didn't notice it. At least, so he thought. Which showed, because he was looking for it to be noticed, that he wasn't quite on to the philosophy of tea I had a friend, Japanese artist, who one day did a calligraphy for me. He took an ordinary small western house painters brush, about an inch wide. And he did the Chinese characters for one, two, three. That's one stroke These are all horizontal strokes, two strokes three strokes. And there was something dust and plastic about this. The brush you see, was partly sometimes dry, so that you've got hairlines instead of solid black. It so happened that a few days later we were due to receive a visit

from Dr Suzuki, the great Zen scholar. And I said I'm going to hang that picture in my office. And the artist said, I hope [he] won't notice it. Which is because, a fine work of art must so fit its surroundings. As not to stand out like a sore thumb. So in this way, Rikyu didn't notice the tea-caddy. But this so bothered the owner, that after the ceremony was over, he smashed it. However, one of his students knew that it was very valuable and he'd collect all the pieces. And then, he had them restored, by putting molten gold as a cement. This is an old technique. And so, when it is finished, you see the original piece with all these spidery lines of gold across it.

Sometime later, a son of the host brought out this mended tea caddy when Rikyu was having tea. And he said you know, that is most remarkable. When I saw that before, it was good. But now it's perfect. This is what one would call a controlled accident. And all great art is a controlled accident. That is to say, it has in it the component of control, but it also has the component of the accident and of the natural. And it's getting those two together that is the marvelous thing.

It's the same in human relationships. Let's take the relationship of love. If I am in love with a woman whom I can control, she may be, have a flawless body, beautiful behavior. But in. If I control her completely I might as well have a plastic doll. Only if she has a little mole on her cheek. Or something like that, or some kind of unpredictability of character. Then I know she's human. Because the accidental has been introduced into the domain of the orderly. So likewise, when you go into a person's house and everything is spotless everything in its place you feel you by God, If you smoke a cigarette you'll make the ashtray dirty. It's just that terrible. That has not got a quality which in Arabic is called Baraka. Now baraka means Grace, roughly but Baraka is a quality when you say of someone he fits like an old shoe. Or you've got a favorite sauce but that's only dirty but it's marvelous or an old pipe which you smoke, where it's become very suited to you it has Baraka, grace.

So the puzzle, for every artist is how to get grace to strike. How to let an accident happen well once upon a time there was a sculpture contest at the University of Chicago it was at the Chicago Art Institute. And the competition was that every entrant was given a cubic foot of plaster of

Paris. Do something with it. Now, the competition was won by a woman. And she started out by looking at that piece of plaster of Paris and said, this thing is so perfect that it doesn't know what It Wants to be. And so she grabbed it both hands and flung it on the floor in pieces but chipped off and it was cracked and so on then she looked at it again. And she said Now I know what it wants to do. And so, by following the grain which she had introduced into that, she made something beautiful. Now, following the grain is what you do when you do a Rorschach test. You see this blotchy thing, which is the Tao, which is the primordial wiggly universe. And then you see something in it, you see an image in it. And you see a far more beautiful image than you can ever draw. By what we call eidetic vision. And you assist. The piece of wood or stone or whatever it is in which you see that image. To do its thing. Now experiment with yourselves in this. Look when you especially when you wake up first thing in the morning. Look at patterns in drapery. Look at shadows on the wall. And go into that state where you are receptive to seeing images. And you will begin to see all kinds of faces and trees and landscapes. Leonardo da Vinci did this. He used to go out and look at a wall which was weathered made of bricks covered with bird shit, and all kinds of scratches and so on and he would watch it until he saw a vast scene you described seeing a whole battle going on. There was a Chinese Zen monk who had long hair, very unusual. And he used to drink an enormous amount of wine. And then when he was really far-out, he dipped his hair in ink. And then sloshed it over a piece of paper. And then he had dried out. And in the morning, he'd come back and look at what happened and he put himself into the state of mind and you begin to see a landscape. And it's fantastic, when you put yourself to this how detail after detail, it fits in. And all you had to do was make a little touches of the brush to bring it up for everyone to see. And it looks when we go to the caves of Glasgow, and those ancient parts of France and go down and see the prehistoric paintings of animals, that it looks very much like they had followed natural formations in the stone on the wall of the cave which had evoked that imagery of cattle, that to us in conceivably realistic people that primitive.

But we shall always find that when the artist has been following eidetic imagery, and has not been trying to construct the image by himself. Because this whole world is created in that way. We are not aware of this. Because

we are so accustomed to seeing it in the way that we think is real and normal. You can also train yourself to see things which haven't been seen before. This is what many artists do. For example, in the history of Western art, seven hundred years ago there were no landscape painters. Everyone was the portrait painter or they painted scenes of the doings of human beings angels and gods and so forth. And whenever there was landscape it was merely incidental background. Now in the course of time, people got fascinated with the landscape part. And they withdrew the figures and left the background. And so we got landscape painting, and the first people who saw the landscape painting looked at it and said, that's not what I call a picture. Why? Because they had seen landscape hitherto as insignificant background. And it took painters to draw people's attention to the beauty of landscape.

Now, you see what we could do and we are only just beginning to think about soundscape. When we record something, or go to a concert, we have the impression that there is the thing there. And so in radio studios, they cover the walls with soundproof tiles to keep out the sound of traffic. So that you have the thing, the important thing you're supposed to notice is the speech but the odd thing is, you listen to that back in your home. With the windows open you know all street knowledge is a coming in there's no reason why they should have been there in the first place. Well now, let's move to that. Think of soundscape. The hum that's going on behind all the things we're supposed to be doing. And you can realize it's very beautiful just as you can see that it landscapers the hum-scape, you see. And so there is become a school of musical composers like John Cage who treat us to background noise. Or to silent concerts. In which the concert is the sound spontaneously occurring in the auditorium. Now you may say that's not music. Who knows?

Well so, the world then is a humscape, is a landscape. A sky-scape. And over thousands of years, important people, that means strong people decided what was important to notice. And they told their children that that was important. We still do this because when a child. Is messing around. And we've signed the child is scrabbling around making patterns and not. We feel that the child. He's doing something unimportant. We say Stop that. Now learn to use a pencil. A child points and something says. What's that?

And you say, well that's a table, no that. I said so this would John says Yeah because he knows it's all wood but I mean that. We still got a lot. So in this way we learn the official interpretation of the cosmic rorschach blot. Which is based on as I pointed out certain criteria, as that you must survive. It's your duty to live, see. Which is a double bind because it says again you are commanded to do the spontaneous. It's your duty to be spontaneous because all life is spontaneous.

So everybody is in a in a bind about this. But there it is. The the world that we see is a creation of eidetic imagery. So wherever we select the human areas as being significant areas, and so they're called human. Where the Rorschach blot is wiggling in the way that we call human wiggling, where it wiggles very much. And was maximal points of wiggling in our environment or other people. I mean there are other things that wiggle. Cats wiggle, but not quite so interesting. The wind in the trees wiggles, but again it's more predictable. But the human will go is the least predictable way to go in the total Rorschach blot around us. So we call that human. So you see that it isn't that way, that you have performed Maya. The world illusion, but Maya also means art and also means magic. And so the magical evocation of the world of things. From the formless world which means from the world of pure wiggle, is the creation.

Comparative Religion

Four Ways to the Center

You know the more I study people's religions, and I've started them for an awful long time, the less I am inclined to quarrel with anybody's position or belief. Or way of practice. And this is also true of various philosophical systems. It's all right that philosophers should argue with each other. I'm not going to quarrel with that either. But from my standpoint, the more I look at it, the more of the extraordinary variety of human opinions and ways of life, becomes comparable to a flower garden. Where these plants and trees and worms and birds and snails and slugs are playing all kinds of different games.

Now some of you may be unaccustomed to the side there because I see some new faces here. But it's my fundamental philosophy that the universe is essentially a game. We use the word game or we use the word play in varying senses, and it may give the wrong impression because very often people. Assume that when such a word is used it indicates something trivial. As we say it's only in play or only a game and then when you consider what an appalling amount of suffering the universe contains. No one wants to feel that it's worthwhile. You see either you mistake the point of view that if there is this deplorable suffering the universe is one hell of a mess. And the only response that you can make to it is to do battle. Or you may say no it isn't really a mess. Somehow all the suffering amounts to something in the end, it creates energies, it's a kind of a process like an oyster suffering to mature a pearl. And therefore, people who feel bothered about that, can't quite emotionally contain the idea that it's all a game. Because then if that was so I would be the sport of some cosmic process whether God or whatever, that plays with me as a child might torture an insect about a fly by pulling off its wings or burning it with a magnifying glass with the sun, or something like that. Only, as I will develop it, we shall see, that there is no system. In which somebody tortures and somebody else is torturer.

In my view of the world which is a semi-Buddhist semi-Hindu. The Creator and the creature are one. And all beings whatsoever are the masks. And plays. And ploys of the central self. There is just this Self. Which plays itself through all forms through all of us. Endlessly. So, if you look upon the different forms of life. Human, animal, insect, plant or whatever. As comparable to. Mazurkas, waltzes, rumbas, Charleston's, twists, or whatever. Or to poker, bridge, backgammon, chess. Or, if you want to get more highbrow, who can cherish the symphony is part of Peter's few and so on. You can see that everything is a way of dancing. And so, this also applies to people's different religious attitudes. There is the Baptist game, you see, and the Roman Catholic game. The Bible game, the ritual game. These are all ways of doing a dance but the religious ones have a way of trying to express some sort of fundamental attitude to everything that there is.

Now, I was thinking about this in New York recently. My wife and I attended a very marvelous ceremonial. Which is held in Holy Week, and it's called Tenebrae. It's really very simple. But it's extraordinary dramatic. It goes on for about two hours and consists of the chanting of Psalms interspersed with the most gorgeous anthems composed by I think Victoria. And enduring the chanting of the Psalms, fifteen candles on a triangular shaped candlestick like they're standing up so slowly extinguished, until only one is left. And this is supposed historically, to represent the desertion of Christ by His disciples in the Garden of Gerthemane. And at the crucifixion. There that one candle is taken out behind it all time. And the place is totally dark. And the choir sings the psalm. Miserere, have mercy upon me your god after the A great goodness which is a penitential Psalm the fifty first Psalm. For behold I was shaped in wickedness and in sin have my mother conceived me. And then they make an enormous crash, and the candle is brought back put on the stand and everybody goes away. While we they this is a church it's a high a high way out Anglican Church, where they do everything to ultimate perfection in music the ritual is just, there's nothing like it in the world. And so, I began to think about what those people were really doing what are they digging in this rightfu repentance about the death and the crucifixion of Christ. So this led, I mean, to begin thinking about their areas ways or fundamental attitudes that run through all the religions. And I classify them in a scheme and the three R.'s and I use

they are simply as a mnemonic device so that you could remember easily. And we get this scheme. So here is the attitude of repentance. And I question what is its opposite? Well obviously it's opposite is rebellion. I won't give in.

When I was a little boy, and I was taught all sprout at my mother's knee. When we got to the sea the phrase thy will be done, I would never say it. Because I thought that the saying I will be done and I was damned if I were to be done. And now, over here is another attitude, resignation. And over at the opposite side I consider what is the opposite of resignation now this is difficult to find the word for and so I'm using an old word in a new sense reincarnation. This is not being used exactly in the sense of successive lives. But incarnation means, entering into the flesh into life. So reincarnation is when we don't do it once but we say that was that was something and so we do it again. So, no it's the attitude of a child when a child sees you do something that's amazing the child says do it again. And an English poet once said that when the Lord God created the world and commanded the stars and to shine on the planets to revolve around the Sun. He was so fascinated that he said do it again and it kept on happening so he was saying this to express an attitude of what we call lately, getting with it. Of complete affirmation of life.

So, now the point is this that every one of these can be seen as a way leading to a center at which point they all coalesce. And you can get to the center that is to say, to the transcendence of our ordinary sense of isolated individuality. You can get to the center by following any one of these ways to an extreme. Only it's very difficult for a person who follows this way to understand this way. Offer a person who understands this way. To get with this. Or even between right angles, they are a little difficult to understand. And I imagine many of you here what you wouldn't be in this kind of a scene. If for example you understood the way of repentance. And that was the way that you like to follow you would be in church instead. So I'm starting out with this way because it's the most difficult for probably most of you to understand and the most repugnant. The extreme of repentance you know, of course is the penitentiary cult. In Mexico and the southwest here. Among the Indians an extreme of identification with Christ and His crucifixion, kind of self-torture. And the extreme of this way is of course

the penitentiary. The most interesting experiences that many of us that have through exploring the prison world. The world of the asylum, the world of the enemy of society. And that as a kind of yoga you know that San Quentin. Looks like the potent of a classic. The great Tibetan monastery it's the same almost the same architectural design. And there are, I lecture San Quentin about once a year. And the most extraordinary question out of the most attentive audience you could imagine. And lots of. It is a kind of monastery, as asylums for the insane are also signs on the street.

So I'm just saying these general things to give you an outline of the scheme we're going to follow. And then, I'm also going to illustrate these moods, by playing music appropriate to them. It's difficult in a short time that I've had to prepare this to find the music that is perfectly appropriate but this is suggestive and I'm going to say something about that in general later. Now then, let's go back to the fundamental assumption that all people, and this also includes all beings whatsoever but we're talking mainly of course about human beings. All people, are manifestations, disguises, of the total reality behind this cosmos. And that if that is so, there are not any mistakes in the world. When you look at patterns on the foam of the breaking waves on the seashore. And you look at the outlines of mountains, and the grain in wood, and the markings on marble. You notice that it never makes an aesthetic mistake. Never. Also, when you study plants, and you go into relationships with each other and with insects. The fact that these so-called diseases of plants are the full life of some other kind of organism having a ball. And you see this complexly interrelated world and you realize that it all hangs together. That everything outside the human world is a system of balances. Where you couldn't have really any form of life without the other is going on too. There have to be friends and there have to be enemies. Because if there aren't enemies. The friends get too prosperous. And they kill themselves by their excessive exuberance.

So they are constantly being pruned via various kinds of enemy species. And what is when you got down there a new suppose you identify yourself with a certain plant. You would thoroughly object to if you were a lettuce, to the snails eating you up. And also a person who gets identified with lettuces you see you say somebody who grows lettuces or is living gets mad at the snails. But actually, the lettuces need snails. Because that would be

too many lettuces, if there weren't snails. And those lettuces would choke each other. Now of course, a human being comes in and starts organizing the lettuces, you see, so that the seeds don't propagate in the usual way because he puts them out in rows and that's a different kind of a scene and so he objects to the snails. But that's because he's looking at the problem of letters from a partisan point of view and it's quite right that he should do so. What he may not see, because he's taken the side of lettuces against snails. He fails to see, that conflict at one level, is health at another. Just as a conflict going on between microorganisms in your bloodstream is absolutely essential to the health of your organism as a whole. But you don't, you are not aware of that conflict going on, because conscious attention doesn't need to ordinarily to focus upon it. And so you don't get involved and you're not anxious about what party is winning and what party is losing that keeping up a kind of balance.

Now then, to take this a step further, we are all amazingly involved in the process of being human and playing our game and taking our side. And therefore our victories and defeats our sicknesses and our health. Are things we get mighty partisan about, and therefore we cannot see that human behavior is just like everything else. It never makes a mistake. Only, it's never making a mistake must include the feeling that mistakes can be made. See that's where this point of view would differ somewhat from the point of view of a Christian Scientist who strives manfully in a way to as insane as assert that evil is purely illusory. But doesn't quite grasp the point that the illusion of there being something evil is important and good too. But we're not trying to get rid of it you see, because if you get rid of it. You would have problems.

It's...I could say for example that the character. A historical character like Hitler, is someone about whom it is very natural for most of us to feel angry. And that's perfectly right that we feel angry. Although he is as much a natural phenomenon as an earthquake. So, what we have then is a system of a sort of hierarchy of levels. And at the point where you are involved you can't stand aside from yourself and look at it objectively in the same way as you look at the patterns of problem on the seashore, or of the life of the fishes of the type. But to be liberated is to be able to see human life in the same way as you see all other life. And to do that you

have to be able to live as it were, on two levels. The level of involvement and the level of detachment. And therefore, cultivating the level of detachment is something that is done through the mysterious human property of self-consciousness. To be able to know that you know to feel that you feel. And by possessing that faculty which is self-consciousness is being able to reflect upon one's own life, we are able to become, as it were to go to a level at which our own life is seen in its total context in the universe. That is to say, to realize, that your Self is not your ego which is the standpoint at which you are involved in your game and taking sides. But yourself. Is the eternal, immeasurable reality, that is what there is. Only the difficulty here is, that this capacity this capacity of self-consciousness, although it is that which enables us to awaken is also capable of getting us into perfectly frightful messes. Into all kinds of, what must be called feedback snarls, where you know that you know. You can think about thinking and the moment you can think about thinking you can think whether your thinking was right or not did it come off was or did I do the right thinking then you start to worry then you start to worry about the kind of thinking you are doing about thinking.

And so builds up our particular human anxiety. When these creatures that are not self-conscious behave they behave spontaneously that is goes a zoo so our way and do what they have to do. And so if it doesn't work they die, but they don't worry about it in advance. That's that magnificent you see, and human beings have a faint memory kind of archaic sort of. The. Active unconscious Jungian-style feeling that there was a time when we didn't have to worry. And where we could never be in your writing. And most...a great deal of religion you see is an attempt to regain the Golden Age The Paradise Lost. And so it involves as it were an attitude of surrender. Be not anxious for the morrow. What you shall eat, what you should drink or what clothes you will wear. Or consider the flowers of the field. They don't work they don't spin they don't gather into bombs. And yet Solomon in all his splendor was not closed like one of those. And so if God closed the grass of the field which exists today and was thrown tomorrow into the oven. Shall he not much more close you'll faceless ones. I'm translating it myself to put it in a way that doesn't just go so familiar that you don't hear it. Now, I mean that's totally subversive! There's words in the Bible are outrageous. And everybody says well it's all very well for Jesus from the Saints I mean

for all practical purposes that's ridiculous you can't live that way after all you've got to plan for your old age we're going to have a savings account going to Sharon's going to get a job you've got to do all those things. So you have to think about that. Why can't I do that? So you see, in this way, the human being comes to reflect upon himself and begins to see that there's something wrong.

Now there isn't, but it's right that he should feel that something is wrong because it is through this that his capacity for self-knowledge and self-consciousness develops. So you see, there is the sense that somehow or other at some time there was a fall. A point at which we became unnatural. There's a great deal of worry going on about this now, because of the rise of the computer. Do you know this this is terribly interesting that a new form of intelligence to see is come into the world which is in certain directions vastly superior to human intelligence. And people are beginning to worry like anything about whether the machines are going to take over. But we've got to realize that machines aren't...see, machine is becoming a dirty word. Just a machine, mere machinery, but actually there has grown out of us through these things enormous electronic circuits that are new forms of life. And these are all connected with us they're not separate from us they're not something. Like a different order of beings that might come from some other planet and conquer us that the the whole development of the electronic minds and brains that we have are new cortexes. See the cortex overlaps the original central brain. And as it were when you play this game you know but it hands over and over countless children like to play you it's a game called capping with a cortex caps. The central brain that is more like the brain of a of an animal, and enables us to reflect on it now all this machinery that we are making is an extension of our brain, and is a new kind of life. But it worries us. And when we start to do that we get the feeling that something is going wrong. There is been a fall there has been a mistake and exactly the same sensation you see is ancient connected with the development of self-consciousness in the cortex. Something went wrong. Because every time we get that feeling it means that we've taken a new step in controlling things. Instead of relaxing and letting our windows fly us like a moth or a bird we now have these jet plays where we have an elaborate system of anxious people Morning, noon and night checking it that those things go right. And marvelous that they do our friend Ralph

Johnson who often attends these seminars, is an American Airlines captain who saved the jet. The other day and very dangerous for them for the. Fantastic but, here it is.

Now when you haven't yet discovered that the new development such as self consciousness. Is really a new form of nature like a branch coming out of a tree which is a kind of a new development of the trunk and it's something just as healthy and just as splendid as that. Then you'll begin to reproach yourself. And say, 'Oh dear. I am awful.' You begin to be alienated you see, from your own center but do understand that being alienated from your own center is a form of a way of stepping apart so that you can see yourself. That's important, that is resonance. When you sing in the bath tub you find you've got a better voice than when you sing in a nonresident room because you've got a little echo you mustn't get too much echo. But just a little echo is resonance and that's more fun because it's more conscious if you're happy and you don't know you're happy you see you're not as happy as if you know you're happy but if you know you're happy you may spoil it by getting anxious about it. So, this of consciousness is a kind of resonance. But then you see when it gets to the point of this terrible feeling. I can't trust my instincts and I'm out. I've got to decide. I have as it were taken over the prerogatives of God. That's a terrible thing to do, because you can't be genuine anymore. You see, you know that when you love somebody, you also want to get as much out of them as you can. You know that when you act as a responsible citizen you do so. So as to have a good image in your own view of yourself. This is your ego kick, only you dress it up so that it's not an ego trip at all perfectly sincere public service and charity and good feelings towards everybody haha. And so then there begins this awful thing. Repent. Behold I was shapen in sin. And in sin as my mother can see. And so somehow there comes up the state of mind when you appear to yourself as a rotten. Some people when they take L.S.D.. get visions that everything is glorious you see and is light inside it but occasionally, people get the vision that everything is corrupt. That all faces are things that are slowly drooling away into into a sort of pus or rot. And the just everything is falling apart. And they begin to get the feeling that life is a disease we originally had here a nice clean planet with nothing but rocks fire. And it was sterile and nice. And all those dreadful goo develop you. Have the best thing for it is to wipe

it up life is a terrible mistake. And a lot of people feel that. And therefore would want to get away from their bodies to a purely geological Electronic state which is called Spirituality. You know what most people think of a spirituality something totally abstract something mathematical something electronic something that has no no kind of pus or or goo, especially no flesh you see. That's the spiritual state. So that expresses the feeling these people. Fundamentally who are at variance with their essential life.

Now, this is going to get complicated I want. Their ambivalent about it you see in those. Hebrew and Christian and I should add Islamic theology. Sin of which one repents, is a spiritual thing. It does not arise from the body. The author of evil is An Angel. A body, of his being. And therefore he is something closer to say equals MC squared than to a rosebud. But at the same time in practice that's the theory in practice, what so many Jews, Christians and Muslims regard as evil, is the body. The physical world and our involvement in it our interest in it and so you see for this reason materialism is a dirty word. You shouldn't be a materialist although William Temple very wisely said once that Christianity is the most materialistic religion. But... that is true theoretically. Judaism is only equally materially different theoretically. Sometimes more so practically Christian. Because materialism is the love of material.

And as we shall see, it is fundamental to Judaism that God's creation of the world not in the state. But a great good thing in the material world at that. So that, if you can see what I'm pointing out to you is this, how ambivalent we are. We say that evil is spiritual, and yet we treat it as if it were fleshly. As if one couldn't escape from this flesh. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak. Within this wall of flesh there is a soul can't see how creditor and with advantage means to pay the I love. See, the wall of flesh, the image of the prison and the soul inside. I'm quoting Shakespeare. Oh this too too solid flesh would melt. And you see when you get sick when you get old, when you find it your body is something tiresome to carry around. It grows up this resentment against physical existence. And so all of these different moods. To one's own perverse so. Horror at being involved in a corruptible body will be involved in the penitential mood.

Now, I presume most of you have had personal experience of this at some time in your lives. It's always puzzling to children when I'll start out on this kick. I know in the Anglican Church. They have a for everybody you know says a general confession that the services and children can never understand that they don't know what all these terrible things that they're supposed to have done are say Almighty and most massive all Father we have heard and strayed from byways like lost sheep we have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts we have offended against by holy laws. We have done those things which we ought not to have done and we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and there is no helping us. Think of it the children, that the most amazing [sic] thing to say. Aura that awful one they have at the Holy Communion. Talking about our sins the remembrance of them is grievous onto us the burden of them isn't tolerable. And then of course it's in the Catholic Church it's a place where they say I confess to God almighty and all the various saints stars Syndic sitting in thought word and deed by my fault by my own fault by now most grievous fault in that it mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa for the story is told of an altar boy who didn't understand Latin always is a mere cowboy me a cowboy, me a Mexican cowboy.

But you see, first of all, there is a wonderful security in admitting that you're wrong. Then you're short of the right thing. If you know your rotten and make a great point of it. And if you're suffering. And pain a punishment you see for being wrong then you know it's OK. Oh I bless the good Lord for my boils for my mental and bodily pains for without them my face all congeals and I'm doomed to hell is ne'er ending flames. So the way of the cross is interpreted by many people as this way of life live in chronic frustration. And I've read many manuals on this. The spiritual advice for example, they say when you get a headache don't take aspirin. Live the pain through and offer it to the Lord in union with the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Always a Ranger life in such a way that it will be a little difficult. That's why some people where I have heard there are always I'm comfortable they always itch. And this this thing they do it to keep them going I mean this keeps you alive you know you are there. I was in Mexico last August studying this because I wanted to go down there and find out why their form of care Catholicism is so agonizing. And I even meditated a

long time and on this in the cathedral in Oaxaca. And, here it was the main altar now not the main altar the chapel where the sacrament is reserved for the central figure behind the altar is a huge crucifix. Of Christ covered in blood and will. The saws are all modeled you know. And then on either side of the walls facing this there are a great paintings one of Christ carrying the cross and being mocked and scourged and the other of the agony in the garden of get seventy and all around in the scars that were there where they sell bonds years of the in the neighborhood of the cathedral you can buy these agonized faces of Christ with the crown of thongs and every thought on the individual is sticking in the middle of cripples of blood the face is kind of green and ghastly. And the people dig this. They love it. They all go walking into the shrine of valet de of Guadalupe you go for a whole mile on their knees you see young girls doing this now. What is this about? Well you see some people don't really feel they exist until they are sitting on the point of the thorn. And they put it that way. Pain..to reality is a measure of pain. The pain in this way of looking at things is the most real thing that there is. Pleasure the pleasures of this world a skate that disappear pass away has nothing to cling to so don't go after pleasure my dear friends. That's all fall out service seat because the real thing in life is pain and so what you do is you train yourself from childhood to deal with pain. We were brought up in a school system where it was simply axiomatic that suffering builds character. So therefore, any time you inflicted pain in on anybody you were perfectly justified in your own conscience because you were doing him a favor. You were building its character for him to do him good it out on the other side of that a hundred.

And so this is based on, this philosophy of pain is reality. Is the ultimate penitential philosophy of go down down down into the most awful. I am wrong see I am a mistake I am responsible for this mistake therefore I ought to suffer. And I go right into that state of mind. And if I've got guts and courage I'll go as far into it as possible. And what will I find out at the end? Now if you go far enough, the trouble is a lot of people don't, and they stay around Middlemount going about their sins them all out as a sort of disgusting. And they never really get down to it. They never find out. Them what our call for the moment the hidden motivation behind all this behind self-renunciation, behind wallowing in the reality of pain. They don't see that it's phony. Because nothing can be more egotistical than true

repentance. As I pointed out you're safe. When you repent and do not. And therefore you can see all for yourself temporarily but in a good test you are. But if you really get down to the bottom of this thing are some of the Christian saints I've done and find out what that repentance is all about and you suddenly see, why it's there all sin all over again what I thought was good was as a matter of fact evil it was the same self-seeking and self righteousness and in a radical pride an irreducible rascality which the Hebrews call the yetzer hara. Which means the evil inclination, but they say that the evil inclination was created by the Lord God. And probably the Lord God as against Iraq himself. That the Lord has his own element of irreducible rascality and that is of course what you might call the dark side the left hand of God. That have town that doesn't know what the right hand do it. Because that mustn't be let out that's the secret you see.

If the game of the cosmos is of the fundamental pattern of hide and seek, then when hide turns up and it's the time for hide to happen. Then darkness has its day. Hide in the dark. But when it's time to seek then light has its day and we find out what was hidden in the dark under the right hand suddenly discovers what the left hand is doing. Now first, it's shocked. What that? What is that by the way. What is the fundamental taboo? The thing you really mustn't do. Freud said if you stack. But because he said that you see we've recovered from. The e pop beer before pride in the a part AF are very different. Sexes and the topic maybe it's incest. Why is incest. It's getting kind of close to home. Going back to mama. Going back about not going back in the ordinary way is going back and I doubt not as a baby and you mustn't do that because why because this is a simply a biological analogue of the great taboo is to discover who you really are. Going back to Big Poppa. And that, that's all, but that's what is discovered when you discover you are a phony...you see what is a phony? A phony is a mask. And the masks used as I've told most of you in classical drama were megaphones. They had mouth pieces so that the voice would be projected in an open air theatre. So we get the phone. And the mask was the person or that's the Latin. For that through which the sound passes so the persona is the mask the phony.

So to discover that you are a phony through and through and through is to discover that you're a big act. That you're a game. And when you discover

that, then you wake up to find out who's the player.

Now I have been discussing four fundamental attitudes that are found in the various religions of the world towards the human predicament. And as you see still on the blackboard, they are given to be four R's instead of the three r's. Repentance opposite rebellion. And resignation opposite reincarnation, the latter word being used in a special sense. Not in the ordinary sense of rebirth, but of an affirmation of the human predicament, of getting with life. And this morning I discussed the attitude of repentance. The frame of mind in which it is self. That there is something profoundly wrong about being a self-conscious isolated individual human being and I tried to show. That when this attitude is carried to an extreme point, it results in your discovering that you are a total phony. And I said that the difficulty of the repentance attitude is that people don't carry it too in the extreme point. And they use the attitude of repentance. And the indulgence in punishment for whatever they think is wrong about themselves. As a kind of lifestyle which assures you that you're in the right. Because you hurt, and because you insist that you're wrong. I've sometimes suggested that this statement I am a sinner is logically equivalent to the statement quote, 'This statement is false' unquote. Because you see, if that is a true statement it's a false statement and if it's a false statement it's a true statement and so on forever. And to say I am a sinner is really the same thing because it imply that the statement itself since it is the statement after sin is a sinful statement. And it's a trap, I call a double-bind. And so I've often twitted my clergy friends about those I am to their greater views from. Gaza clergy aren't as bad as you might think. At least a good many of them, they have trouble in making it with their congregation. And they expect that their congregations will want the good old religion of wallowing in sins because when come many congregations I've found out love to be scolded. And if you make everybody feel temporarily guilty. But also make each individual feel assured that everybody else is more guilty than yours this is an extremely. Much sought after emotional experience.

But the point that I was making was that if you pursue this idea of being sent for being phony being insincere. To its ultimate point where you discover that all you do and all you are is a big act then this raises the question of what is reality? What lies behind phoniness? And so examined there you have an initially attic experience because it leads into the

discovery of the real punish out scroll type primacy that out though. That the real you is not the isolated conscious ego. That is only a game being played all over the place by what there is a part in them. And what there is is...tat. Coextensive with the whole cosmos and is the imperishable reality and everyone is that. But the game, since we've started on the premise that existence is a game. The game is hide and seek the game is pretending that it's not so. We then move on you see to another possible response, not repentance but resignation. I quit the game. I won't to play. There are all sorts of ways of doing this. But basically, this is an aristocratic posture. You ordinary mortals, with all your desire and all your involvement are deluded. You get attached to things. But there are a certain minority of us who are above it all. And we simply resign, we're not going to follow this now this as I say is ours to Craddick but it may be aristocratic in two ways there's the aristocracy of the Hindu sannyasan. The people who are outside and above caste. And there's also the aristocracy are the actual aristocrats I get so mixed up with my British and American pronunciation on the square. The aristocrat who comes on with the pose of always being bored. Who has complete Safwat. Who is imperturbable. Kaiser's study of this mentality is marvelous in his book of Europe the essay on Hungary. That portrays the type he calls the grandstand and he always identified himself with this type in this row. The grand seigneur cannot be fazed. Who can always be can always rise to the occasion under any social circumstances whatsoever without trying to do so, or without apparently trying to do so. In other words if he goes to the opera wearing blue jeans, he will somehow make it apparent that everybody else is improperly addressed. This is a very interesting type of person you know there was an essay written by someone whose name I can't remember in the centennial review. Which contrasted the attitude time of the aristocracy the bush was Dean and the proletariat. I said the heiress the aristocrat lives in the past. Because he is ancient forebears have achieved everything under his very a by the fact of his birth, his existence, he has nothing to ascribe for. And he somehow, he never need overdo it, he's always cool. The bourgeois, on the other hand. Feels that it's necessary to arrive and he's always striving for the future whereas the heiress to crap lives of the past. On the other hand, the proletariat lives in the present, because he doesn't care about his reputation. And he just lives and so are the two the bourgeois are the three the bourgeois is always the sucker. Because the poor poor you are is always cheated. Because well it's

going to cover some day you're going to get it even your money when you pull it out of your pockets, says promises to pay. Watch out for that. It's promises.

And for the bourgeoisie you see lives on promises. The whole of the whole economy of the United States being the great virtue our country is in a state of expectancy of feeling happy. Not on what you have but on what is going to come in. The aristocrat is happy of what has happened these great achievements of the past those nothing left to do except. A sort of glory of it. The proletarian wants it right now saying Amber very often gets it. But the poor board well. As my uncle once said, 'The poor have it given to them. The rich have it anyway, but the middle classes do without.' So, both the aristocrat and the sannyasan have resigned. Now the more interesting of the two types is of course the sannyasan who resigns from the world game.

Let me review for you the role of the sannyasan in Indian culture. You know there are four castes. The caste of priests or Brahmans, the caste of warriors and rulers are called kshatriyas, the caste of merchants call vaishyas are and the caste of workers call shudras. And to belong to a caste means that you are in the state called Grihastha, which is householder. That is to say, you are one who is involved in the world. You are engaged in what is called low cost something rough and Loca means the world Sundra means upholding. Upholding the going on of the great illusion. And so you are playing for money, for position, for status, for success. And hoping above all that you could win, you can beat the game. But it's opposed in the same culture that every man who retains the age of forty five or so, who has now a grown son to take over his work, will quit the game, will resign. And so when you become at that age you're supposed to move from the state of grihastha to house older to vanaprastha, which means forest dwellers. You give away all your possessions to your son. You change your name. You'll take off your clothes and go more or less naked. Because you have abandoned status. So the sannyasan has no status he is however respected in the culture for being an upper outcast whereas the aborigines of the Indian Peninsula. Are untouchables the lower outcasts. And the upper our caste always mimics the lower For example Buddha had his disciples were oka robes because oka robes were won by convicts. So in the same way, if today in San Quentin they all wear blue jeans was special kind of pants and a kind

of a blue denim jacket this could well become the uniform of. A new kind of sannyasan in the western world and to some extent this is happening.

So this guy says, the game is not worth the gamble. The richer I get, the more miserable I get. You know how this is you think that your problems maybe monetary. And you get more money. What do you do then when you've got enough money you start worrying about your health. And you can never never stop worrying about that. Or if you're not worried about your health, you worry about politics or somebody is going to take your money away from. You worry about taxes about who's cheating you. And so a person who goes through all that sees finally, I don't think the game's worth it. I'm going to resign. And so resignation, or renunciation, is different from repentance. It hasn't it hasn't got the same kind of passion and it developed. The repentant person feels he is wrong, has made mistakes has committed serious and wants to get better. But the renounced process isn't concerned with that kind of thing. He knows that better progress whether tomorrow on material is an illusion. And you have to understand this when you approach for example the study of Buddhism. I think one of the most withering remarks I ever heard from an Oriental, he was Japanese. He said once you must never. Get that whereas Jesus was the son of a carpenter, Buddha was the son of the King. You know wow, take that.

And it's true, see that is something always of that about it. That this is not that. There's a sense you see in which Christianity historically was the protest of the slave class against the Roman establishment. Buddhism was different. It was the abandonment of position by an aristocracy. Say we've done it we've seen it all, we've had it. And so now, we check out. And we will be there, we will resign from all games. And if you follow this attitude to an extreme. You're going to make because it all goes to the center of the same discovery. That is made by the personal followers repentance to an extreme. Just as the repentant person discovers that his contrition is phony. The person who tries to resign will discover that he can't. That there is no way of not playing a game. Let's go a little bit then into this game theory. There are a lot of games that we play. And it's not only the game of can I get one-up on the universe. Of pretending that I'm me. This is ego. With its name and its role in the mass. But also we have what I call Meta-games. For

example the game my games better in your game. I won't play with you because your game is vulgar still for it banal, inferior. And, or one of the most therefore effective caves in saying my game is better than your game is that I am not playing games at all. You are. Now, at the lowest level we find that in the form of you're not sincere. I am sincere. You were fooling me was I'm not fooling you I'm being honest with you now that's a great game. And this game of resignation is a form of it. As to say, you are children playing with toys. And you haven't ever really woke up with the important concerns of life. You haven't reached the dimension of ultimate sincerity. Or that is to say Ultimate Reality. And in order to reach if you have to resign from distractions. You'll hear a great deal in the literature about meditation. Of getting rid of distractions. Wondering thoughts. Well you might ask when you think about all that but. What are wandering socks What are wrong thoughts what should I be doing with my mind. Well they all say, actually every day you figure about this and then you think about that and your thoughts run on in an undisciplined way to one association to another. And you can't keep your mind fully on the job. Or whatever it is. So you see, you're supposed to renounce that. Because that's triviality, all those wondering thoughts they're not about the important thing. Now what's important? What should you keep your mind on? Well something, just so long as you keep your mind up. In an instruction of one of the Buddhist scriptures says about concentration one may concentrate on a yellow square on the ground on the burning tip of an incense stick. On your navel. On the tip of your nose on the center between the eyes or anything. And then a footnote the commentator adds but not on any wicked thing. Of the world over, that's commentators the world over it never having a human. With so. Anything will do just so long as you keep your mind up don't wonder. Stick to it.

So wandering is involvement in games. By this kind of definition. So then, you try to get out. Can you now get out? Can you stop competing with other human beings? In ancient Greek society, there was a place in the center of the community called the Agom. A G O M. And this was a place of contests. Where they had wrestling matches and other athletic events. Because all the men were constantly trying to show who was the better. And from this word the agonea, which means please the contest itself held in the are gone we get our world agony. The struggle and striving to be

superior. And a lot of people, that you meet among your you will recognize this among your friends all the time are not happy unless they are involved in a contest it doesn't matter what it is so long as they are trying to beat something, they're happy. And you may say Oh for heaven's sakes. You know can we just sit around and talk. Instead of having to play a game or bet or do something to prove lose the stronger. I was once married to a girl who was never happy unless she was engaged in some kind of condos. Well of course I had a game. The didn't look like one. And so it was a very superior game. Just because it didn't look like one. But it was a form of the game my game is better and yours.

So, you can't really not play. You may go through the motions of not playing if you still are and one of the most marvelous examples of this is the Buddhist Sangha. The Sangha means the order of what is monks of. Monks isn't quite the right word because. The basis of Buddhist monk is a little different from Christian, but I don't want to go into that technicality. There are these people living in save Burma, Salon, Thailand and so on who go around in yellow robes and have renounced the world. But of course they've become as a community very prosperous and powerful. And everybody you know makes a basis to monks and feeds them and they don't they don't feed just on the rice Grewal. Important monks get called into the houses of wealthy laity and get given a fine dinners because the layman feels he is acquiring merit by being so generous to the monks. And you should see the scene in Japan although today the monks have lost their power to a large extent you can see the traces of the power they once have. In the City of Kyoto, the Buddhist orders Zen. Tendai. And especially Shinju sect, have the best parts of town. If you speak day and night in a Zen monastery. As a guest. And go into one of the rooms that you are not in any hobble, you are in a palace. You live differently from the way we are accustomed to but you are liable to get shown into a room where the walls are entirely covered in gold leaf. And painted by the greatest masters of Japan. You'll say sitting down to sleep by a car no motor no blue screen. And the landscape around you, the garden, the view, are just beyond belief. This is the life of resignation. Now it's true. I know most about Zen monks rather than the other order. Zen monks live a pretty rough life. But it's extremely toney [sic]. It's healthy. It's absolutely non masochistic. They have started the art of enjoying poverty.

Now this is a terribly important thing in the understanding of Far Eastern culture. When a man in Japan. If you sort of inherits an old fashioned tradition makes a killing in business. He doesn't go around showing off how much he possesses, he goes around showing off how little he presented even though he may drive to his office in a Mercedes or a Rolls Royce, his house is relatively barren. And he chooses objects of art and paintings that look extremely simple. And he will as likely as not. Have a separate house from his main huge establishment. Where. It's like a hermit. I mean it's almost as absurd in its own way as Marie Antoinette playing shepherdess after reading Rousseau. And having a little cottage, rustic cottage in the grounds of Versailles. But it's not quite as absurd as that, because even the main house has an austerity about it. And they learn you see, to love that hostility. To them, it has the feeling of great comfort. Now you see what happened was there not long ago the best part of Kyoto, the hills that ring the north side and the east of the city being so beautiful were owned by a bunch of Britons. Who were later the noble Daimyos, or lords of Japan, the great feudal barons. And these people work as tough as all get out. They are always fighting. And so the Buddhist monks will live. And decided they would take this property away from Medina by out-competing them. By playing the game our game is more interesting than your game. So they said all those bridges so what. You've attained all these conquests you have your castles you love your greatest days but then what. It all falls apart you know especially when the brigand is getting a little elderly and has stomach troubles and. Dizziness and so on and this man comes along so. You know and furthermore the monk says you can't scare me. And the brigand so I am. And he pulls out his saw as a mark but now the point is you can't kill them up for that then and there because if he does that he will find out whether the monk was scared on.

And so the monk looks straight in the eyes. And nothing happens, he doesn't flinch. When the brigand has an hour and a contest thinks and he puts her saw quite right against his throat. Well the monk has it right there. But you see how in a way easier the game was. Because the monk knows. That he wins. His point. If he doesn't if the bring in kills it. Before the monk flinches. He's obviously cheated. Now since there is honor among thieves. That the chances are all those little sometimes be a BRIGER will feel put down by this contest of that four killed a month the chances are that

he won. But you know what the monk stands to gain. If he wins Brigand says Wow, would I like to have that courage. Because if I had that courage I would be that much better. So the monk says I'll teach you, and as a result of that the Monk does teach him. He teaches him the practice of Zen, zazen meditations and all this kind of thing and puts him through the to the works. And so he comes to understand what the monks didn't understand anyway which was that it really doesn't matter if you live or die because the thing goes on it's perfectly indestructible if you happen to die it just goes on in a new way because you are the works. So fine but the monk is playing a game. And so as a result, all the zen community has got given the old palaces. The Brigands all moved to Tokyo and set up their business and all around the great court. And the gorgeous temples and grounds went to the monks, where, although none of them owns anything personally, which is a great idea you know, because you don't have a new responsibility to the community you serve. And you don't have to pay added taxes and since you're a nonprofit organization if you're not taxable anyway if I'm. Our it's a great set up. And they they really did it beautifully but a part of what they did in effect was to carving those brigades out of the best land in Kyoto. By resignation, by playing a higher game. But you see, any one who goes through that, goes through the Buddhist process of resignation. Will come to a point, where he knows that he didn't resign at all. And this is what makes the difference between pedestrians Buddhist monks. Who think they've resigned. And have feel a little bit guilty because it's such a prosperous of. To resign because you live in the best places so on. And those ones who know will go right through the crowds to do the small. Residue great Buddhist masters who discovered that they can't resign at all. Let's consider an extreme example of resignation in. The life of a hermit. Far Eastern literature is full of the idealizations of the hermit's life. The wonderful idea of an old man somewhere in the mountains far. Off in the forest. Hakuin's book describe such an individual. Who can't be found nobody knows where he is he leaves no trace and they consider that is admirable. Poem you know it says I asked the boy beneath the pines he says: 'The master's gone alone, herb gathering on the Mount. Cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown.' And that idea of the far off man way way. But what does a hundred at the start. If you try and get as lonely as you can get. You become aware that you can't get away from it because when you get very lonely and very quiet you become extremely sensitive. And

everything that goes on that's all not ordinarily unnoticed comes to your attention. First of all you will find as a community of insects. And they are tremendously interested in you are not necessarily hostile they may be sometimes but but alone in the forest when you get really quiet you will notice little creatures will come and inspect you look you all over. And they will go away and tell their friends and they'll come and look to see what it is. And you become aware of every single sound. And you realize that alone you're in the midst of the vast money crowd. [It] may not be human. But it's everything else.

So that the point of being a hermit, the discipline leads you to understand that you can't resign. The lonelier you are. The more you joined together with everything else because you get more sensitive. So then I find them I cannot give up playing your game look at it to from another point of view Supposing I say everybody is playing the game me first. Now I'm going to play the game you first. To use the phrase of Bon Huerter, who called Jesus the man for others. Now let's see if we can play that game instead of me first you first. After you please. Will you please. You know what a way this is putting everybody down. Say I'm the one you see was so generous I'm the one who's so loving so self-effacing and all you with inferior brats could go first if you could play me out play you. Are trying to convince you to play you-first. But the success of convincing you on that is relative this law and therefore the in-group will always be the people playing you first. And therefore they will get the honors. So, when you think that through, and you say I cannot stop playing me-first. There's no way of not doing it. Very well. And what does it mean when I'm in a trap that I can't get out of? The no way of getting out of this trap. Well what it means is that you and the trap of the same thing. You're not caught. Because when there's nobody in the trap there's no trap. So that long as you think you're in a trap then your traps got you but when you know you are the trap then what is the trap got. If you're trying to get out of the game, you're trapped with no way out, but when you will have found that you are in the game are the same. There's no game to get out of there's no one to get out of the game. And that's true resignation. And then you can take the point of view of the bodhisattva as to distinct from they arhat. The arhat in Buddhist terminology is the person who escapes from the wheel of birth and death. The samsara, gets out of the game, so he stands here. With both the stock

price is they are past his they are gone are to find out that you've got to get out again all the Bodhisattva's found over here. In other words, he goes back into the cycle of reincarnation and doesn't bother about escaping anymore.

So, in just the same way as to repent of leads to the understanding. That you're a phony even in repenting. Resignation leads to the understanding that even in resigning, you can't resign. It isn't as if someone were saying. You must play this game. And you felt yourself under some sort of compulsion. It's rather discovering that the game is what there is. And if you get out of it, you would be to be no where. You don't have to play. This is the point I'm going to repeat this because as is crucial it isn't that you have to play. Because that would make you feel a victim of some process beyond just self that has been telling you. It is that. The playing is you and nobody is shoving you around. Because you are in the universe which seems to constrain you are not to think. If you play the game that you are only here, then you will feel pushed around. But when, through trying to resign from either pushing around or being pushed around you discover that it can't be done. You then become very much aware there is no point getting away from anything. Where is away? And so it said a true zen monk has a mountain hermitage in any place that he stands on. So, let's have an intermission shall we?

Thus far, we have discussed two of the four attitudes of the human predicament. Characteristics of religions and methods of spiritual development. The attitudes of repentance and of resignation. Now let me repeat that the premise of this whole discussion the first premise is that existence is a game. In the in all senses of that word the best sense and the worst senses. That it's a pattern of dancing. The principle of which is now you see it now you don't. Or hide and seek or lost and found. And that we, as members of Western culture in the twentieth century, inherit a way of playing this game, where even we pretend. That we are each one of us an isolated individual. Who comes into the world as a stranger. We do not know in the ordinary course of events, that that is not true. And that each one of us is a way in which the whole fullness of ultimate reality pretends that gets lost. In an individual life situation and endures the adventures of pain and death. And endures all the critical efforts and decisions connected with practical and moral problems. The fact that this is the case is of course

the content of certain kinds of experience which are extraordinary. That means simply, not necessarily rare, but outside the usual order of things.

The types of experience we call cosmic Consciousness, mystical vision and so on. Where in sometimes as the result of following a yoga but sometimes simply as a consequence of a spontaneous change of gears you might almost call it, inside the brain. Or some anomaly of switching, we get let into the secret. And in such a moment a person feels that the scales had dropped from his eyes. And that he was awakened to the true state of affairs. That we do not know this to be the case in the ordinary way, is because we are...you could say in a certain sense of the word, hypnotized. In the sense of the word that is applicable to the technique of a stage magician. Almost all stage magic consists in misdirection of attention. So that the magician makes you watch something that will distract your attention from the trick he's going to pull on you. And we are almost all distracted in just such a way. Because we have so specialized in the powers and properties of conscious attention to things that we have identified our very selves with that faculty alone. We are therefore unaware of a much more inclusive and diffuse kind of awareness, which underlies the possibility of conscious attention. And which characterizes every single nerve end in our bodies. We screen out, that is to say, we pay no attention to, most of the information or to use electronic terms input that our organism receives. It is possible however, to, as I say, slip switches so that we become aware of the inputs. I won't say of the total in part because that would be shattering. But we've become aware of a great deal more than we ordinarily notice, and it is in those moments that the experiences of cosmic consciousness occur. Because it is in those moments that we become aware of the fact that what is inside your skin goes together with what is outside your skin in just the same way as your head goes together with your feet. Though the two..obviously, it's physically impossible for your inside of them to exist apart from the outside universe. And then you would just simply wouldn't have an air to breathe for one thing. The simplest possible case of it but it's far more complexly related than that. And the going together of these two worlds constitutes. A Unified Field of process of being. And we are not ordinarily aware of it because of the tricks of the game of pretending that we are the inside of the skin only.

So then, under the conditions of this game. And I'm not saying it's a bad game, that we shouldn't play this game. I'm only pointing out that it is a game. And that if sets up in other words all game sets up it sets up some formal rules. But these formal rules of the game should not be identified with the laws of nature or with the state of affairs of reality. There the rules of games are conventions. That is to say, agreements about how we are going to carry out a certain operation like the rules of dancing or waltz are game rules. So also are the rules of marriage, of political elections, of how we measure time and distance. And all sorts of things there are conventions. And convention is a word that translates exactly one of the meanings of the Sanskrit term Maya. Which is the all inclusive word that the Hindus and Buddhists use for the world illusion. It is therefore a convention to think of nature as divided into separate things and separate events. That is a convention that corresponds exactly to the mathematical operation of the calculus whereby a curve is measured by pretending that it is a discontinuous a series of points or of tiny tiny straight lines. It isn't so, the curve is continuous, but by pretending that it could be a series of point-instances we can count them, work out their positions in reference to some kind of a standard scale. And so we get a measurement of the curve. Just as one does that in mathematics so in everyday life, we count every human organism as a thing-unit. And we count all kinds of things as a thing unit but sometimes a child will surprise you by asking you for the name of something which you never thought I was a thing.

We don't for example have a word which specifies the inside of curved surfaces like the inside of a part. Of the inside of a pipe. Or the inside of a a tin can. We don't have a word that specifies dries space. Or a dry surface [sic]. Now, other languages have words for those because to those people for some reason or other this concept is important. Aztec language has one word which covers rain. Ice hail snow. Whereas the Eskimos have five words to differentiate different kinds of snow alone. So our child will often ask about something and say What is that? And the parent is not clear what that signifies. And it is because you see things and events are the units of experience. And they are those parts of experience that we notice. And when you've noticed something, you apply to it a notation. You notice by making notations and notations are words, numbers and such symbols as musical notes, or algebraic signs, or astronomical symbols. Or whatever. It

is a way of dividing up the world, so as to be able to discuss it with each other. And so to control our environment. But don't be deceived by noticing and notation. The world in which we live is not really divided. It's like taking a sieve and passing it through water. The wires of course cleave the water, but the water doesn't stay neatly sliced into the square lengths you see, as if it were something like being on the water close again and so in the same way although the intellect constantly slices the world into units the world. Well the slice that does not mean that the real state of the world is something like bean curve or junket. Completely formless. It means that the world is full of the just those various forms that we see. But it's real of a lot more forms than we see.

First of all, the waveband upon which our senses are responsive to, the electrical going around outside our skin, is quite narrow. And if we had a wider. Range of sensitivity let's imagine that we had some additional sense organs. That were as different from the five that we have, as sight is different from hearing. Then we should be aware of all kinds of connections and phenomena that we don't see in the ordinary way but even with the eye out without the addition of extra senses of that time it is possible to increase human awareness. So that we can see all kinds of things that we ordinarily ignore. The simplest example of this is that when we look at other people's faces, we see the human face in a formalized way. We see faces as painters and beauticians have taught us to see them. There are many characteristics of the human face that we block. Now supposing you are a so-called white caucasian. You are supposed to have you see a very very pinkish smooth skin. Well you don't have anything of the kind. You have a highly differentiated many colored blotchy skin. Only if you put on heavy makeup like a pancake makeup of course you reduce the color variations. But even then, your face moves constantly through an interplay of lights that are altering all the time. And we choose, unless you are a painter or a photographer who is trained to look at these details, you ordinarily ignore them altogether. Our faces have all kinds of hairs on them and pimples and little funny jiggles and it's all there. Only we don't consider that those details are significant. And so we screen them out of everyday consciousness.

So this Maya, this calculus of dividing up reality into units which are presumed to be disconnected, but somehow related to each other in more or less the same way as billiard balls, that interact by banging each other around, becomes the commonsensical view of the world. And is, just a convention and nothing more. Now in that circumstance, in the circumstance of the person, the human being feeling lonely. And feeling that he confronts an alien world, one of the possible tactics and the games that he can play is the highly aggressive game of dominating the environment by the power of His will. And this game is what I've indicated here by the word rebellion. Now, I'm using that word in a very loose and inclusive sense to cover not only formal rebellion, that is to say, the criminal way of life. But also, even official rebellion. That is to say, a US Marine sergeant might represent in some way an official rebel, since his attitude, his whole way of life, is based on guts. And the exile Taishan the gutsy attitude seems. Of the strong arm of muscle of brawn as against brain. And you can carry this attitude to such an extreme. That it can become a way of realisation just in the same way as these others repentance resignation and I which will see, reincarnation.

In a certain sense, Jean Genet is an example of the rebels. Are Big over such as put forward the view that Genet is a Holy Criminal. And this idea has had great popularity in modern times in France. And is part of the mystique of criminal young people in the United States. And it has to be understood, because otherwise, one doesn't really deal with it. To be, in other words, delivered wrong the egocentric predicament by carrying egocentricity to its extreme. Now, first of all. The idea that we are egos, although I have described it as a convention, and as something that is not fundamentally so. Nevertheless, the idea that we are egos does exist. There was a faith healer of deal who said although pain is not real when the point of the pin goes into my skin I dislike what I fancy I feel. But you see, the fancy is there. Little the same way the imagination. The illusion the Maya, that we are separate egos is something that does exist. And that fact, that our fancy is so is not a bad thing. It is a form of game. If you would imagine life. As a dump, a choreographic pattern. You might say that the imagination of being an ego is a very far out curlicue. You know how people do from design so you get. A front like this. And I want to hear. Another one here. And so. And then say Well now come on let's go. In the

smaller one, drawing the tendrils on the vine and then in the bidding temple come out of the other. Three and they make it more complicated and more interesting. And so, in that in that way. The development of the sensation of the ego is a very far out curlicue on the extremities of life.

So, the fact that you and I imagine we're egos, is the same sort of thing as you will observe in any complex pattern. Of crystals. Or surface tensions in foam, or anything like that. It is very very natural. And so, there is then a legitimate way of following this fancy through to its logical conclusion. The yoga of egocentricity. This is a very difficult yoga. For many people to follow. Because we've been brought up so as not to have the courage of our convictions about. To be a consistently egotist. Perhaps Nietzsche was a great example our philosophy. To be a consistent egotist requires a tremendous amount of nerve. Because everybody is trying to put you down. And say to you you should be unselfish. You should go. Operates with us and that requires doing things that you may not not like to do but it does for the common good that you should do these things. But the difficulty about all this is, that I'm talking about a quite superficial level of this descent. I'm talking about here. When people pretend to be unselfish and cooperative, they confuse others horribly. If you give somebody else the impression that you're going to be their loyal friend and you're going to really knock yourself out for them, and they rely on you to do that and then you let them down because that wasn't really what you meant to do you create a great deal of trouble.

So in marriage, if you have vowed to be faithful and constant to some girl in a moment of intense passion. And then after a while your affections cool off. And you lead her to believe that you will always be reliable and faithful, there's an awful crash coming. So it's terribly important to be emotionally honest. It's very difficult, because we don't always know what our emotions are. But to say to someone that I will love you forever and ever is a very very serious dishonesty and deception. So in the same way, to give the impression to all those around you in your society your community. That you will put the community before yourself can be relied upon to do this is a dangerous thing to do. You may have the fullest intention of carrying this out. But I find in practical relationships that I am much more comfortable with people who tell me frankly what their feelings are. In

other words if I'm not welcome, because they've got other business to do and they're all tied up with things it's much better that a person would say I'm sorry but I don't feel in time to see anybody right now I'm busy and so on. Then I can rely upon that person that when they tell me you are welcome that I really am. One of my best friends is a woman who is totally frank and if she is even if for purely irrational reasons she doesn't want to come along with something or do something she just says I don't feel like it. And so we understand each other perfectly everybody understands her. Because then they know when she says Please come, that she really means it.

So, a proper egocentricity. If you feel like an ego, you see, is essential in good human relations. And to be guided by your real wishes as far as you can make them out know what they are, is on the whole. A safer bet in human relations than to be guided by abstract principles. Now the abstract principles are all very well, and we should know what an ideal pattern of human behavior might be. One has to keep as it were one's eye on that. To see if you like it. You see, the game of existence is not isn't this not very simple. If I could say you know rely entirely on your feelings act on impulse never do anything except what you would really want to do. It isn't that that would be oversimplification. Because, among the things that most of us really want to do there is a certain concession we would like to make to an ideal pattern. So sometimes when a person does do something which is an act of self-sacrifice. Or described as such it really is something he wants to do somebody gives away some of his the money. [He] doesn't do it because this is a sacrifice and a masochistic spirit that the cars go to heaven I would really like to see what would happen when this guy gets the money. What fun to see this enterprise stuff even if I don't get anything back from an. Hour of the entertainment.

So, an ideal pattern of how human relations might be is always something to be worked out thought about and kept in mind. For we are all as always possible we might want to that way. But basically, to do what you really want to do is a more secure gamble than pretending all the time about a lot of oughts and shoulds. A friend of mine with a very brilliant mathematician once told a story that in the beginning of the ages. God was making up a dictionary of all the words that would be used in language. And one day he

visited the Archangel Gabriel, and they left the Dixie dictionary in the taxi. And while he was in with talking to Gabriel the devil got into the taxi and rode into the dictionary to work. Out and should.

Well, as a result then our pretenses. Of not being honest about what we want. Untold confusion arises. You know the proverb. Be very careful of what you desire. You may get it. But we live in a culture, where the almost the whole economy depends upon the creation of artificial desires. Upon giving you desires the two. Might never have had in the ordinary way. And therefore thinking that you want that simply aren't want to bore. A lot of people for example, when they feel miserable, depressed, simply go out shopping. Because somehow purchasing something, seems to be a lot of fulfillment of life. I mean I know of a lot of a wives whose husbands are engaged in business and leave them alone most of the day when there's nothing to do except they regularly go and go shopping. And they shop every day as if it was something I had to do every day like having breakfast. And of course, that keeps things buzzing and. Critics are only going to ask. If it means you're misinterpret your own feelings. And so there's always after a shopping spree a sense of letdown. Same thing happens every Christmas Day with children. You know that toys are increasingly phony. They are a method of propitiating children. I was saying yesterday about the educational system being a method of preventing children from growing up too fast so that they won't come on the labor market in one huge blotch.

So in the same way, children who are not allowed to participate in human activities such as cooking and hunting and so on have to be given so many activities. Toy cooking stoves dolls dolls houses, guns, anything, but the real thing so that they will be kept amused and kept out of the way. Because any real child you know, likes to play with pots and pans and all the things that the adults use and are doing. But toys prevent them from doing that. Now then, what happens is the children are given an immense artificial desire to tolerate. A toy shop seems paradox. When on Christmas Day, the suitable tree in all the fills all in all the stuff and package is wonderfully wrapped you know the wrappings are better than the content. More beautiful. They get all these things out and the room is to room with guns and buses and dolls and all that stuff by four o'clock in the afternoon they are screaming frantic. Because actually the whole thing was a terrible

letdown. And that happens again and again, but that happens to the other up to. The outside merely repeating for the children what they're doing they're acquiring all this kind of pretentious junk and thinking that's the answer and it's a let down. Because they didn't find out that they don't really want it and they don't find out what they do really. Because everybody has to pretend that it's good to work for what you don't want. So that's the initial difficulty, that is the mere Guardian dog at the gate on this part of the city. But so there I mean just simply an initial step here is to be honest with yourself. And to be unashamedly eager to. See I like people. Who are supposing they have a certain accomplishment don't be blushing Violet about it, but say I can do that. I know how to do that and I do it well and I can exact therefore a fair price for it. I feel happy with a person like that. Especially if he's someone say like a doctor. I show him the know that he is good at is job. And if he is confident about it like that and says as I know what to do then I have that essential faith in him which everybody has to have in their doctor in order to be able to be healed. And but we say the community says to a person who does that you are immodest. You are too big for your boots, you've got a swelled head. Now, a person has a swelled head, and when his opinion of his accomplishments is excessive. The when a person's accomplishments are good he ought to be proud of them. And be delighted that he can do it so well everybody says if you can dance well don't you love to do it. Are you a show-off? Yes, you are a show off you know but but build a show off please please like to see it but. This is part of the willies into why we all go around and grab colors. Nothing so off a meter can pick. You know kind of a clergy look to you. [laughing]

Because you see, people have thought in the past. If you'll show off, the enemy It will notice you. So a chameleon disappears into the background. And doesn't show off, so that the birds or whatever want to eat that chameleon won't notice it. But when you live in a reasonably protected community as we do, we are still carrying over from the past all kinds of camouflage habits, which really aren't necessary anymore you can't branch out a little. When it's extraordinary that our society doesn't really tolerate eccentricity. Even though it was based on what it thought was rugged individual. But you see, that's because we are half hearted about individuals. And if you are going to go the way of the ego you must go it's far away. That was true of all these ways. If you're going to chop off

somebody's head. And that really is the decision somehow or other it's necessary, you've got to do it with determination. For a half chopped off head is very bad. To use a blunt axe. This is the philosophy underline Bushido which is the Japanese philosophy of chivalry based on Zen, where they decided that if there are going to be soldiers and if there is going to be fighting at all then it must be done supremely well. And if you're going to fight supremely well, you've got to have a sword like a razor. You know a Japanese sword is a letter that literally every razor. And you've got to know how to go on to have what we call follow through. So the whole notion of Bushido swordsmanship is based unhesitating, going ahead, going ahead. It's called in Chinese Mo chir Chu. Are going straight ahead-ness. Which is an added field of never pausing if for example if you drive a car on a freeway here you have to have a little mo chi chu. You mustn't hesitate. It's true, even more true driving a car in the room. Where these Italian drivers fast but very subtle. And there are tremendously aware of each other much more so than here the worst drivers are in England but. In Rome this is very fast beat driving but that instantly responsive and you just have to go ahead and get into the traffic and. That's the only safety that is if you hesitate and fiddle around and so on you're done for. So this is absolutely the capitulation. With sudden swift speed. If the, what you're going to do is wrong do it well. As Luther put it check out a fortitude if you're going to sin make it a good one if you're going to make a mistake make it a good one. But don't nimble mountable them suffer them as they say and then. Walk or stand as you will but whatever you do don't wobble. Them. So that realization is about here. You know, we have the first one there we're about here now.

Now then, keep on going, when in the Divine Comedy, Dante accompanied by virtue of his guide explore how. They pass through a gate which says All Hope Abandon. You who enter here. You never never get out. That means you can't retrieve your step. There is a way out. If you have to go down to the bottom. And they. Finally come to the place where Satan himself is encased in ice, brooding over a new vast field of ice. And gnawing on Judas and Brutus and someone else Cassius the great traitors. And our very is utterly malignant, and every now and then his bat-like wings close together and open those together open. Now about those wings are the symbol of the active door. The active door in all mythologies in some way or other and it is. The gate through which. In passing you go through the critical moment

of initiation. And to get through the active draw. You've got to go without hesitation, because if you hesitate you're too late. It crushes you. Jason assailing the Argo has to go through the simplicity of the clashing rocks but this use has to get between skill and character. In the, one of the Arthurian legends ...is it Sir Gawain and the Green Knight? I forget. but there's somebody who has to charges cost. Across the drawbridge and into the park colors. And just as he gets in the park colors crashes down and takes up the rear end of his fall. He's got it. All sorts of stories like that so the wings of the devil think this is it they have to get quickly through those wings and they climb down the devil back on the great tuff but he has very heavy. Then suddenly they get a strange sensation. That they are no longer climbing down but climbing up. Because they passed the midpoint of the earth. And then they come where they hear a stream. By following the sound of the stream they find the secret passage which leads them out again to the vision of the stars. So what it means all hope of than when you enter here is you can't go back. You can only go on.

And so in this thing, this egocentric situation. Once you're in ego. Or think you are. There is no way out but on. Now you see what's happening here. People who repented of being ego. Were trying to go back. And by trying very hard to go back, to relent. They know now I should never have got into this, they found they couldn't go back. And that they were phoning. The people who said we resign from being the go down, they couldn't resign. And now we're getting a little bit warmer aren't we. We found it couldn't go back, and so you've got to play the ego game to the limit.

And, so comes a point, where the person plays this to an extreme and he may. Maybe in a very odd situation he may play it by being a real criminal. And end up in the penitentiary. But he's going to end up in a situation which is symbolized by three great myths. One is the myth of the tar baby. The other a giant sticky hair, and the other, the crucifixion. We found the crucifixion again didn't we, when we went along this way. But you know the tar baby is. You get stuck there are going to be a topic. And giant speaking here comes in the Jaffa tale about the photo in one of his previous incarnations attract a certain giant. Who would have a sticky and everything that hit him got stuck. Under a giant used to eat. The people of a certain village. And a prince came there one day and heard about it consider he

would go and clobber the giant. So he fled for the Giants and you struck him with his left arm half pound and it got stuck he struck him with his right hand and that got stuck he kicked him with his left foot that got stuck think there were this right foot and that got stuck his head banged it with his head and that got stuck in the giant's that Aha Now I'm going to eat you. And the prince said that that's all very well but you will find if you leave me that inside my belly is a thunderbolt. And if you swallow that it will blow to pieces. So the Giant really is the prince and promise not to eat the villagers any more.

So when you follow your ego to the limit, you'll get stuck., when you find suddenly powerless in your efforts to play again the world. But you realize that the reason for this is that, in fighting the world you're fighting yourself. You are like a person who picks up a dagger in each hand. And the left hand says to the right, I'll take you on. Let's fence. You ever try it? Fascinating. You know, be careful. But, you can have this strange thing and what happens is this: you meet a moment of total paralysis. Because each hand knows perfectly well what the other one is going to do. It just always. So, by following your ego to its most intense point you reach stalemate in the same way because suddenly the left hand discovers what the right hand is doing. And at that point the Oh ah oh oh oh oh. After all, I wasn't a separate ego. So let's have an intermission.

It's curious that in all the three approaches we have thus far discussed. The response of repentance, resignation, and rebellion, that there's an element of desperation in each one of them. Each one is an expression of conflict. A conflict between the human being sensing himself as a separate ego, and the life situation in which he finds himself. Now remember that I pointed out, that the situation of feeling yourself to be an ego is a kind of game. It is a pattern of life, a style of life. Just in exactly the same way that a robin or an ant or a marigold there's a style of life. It has a particular shape it goes this way or it goes that way or whatever it is we see. And so the human world in which we live out our egocentric adventures is a certain style of behavior, a certain kind of music. And so also are these three conflicting scenes. The fourth way though that we bring up now I call reincarnation. Simply because, for mnemonic reasons, I was giving four R's instead of the usual three R.'s. And I don't mean reincarnation quite in the sense that it's ordinarily understood. I mean getting with life, and if this should by any

chance involve reincarnation that is to say the willingness to be manifested in this world and all of the ventures, again and again and again and again, you can take it in that sense. But you know. This attitude in the religions of the world is extremely rare. And most religions are against life. Practically speaking. They turn back as it were to the law of God and say you know. You made a mistake. Either in creating the world, or in allowing the snake in the garden. And what we really have to do is get out of it. The way of repentance says God you didn't make the mistakes we did we're terribly sorry but we're trying to do better next time. And we know we've offended them most awfully against you. But I know you will still love us and we really will do our best if you will help. The way of resignation tends to say that they are not there wasn't some kind of original sin that man or an angel committed, but that the manifestation of the many out of the one, is itself some kind of mistake in some way. At this game, where for example all biological being used live by eating each other is a bad show and we resign. If possible we won't eat anything that screams too loud when it's killed. And I asked R.H. Blyth, or my wife I think I asked him. Why are you a vegetarian R.H. Blythe is a great British Zen man. And she said truth don't you realise that it also hurts the plants to tear them up and so on you said yes but they don't scream.

But in the end in the attitude of resignation you see there is still this conflict. Spirit against matter. The sense of the dualism. Of the soul incarcerated in the fleshly prison. In the attitude of rebellion, there is still even no known or very critical way express the sense of differentiation between the individual in the world. And our modern technological civilization dedicated to the so called Conquest of nature is a preeminent expression of that spirit. But as I pointed out to you if you push it far enough, if you rebel or oppose the universe was sufficient will and vigor. You will eventually reach an impasse which is just like a fencing with yourself. You have two knives crossed, see, and you are going. To date one of them I mean if you don't want to do it so dangerously you can do it with knitting pins always was chopsticks. And have a fencing match with yourself so that one hand tries to hit the other and the other that is to defend itself. Well you reach a stick point, because both hands know in advance what the other one's going to do. And I use that as comparable to the situation which arises when you have opposed whatever it is that you want

to opposed, sufficiently enough to discover that whatever you define as other turns out to be the same as you. Or to put it more exactly, I am not I. Turn out to be two poles of the same process. And it's the process rather than the Poles that really constitutes you. The last word in metaphysics is if you understand the subscript whole secret there is an inside for every outside and an outside for every inside. They go together, you see. When the inside moves, the outside moves. The movement of the inside is the same as the movement of the outside in the movement of the outside is the same as the movement of the other side. When a globule of some kind changes its shape, this is the same thing as a change in the shape of the space that surrounds it only, we are brought up to believe that space isn't there and is an unimportant factor. In the changes that go on among the solids in space. But this is why astronomers have such difficulty in communicating to the general public ideas of the come under the heading of properties of space. Why, because to the average person space doesn't have any properties space is just what isn't there.

But we know now that space isn't nothing. That it has properties only that they are not yet clearly understood. And when space may be said to be curved and by its curvature influence the way in which light is propagated. Or when, you can consider space as a magnetic field, you begin to realize that there's something you've been ignoring all the time. It was for example perfectly a matter of common sense to Dante and probably many of his contemporaries, to regard space and mind as the same thing. If you read a book called saving the appearances, by a British man whose name momentarily escapes me. Baron's field I think that's. The way our the N S S I E L D Barenfield Saving the Appearances. Anyway, that's the title.. He has the most marvelous discussion of changing. Common sense says, how different it would be to live in a world where everybody realizes that space is the mind. Rather than our present superstition. That the mind is something inside your head. When neurologists looked for the soul somewhere in the brain, they can't find it. Because they're looking in the wrong place. The brain is in the soul. And the soul is not some kind of gaseous spook. The soul is the total arrangement, and system of relationships constituting the universe, as picked up RAM transmitted by a brain. The brain in other words as some like a radio receiver. Found it expresses enough highly complicated way the total configuration of all

things that are. But in each brain it does it slightly different. So the cell, as you know, when astrologers drew a map of a person's soul. Past his horoscope. They drew as nearly as they knew it a picture of the universe. As focused upon the time and place of that individual's birth. Well that is a... astrology I think, is a highly unreliable science for practical affairs. But he did express in a kind of mythological image. Very beautifully. The truth that everyone is the cosmos center. In the place that you call here and now. But you see. When you don't know that, and you think that the external world is foreign to you. Instead of being as it were, your better half. I mean imagine that. It's so it's so. You do I know of one difficulty that people have assimilating this idea is that what happens to me when I'm unconscious. So I go to sleep at night and if I sleep soundly and don't have an injury. I wake up at the same moment I went to sleep. You know that just wasn't any interval only I feel different when I wake up revive a hangover or I feel refreshed. And, but the interim just wasn't there. And you think if it wasn't there then but that was I ever open to everybody else's inspection while I was lying in bed.

Now at the same sort of situation bothers people about death. Because if you come to an end and after death, there is unconsciousness. But you see unconsciousness doesn't last any time. It may from somebody else's point of view. But actually, there is no such thing as experiencing being unconscious. But in the same way that you are unconscious of the way your pituitary gland is functioning at this moment. And unconscious of the structure of small capillaries inside your body, and yet they're working even though you don't know anything about it consciously. So in just exactly that way, your extended body, namely the cosmos, goes on when you're dead in the same way that your organic body goes on when you're asleep. And as when you wake up your organic body restores its particular local consciousness, so after all of us die, the big organic body which is the cosmos wavers lives somewhere else. And they are us. By us I mean the real self the total cosmos appearing all over again and becoming conscious once more and when it happens, do you know what it will feel like? It will feel exactly like it felt when you were born. And whether you have instead of eyes long tentacles of some kind of whether you have an anti. Now on top of your head on nano head whether you have one hundred legs or two. You will see yourself as a human being. After all, mice and cats look human

to each other. They think we look very odd. We are some kind of monster, because we are a different piece of the all species look human to each other because with what the word human really means is the center place. Where ever anything looks out from is from its point of view of the human place. And you must also be very respectful to creatures because although you may think that they're not very cultured. They have a culture which is from their standpoint as refined as ours. They know, cats for example, know that there are more and less refined cats. I've just been sitting on and are denizens of patio listening to a Mockingbird. And that thing has a tremendous culture. The things it can do with its voice. And there's no apparent reason for all that is just sitting there on the T.V. antenna, enjoying the afternoon. It doesn't seem to be a mating call no mate comes around. It doesn't seem to be threatening anybody. It's just happy, and it's up there doing its stuff and making this gorgeously complex music and it's much more complex than we can hear. There are things in the qualities of the voice, subtle tiny changes, that are perfectly fascinating. This creature is unencumbered with codes. To, in other words we judge people's culture to such a large extent by their shopping I was talking about that was money you know why they go around and acquire things and have them all around and that's the human way of showing off. But other creatures do it in a different way they would from their point of view criticize us as being messy. As having all these things we have to dangle on ourselves and put on jewels and things and whatnot and they would say well that's not. For humans they have to do that because they have such ugly bodies. They look like potatoes. Underneath their skins. We have all these lovely fellows and the fish have such beautiful colors on them and they live in the water.

One of the most intelligent creatures on earth is the Dolphin. And the dolphin many many thousands of years ago it was a land animal. But when it saw what human beings were doing and the direction the high intelligence was taking on land they all decided to go back into the water because in the water others plenty of food. You don't have to hunt too energetically you are never right liable to run into a famine, and you don't have to be encumbered with houses and clothes and so you don't have to work. So dolphins spend most of their time playing they like for example, to pick up with a human ship. And then the the ship makes a wake, and so they set that tail at that exact angle Apprentice It's not have to graze or something and

the ship pushes them along. Where they can actually swim faster than the ship goes but they don't want to work. And they they laugh they play they break circles around the ship they do all sorts of things because that. It's their way of life and that very very sensible people. I've absolutely renounced eating dolphin meat because I feel that cannibalism. The Dolphin, in other words knows how to get with it. And you see, this is the thing that these three religious approaches only find at the end of the line. Now is it possible that there could be a new kind of religious approach in which Heaven says to earth. I really do love you with no its and buts. They say in Christianity God so loved the world. But there's always a but after it. But the world is falling away from God and He loves it of the sense of a kindly but stern father who says, this is going to hurt me more than it's going to hurt you. As a sort of I don't know. The whole attitude you see, is one of Cism, schism, schizophrenia. Division between the spirit and the material. Would it not be possible for there to be a real reconciliation, in which the spiritual in the material make friends? And can say to each other genuinely I love you with all my heart. And you see this possibility emerges in the fourth way and this fourth way historically, is largely characteristic of Mahayana Buddhism. Because whereas in Theravada Buddhism, resignation is carried to its full limit. In Mahayana...what happens really, is that when a resignation has been carried to its extreme and you'll find you can't resign from the game. Because you are the game there's no you to get out of it then you see this tends to happen automatically. So that the kind of personality called the bodhisattva emerges, that is to say, the one who doesn't go off into nirvana but who comes back into the turmoil of everyday life out of compassion for all other beings and helps them to be liberated. But when they get liberated you see, they in turn become Bodhisattvas. Because there's always someone to liberate. Because, while, with one hand reality is realising what it is with the other it's forgetting. See. It's like this and three for a penny three for a pound lover makes the world around that's that's what happens. So this is constantly going on, just like you're eating and yet excreting in breathing out, breathing coming and going everybody is a whirlpool into which a great stream of milk comes. Out of the stakes are all sorts of things are flowing and they swell around like this and shoot out the other end and that's that's like a whirlpool in water you see. So everything is like that because existence is constituted by in and out. Air in alone doesn't make any do out alone doesn't make any do

but in and out together they make a do. And so, much ado about nothing is a Buddhist conception of the cosmos. And that's marvelous, you see, because Much Ado will be better than nothing. Nothing all by itself to see you can have nothing all by itself. You have to have something to have nothing and as soon as you get nothing about something they go together in the same way.

So, in this point of view of then, we are at peace. In the middle of conflict. This is really the point, from which I started in saying. That from my point of view. There are no. Right religions and wrong religions. All of them are simply different like different flowers. And one has certain preferences and tastes one has one's favorite frog flowers and the flowers one personally doesn't like but the variety of them is necessary for every individual species they all go together. Well so in the same way from this standpoint, you get this odd view of the world as fulfilled and completed, not sometime in the future but now here today. With all its...with all those with all the things in it that appear from various points of view to be faults sicknesses, peculiarities and horrors. And now I quoted the Smalling a child a kid in a college. Who said the thing I can't stand about college is that it's always preparing you for something to come you never teaches you how to live now. You know that the poem. Called the Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. Which is not really only off but FITZGERALD It's an extremely free translation. But it. Carries the seam that we call carpe diem. Seize the day. Drink eat and be merry, for tomorrow we die.

And so, especially drink get roaring drunk because the future has nothing in it for you. Actually this poem is really mistranslated you should read the translation by Winfield, which is quite a different matter. Omar Khayyam was a sufi, that is to say an Islamic mystic. And the sufi is have to keep quiet about their doctrine. The central doctrine of Sufi as I'm is and I have. And that means I am he. The realisation I am God. And so they say, just as there is no deity about he. So there is no here to save us he. Well many Sufis were tortured and slain, because of the proclamation of the UN our heart so they used hidden language to propagate their ideas and in sufi symbology wine is the divinity. And to be drunk is to be enlightened, is to transcend oneself. And of course this imagery is likewise in Christianity that's one of the meanings of Holy Communion blood of Christ anybody. Is

one of the sayings in the I think the divine praises. And. So the whole meaning of the Rubaiyat is get drunk today because there is no tomorrow. Why is there no tomorrow it is not because life is transient. Not because we fall apart we keep on falling apart. So you once you fall apart you fall apart again everything is falling apart, it always has been. I mean life is a process of everything falling apart that makes multiplicity of many things. But the reason to get drunk today, because tomorrow we die is that. There is no such thing as tomorrow. There is only now, and if you don't do it now you will never do that. Because now is the only time it can be done.

So anybody who makes preparation for spiritual development and says. Well this is a tough and difficult road and after many lives I shall finally attain you know what you're doing you're playing games you're postponing it. Because you don't really want to wake up it's better to stay in the adventure in the dream in playing the role that you aren't. You know who. Now you see how in this way I've mentioned in talking about repentance how you could play with guilt. And I raised the question What is the awful thing you've really done. And I showed you how the confessor. If he's a really smart confessor will reject all the ordinary sense. All the murders and adulteries and all those things and say just small cheese, just a piddling menial sins. But there is something awful really awful. Everybody done what do you suppose it will be. Was it something I did in childhood in a forgotten. Something you're doing now but I forgot it Now, nobody can admit this. Because if you admit having done it you're immediately classified as insane. It's to say, Uh-oh, I see what happened. I am the supreme Self playing it doesn't. And the reason for having a guilt feelings is to keep the game going. There is this prohibition. You mustn't step beyond this mark. Don't do that that's the deepest taboo we have.

Worldly Religions

I see many faces here tonight that are rather new to me, and I'm happy about this, because I believe in turnover. I don't like the idea of a philosopher who has a kind of constant clique-ish following of disciples. Because I believe that the kind of philosophy I'm talking about is more like a medicine than a diet. And you don't want to get hooked on a medicine. It has a specific job to do, and then send you away and of course if you want

to come back for kicks that's a free country and you always can. But basically, my idea, in giving lectures and any kind of political discourse is to set people free from me. It's like a good doctor is always trying to get rid of his patients because he knows that there are always an enormous amount of indefinite supply of people are going to be sick and if he gets rid of patients the patients he gets rid of will recommend those new ones to come and he'll get rid of them to me and that's my attitude to all this and that's why I'm giving a seminar this weekend on the worldly religions which means being free from religion. So that your everyday life and your everyday profession and honor in your everyday work becomes your religion instead of being something that you feel bound to belong to and the that you use as a crutch and as a support. Of course, I'm not against the idea of religious celebrations, of rituals and so on, so long as you don't get hung up on them. As a matter of fact, if you do get hung up on a ritual like many Catholics get hung up on the necessity of having to go to Mass every Sunday, because it's their duty they learn to hate it. And it in comes out in their children because the parents hated going to Mass but felt they had to the children hate it even more and don't do it and thereby they deprive themselves of a celebration that would under other circumstances be a great delight.

So, we are going to move into an age now, when our formal religious exercises anything that can be branded as religion in quotes will only survive it's of if it's a great deal of fun. It will not survive if people do it as a solemn duty. On the other hand, the real religion is not so much in these symptomatic celebrations and I'll call them symptomatic just in the same way as would say if a person is blushing, it's symptomatic of a certain psychological state so in the same way if people are performing rituals in the right way it's symptomatic of a certain interior joy and peace, which comes about because they don't need a religion anymore. They've been cured of religion by religion. Buddha gave the example of his doctrine the dollar model of the method of but as I'm he likened it to a raft for crossing a stream years thereafter get on it and you cross the stream you get to the other side where you certainly don't pick up the raft and carry it. But there are a lot of people who are kind of rafting, they they love the raft they stay on it and they get to the other shore they go back and pick up a new load and then bring it over again and there you find all kinds of philosophers and

clergy types, and monks and people of that kind who are shall we say. Addicted to religion.

But I want to talk to you now about and the non-addictive sort of thing where the Superior, the finest product of religion, is something that doesn't look like religion at all. But is simply the practice of one's life. My bit old friend Frederick Spiegel Berg of Stanford University called this the religion of no religion. You might say it's like. When you get a great artist performing it looks so easy he doesn't seem to have any props. When a building is finished, the scaffolding disappears. And so in this way, there are certain people whose religion was like a vanished scaffolding. Where they become, well really in a certain way, indistinguishable from ordinary people and yet the something about them that you can't quite put your finger on. You know there's a difference but you can't say what it is. And so, in Buddhist philosophy the superbly in life and person is likened to the say, let's say this verse from the Chinese poetry. Entering the forest he does not disturb a blade of grass entering the water, he does not make a ripple. In other words his spiritual power his religion if you want it does not stand out like a sore thumb. It is a kind of anonymity that. I remember once a great Japanese artist to done a piece of calligraphy for me. And he'd...And it was amazing he had just written on a hanging scroll a kakemono the numbers in Chinese characters one, two, three, but he done it very skillfully. And I was very pleased with it and I hung it up in the. My office in the place where there was a kind of a token on my alcove. And just in the next few days the great Zen scholar. Professor Suzuki [was] going to pay a visit to us and I said well I'm going to hang it up and it's going to be there when professors if he comes and the artist said I hope he won't notice it. In other words that it should be something so compatible and so congenial with the whole environment but it doesn't stand out like a sore thumb.

So in that way, a person's religion can be something that becomes, as distinct from something that they have a hang up on. To be hung up on religion, is just terrible. Because they are always talking about it you're always trying to convert other people to your point of view you're interminably discussing your opinions and saying you know it's just like you found a great doctor who has got the latest medicines you to get hooked on. And you go around and you try and dissuade all your friends to join up

with you because that gives you a kind of feeling of confidence that more people agree with you have a stronger you feel in your opinion. And all missionary was based on this fallacy.

So please understand from the start, when I'm talking to you, I'm not trying to convert you. I'm not trying to do you any good. I'm just doing my own stuff. I talk this way like birds sing. It amuses me. I'm enjoy it because I'm interested I'm full of wonder about this universe. Full of all sorts of thoughts about it and I like to share these with people not in order to interfere with your personal lives or make you dependent on me Heaven forbid. If I had enough people depended on me I would have no sleep at nights at all it would be on the phone that be hanging around as I go away. But simply that. I think that with and with our exchange of ideas and rubbing ourselves against each other we may find something of mutual interest. And let's not make any more ambitious claim for it than that. Because anything beyond that would be getting us into the world of power games. Trying to influence people, trying to control people and I'm not interested in that. So let me start by putting my cards on the table and saying more or less as simply as I cabin what my basic approach is to the whole question of religion. Namely, my feeling for, idea about the nature of. This thing we call life the universe and so on here's. A. Very difficult. To put it in the form of a belief or a set of propositions, because what it begins from isn't ideas at all but experience. I don't mean quite experience in the sense that a person says to an applicant for a job how much experience do you have? I mean experience more in the sense of the word sensation. When you experience that water is cold by drinking it, you can't say now I've experienced twenty two times that water is cold and therefore I'm qualified about it. You see you don't go about it that way you just experience the actual sensation of drinking water.

But what I call religion is based on that sort of state. [It's] based on a kind or modality of consciousness, as to what all this is that's going on. Now we are mostly brought up, in all different kinds of cultures. Not only Western, but Africa and Latin American Eastern and so on the individual human being is by and large brought up to feel in some way, that he's a puppet. But of various ways of describing man as a puppet. That he is... you see, it begins with childhood. When the child is made to feel a subordinate

member of the family. Because when children come into the world we play all kinds of funny tricks on them. We are not at all honest with them. The first thing you notice is that when people start talking baby language. That's not being fair with a child. You get these I've been watching some educational television and of these sort of funny school teachers type girls who are very well meaning but they always rolled our eyes and lift their eyebrows when they talk and tell kind of a simple direct baby language of this kind dear children we are all what a nice boy I will do this, that, and the other you know, this isn't direct speaking at all it's not as where you would speak to each other. Creating children is a separate class. From the child if you don't treat a child in the same way as you would treat any other person a child is instantly bewildered. Why do you come on to me in a different way you come on to somebody else? Because when we don't welcome children frankly into this world saying how do you do? You're another one of us, and we're going to explain to you what's going on we're playing the following games, and these are the rules of the games and if you will please understand these rules you will later on maybe be able to think up better ones.

But what we do is we mystify children. And we put them all through all kinds of complicated grades of initiation. And most of us therefore, grow up as still children. We grow up always thinking that there is a parent above us. And if our parents are long ago dead and now I am a grandfather I have five grandchildren. And therefore I am able to I suppose assume in their eyes as much authority and as much dignity as my own grandfather did but I know I'm just as stupid as he was. So because you see in our most impressionable years, we get the idea constantly that there is someone out there and behind who knows the answers. And to a certain extent they do because they're more experienced they've practiced skills they're more developed in certain ways but we never are really able to get people to grow up to come into the state of adulthood without still taking the infantile attitude. There is something and someone who knows the answers better than we do. And therefore we always have through this kind of childhood indoctrination an attitude towards the universe and towards the ultimate reality behind it I was as if we were on probation. As if somehow we were interceding we were saying constantly to the lot of God please forgive me for having the disgusting effrontery to exist. And that goes back you see, to archaic

notions of the world. As if it were a political state, modeled after the political states of the ancient Near East, where great tyrant Kings were the fathers and rulers of the people. I'm constantly puzzled as to how the citizens of a republic such as the United States, [who are] supposed to believe that a republic is the best form of government. Can believe that the universe as a monarchy. It is a completely inconsistent idea. If the universe is a monarchy, then the monarchy is the best form of government, and you ought to have one.

No, I rather feel. If I can put this into words at all the sort of experience. That we are not strangers in this universe. Although we've all been somehow slightly with our own connivance been hoodwinked into thinking that we are. And we say I came into this world. I feel myself put upon by fate. By chance by my environmental whatever. And we take the attitude that we are in some way are other, victims of the scheme of things and therefore most of what we experience is defined as what happens to us and only a very small part of what we experience is defined as that which we ourselves do and wish and decide upon. So we feel experience as a conflict on the one hand, between our efforts and willing and wishing, and on the other hand what simply happens. And therefore, we feel sort of tossed about like ships on an enormous swell in relation to the rest of the world. But when you really consider your own existence, you can't account for it as something introduced into this world from outside. What you are as a total being..that is not only what you think and are aware of but also all that you don't think about and aren't aware of...the whole structure of your organism. That you are this is a symptom and expression. Of the whole thing that's going on. In a certain sense, you are just as much a part of an essential expression of the universe as the sun is. Or a galaxy is. Only, we tend to think of ourselves as discontinuous with the whole thing. In this way, when you look...;let's say at a photograph in a newspaper. You look at it with a magnifying glass the picture disappears. And you see only an area of dots. But when you stand away from it and drop the magnifying glass the dots merge into a face. So when you look at anything close up. You don't see it's related and as to everything else. Look at the dots under the magnifying glass and you don't see the connection with the face. So our view of our own personal lives, our own work, and our own personal circumstances is a very close-up view. And we don't see how it fits in with

some larger design we're too close to it. And we can argue it doesn't fit in. We feel we really are separate we're not connected with this whole thing our life my life as an individual is just a flash. Between two darkneses. Well there are all sorts of other flashes going on before we were born and after we die flash flash flash flash flash. Between all these different flashes which are likely dots in the newspaper photograph there are for those who want to see connections. After all you think of your body as a connected unified reality, but if you look at your body from a certain point of view you are composed of molecules that are vastly separate in space. But because those molecules are so tiny, and the separations between them so tiny as to escape your notice, you don't see that you are nothing as they stretch out your apparently solid on this is just did it did it did it did it that it did it all the way down thing. Is that some bird. So. It's all right that don't don't don't don't interrupt him because he's going to make a very amusing comments at some point.

But you see this that. When you take the small in view, you don't see the connectedness. And therefore you would say now is this the solidity of the continuities of this is that real. And the person who always thinks in terms of the microscopic would say no it's not real it's only an illusion the reality is all those separate knowledge kills. Then the physicist comes along to him and says That's a lot of nonsense those molecules aren't there at all they're only minute electrons and other subnuclear particles. But actually you see every part is point of view is correct it is correct that there are these widely separated little particles, but it is also correct that there is a unity through the whole thing. So in just the same way, we looking myopically at our own lives and seeing ourselves all the separate bodies and feeling that each one of us has a separate time beginning with birth and ending with death we are blind to the way in which each one of us is really absolutely integrated with everything else that's going on. With so long we see as we are all brought up to feel. That we are here on sufferance. Then we are to that extent emotionally prejudiced against seeing. That each one of us is really a particular way of looking at all that there is. And a picture peculiar way of being responsible for all that there is. You, in other words yes you did it, and are to be praised or blamed on neither for everything that's happening. When we say well that wasn't my fault, it was those scapegoats, whether they be if Jews, Communists, Turks, infidels, heretics, Chinese, Vietnamese

and Africans any, any Catholics butchers, New leftists anybody you can think of you don't like. You can always say well they started their cattle trouble. But the real secret is that you're responsible for everything that's going on. And there is in you, everything that is angelic about human beings and everything that's done by. The question is how do you play those two together. So putting it in this way then I would say simply. That life is the play. And I underline the word play of a single energy. And you are that energy. That energy like all energy is a pulsation. And therefore we have the appearance and disappearance of its pulses. You could say I defined as a certain human body called Alan Watts I am a pulse of this energy. And therefore I have my my presence is inseparable from my absence. As is the case with all waves and pulses. A wave must have an upside and the downside, or shall we say a crest and a trough where it is and where it isn't and so every powerless of the Universal Energy has an on and off we call that life and death. Or it may be waking and sleeping, or now you see it, now you don't. And this thing is just what we all are. From the highest point of view, it never makes mistakes. When you watch the clouds Did you ever accuse a cloud of being aesthetically malformed? Did you ever think that mountains were to be criticised for their outline? Did you ever think that the stars were badly arranged although the patterns in foam had something to be desired? No. But of course, we feel that about ourselves just because of our close point of view to ourselves. If we took If we look at ourselves. Sub specie aeternitatis, from the standpoint of eternity, we should see that our lives in every detail and in every respect where as harmonious and as exquisite as the patterns on seashells. And we should find that everything that was a mistake that was done wrong. Was actually an integral part of a harmonious relationship. Only we couldn't see it that way from my limited point of view. So one could say that at the highest level, this universe is an incomparable jewel of harmonious dancing, patterning energy. Very intelligent, in the sense of what do we mean by intelligence. A complex harmonious design. Included in this harmonious design, is of course the fact that we feel it not to be so. Our objections to what we wrongly think of as the disharmony of the universe did any fact that those objections occur are an integral part of the harmony. So that if I feel furious with somebody like Hitler because he kills ever so many people like that massacre of the Jews, I would not say that it was wrong for me to feel furious but simply that that too. If, if his slaying of the

Jews is after all part of this harmonious thing so is my theory about it. At that and from the highest point of view the most inclusive point of view, it all goes together. And if you understand that if you actually feel in your bones if you sense that there's a vivid sensation. You live very curious thing happens and. You are able to function in your everyday life without hang ups. It's like this. Everybody is really using an enormous amount of energy protecting themselves. And a lot of the energy we're using is only thinking about how we would protect ourselves if we were challenged to do so. We waste an incredible amount of psych psychic energy in this state it inner cramped tension, of anxiety about what will happen if. Supposing.

Now put yourselves in the position of realizing that you are walking and dancing around in a space like a trapeze artist. But there's no concrete below you to fall on. You can do anything you want, any crazy act. Flip any way you wish. And although you may go through the illusion of a crash there is never a real crash. You have nothing to lose because you are in fact the whole works. Only, the whole works has a most interesting device in it, which is pretending that it's in danger. That it could come to a final end. This is the familiar phenomenon of goosing yourself. Giving yourself a scare. As if the universe were a system that crept up behind itself and said move so to jumps you think and each jump is like the new spring of the grasshopper going along. Every time it gets as a book and it jumped as the book jumps like that. Because, you have to understand this, this is terribly important. A lot of people think you see that the goal of life the thing that you really should get hold of his power. To be in control. And you can take all kinds of lessons on master your life, be in control of this be in control of that. Now let me let you into a secret life the real meaning of all these things is. That when you study the the whole philosophy and psychology of power. And you really go to the end of it you'll find that that's not what you want to. Imagine that you're found as you go make us. The master magician. You can read everybody's mind you know the future completely and clearly. You need not be subject to the ordinary conditions of nature. Supposing for example, you could renew your body all the time and never need to die. Supposing you could be anywhere you wanted to be in the universe at the slight quiver of a whim. Go through this. Think this through. Everybody thinks they want power but if you really think through what you what situation you would be in if you had absolute power. You would say.

Man who needs it. You wouldn't want it. Because you would be completely bored. So power is not the thing we really want. There is nothing more instructive in the world than to think out systematically and thoroughly what it is that you do want. And curiously enough, the best you will come to is that you don't know. Because you want to surprise. Now you can surprise yourself, you see. If you're in control and you plan a surprise it's obviously not a surprise. But you see once you could imagine God who came to the conclusion in eternity that he knew it all. He had to create something and said to it surprise me. That was man. Of course it was God. Because God had a system in him self whereby he could let. Is Left happen to not know what his right hand was doing. Like when you play chess for yourself and you take each side in the game quite honestly and try to make it when one of the most interesting exercise take a couple of knitting needles all those cocktail pics that look like Saud's and have a fencing match between your left hand and your right hand and really try to get digs in but let the other hand be equally defensive against the digs so interesting that's a good exercise in yoga to do that. Find out a lot about yourself that way. Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth. But that's the sort of system we're in. That's like this universe. Because if you understand that you don't want power not really you know you always want to be getting a little more power but you don't want the final part. Because then nothing would happen. Just like when you're playing a game. Maybe bridge, maybe chess, or whatever it is and at the moment that the outcome of the game becomes certain you cancel the game and begin again as a no fun and then a game with a certain outcome might just as well not play it as any future that is certain is already past in the sense that you've had it.

So I look then upon what we're doing. In this well that every one of us, is a particular expression at a particular time and a particular place of the whole thing. Basically you are, the which then which there is no which or you are the god. And you don't have to think of that in terms of an old gentleman with a beard. You are basically the Godhead. But this energy, intelligent energy, is capable of expressing itself in myriad forms. Each one with a different point of view like your eyes look out of your head each one with a different point of view all your nerve endings are there in your skin almost like the on down a little snail all feeling around everyone is you looking from a different point of view towards the world. So in turn, because I can

see all human beings I is as many many of pawns on a cosmic snail. All looking up from a single cent. All of us. Appearing and disappearing, coming and going, we pop out at me, pop in and we're born and we die. We thrown out and withdrawn. And as you watch this you see from a larger point of view you see a throbbing rhythm each time coming out with a different variation one day we could call it John Doe The next time. Jimmy Smith the next time it's you know it if it throbs it has little subtle variations in it each time each one worthy of being given a different name but it's all the same energy doing this.

Now obviously, if you aren't aware of that, and you think seriously. That you're just poor little me who got thrown into this well by some irresponsible parents. And a saddled suddenly with all these problems. And that all it's going to be is that you've got a struggle along as long as you can man. And maybe raise some children to struggle along in the same idiotic way you do. And then give up. And you generally feel frustrated and cheated by the whole scheme of things because you do not acknowledge that you are responsible for. What you got yourself into this situation. That you were the evil gleam in your father's eye when he pursued your mother. You were your father. Because he feels in just the same situation you did. You feels he's an 'I' to cast into this world. And he may have been brought up just like you to feel that he had nothing to do with anything else that he was somehow disconnected from the whole scheme of things and merely experiencing it passively or something that happens to you that is thrown upon you. So, so long as you choose to feel about things in that way. You complain when you are frustrated and you're fighting bitching about the whole thing, which is of course all right because that's what you want to do. Only, that you could see there's a certain joke in that indicates that it could be different but, that you don't need to be in that state of mind in regard to it. That you could wake up from this illusion of separateness and understand. That you aren't just a little an amalgam, crawling around on the surface of a globular rock that revolves around an insignificant star on the outer edge of one of the mind of galaxies. But that you are a special case of the center, what there is and of all that there is. You know, it's interesting that in a view of the universe which sees space as curved. Imagine for a moment this is not quite correct but that all objects in space are on the surface of a sphere. Then you will see at once that every point on the

surface of a sphere can be regarded as the center of the surface. Where is the central point of the surface of the sphere? Anywhere! So in this way, we can legitimately regard every point in this universe as being the center of the whole thing. And it's in this multi centered sense that every eye, which looks around and sees the world as something that been around you in your the axis you're quite correct it does. But you know how it is when you hold in your hand a gyroscope. And that it always feels alive doesn't it, because it surprises you it wants to move in a direction which you didn't predict. And that movement of the gyroscope that you hold that seems to be against you is the movement in life we call us us. All what happens to us. When we feel on the other hand that I am moving the gyroscope in the direction I wanted to go that's what we call self that's what we call voluntary. And you can't possibly know the one without the other. You don't know what you mean by self unless you know what you mean by other. And you don't know what you mean by the voluntary, what I want to happen, except in contrast and play against the involuntary what happens to me just as in the gyroscope the voluntary and the involuntary of the self on the other two poles of the same experience.

So, when you understand this, it is as if you had become one with all had a grasp of the axis of the gyroscope. And you know, that when the north side is going the way I want it. The south side is going in the opposite way. And it's really all one. Only it has to polarize itself in this way, so that there shall be something happening. That's the condition of the game. So then, we can say then that there are two poles in another way. We'll call one pole involution on the other pole evolution. Involution is all that aspect of life in which we get involved. In the schemes, in the games and the conflict, in the quarrels. So involved that we lose sight of the forest for the trees. And there comes a point as in every movie. Where that is so extreme that it has to swing up again in another direction. Where we see the forest over and above the trees and that is evolution. Where we for example, in our present day culture have gone through a historical. Sort of psychological historical development which is emphasised our consciousness of ourselves as individuals to an extraordinary degree. Never, never before in the history of man have people in the sun themselves so much with the plight of the individual. Never before have there been such social services. That would take every person and it consideration or at least go through the motions of

doing so. Never before was it thought important that every individual should have the chance of being given hospital treatment. And sickness all the sort of thing. But in doing this, we've raised a new kind of problem. The individual, having been brought to so great a realisation of his individuality because of the importance which society places upon, isn't quite sure that's what he wanted to be. Be careful of what you desire, you may get it. The individual, so critically emphasized, therefore turns towards. Going beyond individuality. Now you can do that in two ways. You can go beyond individuality by submerging himself. That is to say, by mindless and thoughtless adoption of a fanaticism. All by joining some mass movement some fanatical religion, some form of screwy politics. And by working for this cause be equally delivered from individuality as if you became a stone drunk. It's the same thing, there's nothing much to choose between the two. Or, by going right through the extreme of individuality. Instead of trying to forget one's loneliness self ego feeling go right into it. And through becoming an individual as intensely as you can become one now becoming as separate as you can get, you'll discover in a very natural way. at you are the eternal self behind the whole thing. There's that wonderful passage that is quoted in memoirs of the poet Tennyson, where he describes the way in which as a young boy he often used to be alone and used to repeat his own name to himself. Saying Alfred. Alfred. And you know he got that this thing called Alfred, this particular I is kind of spooky. You look at yourself in the mirror Don't look away you know other people feel awkward when they look at themselves in their. They don't quite want to look at themselves sometimes we feel your own power you see that thing going for our problems I do you figure start it's and want to rub it off like that. You're own inner processes, your own gut is something clear. But if you don't turn away from that you keep looking right in into your own eyes in the mirror. And first you say you rascal you Rod you down. You go on looking and you go deeper and deeper and deeper looking into your own. And then Tennyson goes on to say after he had said this name Alfred himself several times of this extraordinary feeling coming. In which he knew with total certainty, that beyond this little thing called Alfred, there was this absolutely eternal life that was forever and ever was the root and ground of everything. And if you've ever had the experience of going back in your own mind to childhood. Feeling that there's an immeasurably ancient you behind your childhood. A very knowing, Ancient of Days. That's what happens is when

you go through the experience of individuality to an extreme point. It very naturally explodes into the universe. Whereas if you withdraw from individuality, you're liable never to come across that. You just get caught up in the fashions and fads and customary escapes. Which other solace but most people. That's you see, the reason for being a hermit. Hermits are people who pursue individuality to an extreme they go off into complete solitude. And the most interesting thing you'll find in the state of complete solitude, when you get really alone. You find that you're connected with everything. Because what happens in complete solitude is that your ears become sensitized. And you hear all the sounds you want accustomed to hearing. You hear your own heartbeat, you hear the singing in your own ears, you hear the buzz of innumerable tiny insects you never paid attention to before. You hear the sound of the wind and every leaf responding to it you suddenly realise that the leaves are rippling through the wind and your eardrums rippling glitter all one process. That you indeed, are like a whirlpool in a stream. The pattern is constant but the water is always changing. You are a shimmering manifestation like the flame of a candle, which is really a stream of gas that never for two minutes the same you are dancing vibration and on either end of you is the whole the energy of the universe flowing through what is called you and wiggling in the recognizable form and then going on, you see. You are a wave waving of this energy. And we are all that is it's doing that hermit finds this out. Because by going into complete isolation he discovers there is no isolation. We become so sensitive to every tiny vibration. And when he discovers that then the good of him it comes back into the world. And even though he is involved in the business and turmoil of everyday life, he still sees this. So what is important for us to learn we're all most of us involved in some kind of frantic business. And what I want to suggest to you is that this frantic business. Can be your yoga. Your way of liberation. [That] you don't have to get out of it, you don't necessarily have to drop out. Although that's important for some people. It depends whether you have the vocation to drop out or whether you have a vocation to stay in. But you, I would not only say it is would help. To make your everyday life into a yoga but that you won't really be able to stand it if you don't. It's not as some people say can we Westerners practice Oriental disciplines. The question is if you can't you're not going to survive. You won't be able to take it.

So let's get to the point of view where we can see certain types of activity which are normally associated with extreme anxiety. Such as various forms of business where we always worry whether we're going to make the payments whether we're going to make the profit or whether we're going to do this that and the other and day to day, there's this constant anxiety going on. Now, there is a point of view from which those activities can be conducted as complete play and dancing, when you realize that you don't give a damn how it comes out. And it's only when you get to the point that you don't give a damn that you can be deployed to do the sort of things that all. If you do give a damn you can't get affordable afford to get involved in that kind of business that it has wreck your nerves and gives you ulcers. So it's terribly important not to give a damn. We are generally think that people who don't give a damn will collapse on the job will have no motivation. It's because they're not striving for power anymore. They realize that the striving for power is futile. So if you realize that striving for power is futile, what else would you do? What what other what other zest will there be? Other people think that if you deprive people of the urge for power they will have no motivation to do anything. What would be the motivation shall we call it if you are not interested in. Why would you do anything why would you make any effort, if it isn't that you want to control things. But you put in the place of the striving for power. Fun yeah, or to be surprised. Yeah. Right you. Are. Right. Yes but you will realize now once that there are several alternatives there isn't only. The fun which is one of them but say all that is also compassion. Where you see a lot of human beings are really suffering. And you can feel now but it's just not necessary you don't have to do it that way. And this may supply a great deal of energy you see, but the moment your energy is released from the power game, from the self-protection game it's free to do all kinds of other things you get a command as access now wait a minute let's let's have an intermission now and then we can bring up questions after about five minutes intermission OK. Well now, in pursuing the subject further, of yoga as everyday activity. I presume it is understood just what the word yoga, used in a very general sense, involves. The Indians use two words what I'm talking about one is yoga. And the other is sub par not. Meaning. Essentially a method a way. The objective of which is for the individual to rediscover, to realize, his true identity. That is, to say not who he may be defined as as a particular expression of life. By discovers his identity as deeply and essentially one

with the whole eternal process of life. With what I'll call for want of a better word the timeless energy that expresses itself as this world or all worlds all possible worlds. That's you know very deep and real sense you. The most real basic sense in which you can say the word I had all. But since this is not often never really realized because we are myopic. That is to say by looking at life close up and in narrow areas we become fascinated. With the contests with the problems with the games that are going on. Just for example if you examine your own blood stream under a microscope you would see a tremendous battles going on between all kinds of microorganisms and if you watched it long enough you would start taking sides. Yes taught to be wired. About which one was going to win and you would feel this crunching of the bodies of microbes as it were in your own bones. And you would therefore forget that you are a healthy human being just because that fight is going on in your bloodstream. The fight at one level, the conflict at one level is peace at a higher level. And life is all the way like that all the way up so that you can imagine what a whopping big piece there is at the top level. When you think of our conflicts as human beings as the conflicts of microbes. Redound into the health of a higher order of systems and then if you go into mythology and think of the conflicts between Deva's and Asuras. The angelic principles. Wowie you know what effect that is. And yet that is at a higher level of peace.

So when we are myopic, that is to say when we are working and living with a narrow view of what is going on. Then we are anxious and depressed or fearful or whatever it may be. Because. Yes we have lost contact. With awful selves and now of course we get into this way of looking at things. Because, for many many centuries, human beings have specialized. In one certain aspect of their total mind activity that's called it that. We've concentrated on our faculty for conscious attention. And this is in a way, what might be called The Fall of Man. We have you see this ingenious and valuable faculty of narrowing our gaze upon selected areas. If we take the visual field first of all, you are actually receiving everything that is in this great oval. The visual field. But you're not noticing everything. In order to notice, you have to focus your attention on some particular face or shoe or bag or pattern, or whatever it may be. And then your model to be able to recall in memory those little grasps of attention then you would any random detail in the whole thing if somebody says to me just by chance what was so

and so wearing at this gathering although I've seen it several times I won't remember if I didn't pay particular attention to it. Now hand in hand with this kind of raid up a separate in of the world that we scan. The environment and pick on things which we think are significant. And we select things that are significant with the aid of having words and therefore markers or tags which we can put onto these particular grasps off perception. And so, we come to be completely fascinated, in this way of looking at things. It is therefore at the root of reason of conscious calculation of all kinds it's at the root of science.

But, it is in fact although it has extraordinary advantages it is a very limited way of responding to the world. Because it's clumsy. And it is not the only way in which we respond and fit in with the world because all the time going on underneath our conscious attention is an interaction. Between our own organisms and the total physical environment, of immense complexity and which for the most part escapes our attention. We are doing our bodies. But we haven't the faintest idea in terms of language how we're doing it. You don't know how you managed to get born, not really. You know a few skimpy details but you don't know. How to Grow a fetus in the womb. How to arrange the marvelous balances which keep that fetus warm and fed. You don't know how to shape your bones, but you do it. But this is nothing to do with your conscious attention. And therefore we may be constantly astounded at the miracles performed by say a nervous system upon which our power of consuls conscious attention is based but which conscious attention itself does not comprehend. The nervous system is still too complicated for our most advanced neurologist to understand in any but a very partial way. And therefore, all great skill in any kind of work of art or craft or any human activity, depends upon your being able to do it in the same way that you grow your hair and shape your bones. To be able to go beyond performing whatever you do by mere power of conscious attention. Because that is a really very superficial faculty. It's like radar on a boat, and the function of the radar on the boat is merely to watch out for rocks and any novel thing that occurs in the environment. Consciousness is directed towards novelty, and those things which stimulate the nervous system all the time disappear from consciousness. They are beneath notice, because they're constant. That's the difficulty of say monogamy. When you have the same girl stimulating you all the time, you tend not to notice her, and

likewise husband. That's the problem with all constant features of life. They begin to slip from attention. But that's a pity, because then we become unaware of the incredible harmoniousness of all the features in our environment which are constant. The absolute beauty of this interchange, transaction, between our organisms and the total environment, which if we became aware of it, we would be in a state of total bliss. About it because our conscious attention is geared to looking out for differences and for things that are new and novel and because we've become over fascinated with it, we are mostly blind. To the miracle on the joyous performance of life which is going on all the time.

So then one of the major aspects of any doing a work, whether it be washing dishes or managing a bank. Or flying planes or whatever it is. You can learn to do that work effortlessly. In the same way as you effortlessly make your physical organism function. And. Only when you arrive at that point is the work that you're doing really good. And everybody knows this to some extent in whatever work it is that you do. If you are at all an expert in anything at all. I don't care what it is it may be simply that you're expert at riding a bicycle or swimming or talking. Or maybe cooking or something like that. If you really achieve any degree of mastery in the art. You do it. By the very fact that you don't do it, you in the ordinary sense. That you as a total living organism which is in turn a function of the whole universe when that is doing it it's always incredibly competent. And what we would like to know, is the difference between doing it that way. Doing it the hard way, that is to say by conscious effort and a third possibility the purely sloppy way, where it appears that the person is doing something effortlessly or they're really doing it very badly. It's just a mess. This culture today is confused between spontaneous behavior and messy behavior. Of course that is because we are primarily educated to do everything consciously. An enormous amount of say of sociological studies and psychological studies when you read them through their conclusions to which they arrive are just common sense. Everybody knew that already they got a Ph D. by proving it. That is to say, by analyzing how things happen naturally so that you can put them down in formulae of words, or formulae of numbers. And then we say now we know, because we've translated it into these terms. Not all academic knowledge is the minute measurement of what goes on in the world, in the hope that if we measure it this minute we should be able to

predict what it will do next and in this way control it. And up to a point, that's very successful. But there comes a point when it's not so successful. Because in ordinary affairs of life, we do not have time nor the expensive instruments to make these minute examinations of our problems and what we're supposed to do. We have to make decisions long before any kind of rational process could have worked out the right thing to do. Life comes out of that quickly and we really have to make ever so many decisions at once. And therefore, you cannot rely on your ordinary conscious calculation to make these decisions. And if you are not trained and accustomed to trusting your I'm conscious brain to make the decisions for you, you are at a great disadvantage. And therefore, basic to all this kind of thing, is learning to trust your own apparatus. You have far inside your head the best computer. That exists at all anywhere. And it's there to be used. It's there for you to give it problems and instead of your trying by muscular efforts to work out those problems to let your own computer do it for you. And you will always be confused when you first try this. Firstly, because you can hardly believe anything can be worked out that way. And secondly because you will accept answers from it before it's ready. Or after it's ready, because you didn't accept the first thing you thought of as the answer. For example, when people are trained in aircraft identification they expose outlines of different types of aircraft on a screen where they're exposed for only one thousandth of a second. And then they that's the speed with which you need to be able to recognise different kinds of aircraft. Or then they put on the same screen eight figure numbers, and the art of recognition is always to go for the first thing you thought of. If you got an eight figure number, don't stop to think just write down the first eight figure number you can think of and in a short time you find you are recording what came on the screen quite accurately. Because you're trusting your real first thought. But you see, this is a thing so contrary to the way we ordinarily brought up that we have a good deal of trepidation about doing it. And this, for this reason most people find it convenient and safe to do this kind of experimentation if at first in things that are not important. That's why you might for example take up the art of painting or pottery or archery or something that is simply a recreation and not not your main business in life and learn first of all to do this on important things in this way. So that you get enough confidence to be able to apply it to those aspects of your life which you feel to be important. And so that's why I say in Japan, many people take up an art outside their

ordinary business they'll take up tea ceremony or flower arrangement, or judo, or kendo, which is fencing. All even Zen practice, because this is something aside from the normal business of life in which they will get the training off how to have complete faith in your own organism. In what there's a master Bunkei, who taught in the seventeenth century called your unborn mind. That is to say the mind. He explained it this way, that when you hear a bird call, you instantly recognize a bird calling. When you hear a bell you instantly know it's a bell. That is to say your unconscious. This is what the really the word unborn means on. A manifest your on a manifest mind as this tremendous. And one learns to bring it out in exemplary ways. And so you gain the faith to live that way all the time. Now, let me say in doing this it is of help to understand that in a certain way you do live that way all the time because you can't help it. You are actually interfering with the normal functioning of your life by making all sorts of anxieties and stratagems and inner plans, and thinking about what to do if this happens and what to do if that happens. And most of this is not helping you at all it's just getting in the way of your ordinary functioning. Only you feel that you must do it in exactly the same way as a person afflicted by superstition walks down the sidewalk and must not tread on any lines. The feeling that I ought to... it's fun to do that of course but if you take it too seriously and feel that you must not avoid those lives you're completely interfering with your walk. And we're doing that all the time.

So, if you realize the extent to which you are ordinarily quite leading there are quite a civilised life. But that you are doing it. From, in the sense of by conscious will and effort. It's your innate sense, your innate intelligence that's taking care of it all. Furthermore, it helps too to realize, that you are not safe. However well-protected you may be. I notice that when people solve their so-called physical problems when for example you didn't have enough money and then you get enough money. Then you start worrying about your health. And then of course, you can take reasonable precautions about your health you can get the right shots and immunizations and so on but there's absolutely no way whatsoever of foolproof avoidance of accidents. Despite the best predictions of physicians you can always get heart trouble suddenly or kidney trouble or something and there is no safety. And therefore, going along with realizing that you quite ordinarily do transact the affairs of life in this through your unconscious intelligence, you

also realize there is really no way of protecting yourself. And an enormous amount of energy you used to protect yourself is completely wasted. Now the words you may be, you may discover through becoming aware of your own body that you're in a constant state of tension. As if ready to jump ready to defend yourself. Or even your trying to hold your body together. Charlotte Silva finds that when she but it gets people to lie on the floor and relax, they can't do it because they are in fact trying to hold their bodies together in the fear that if they didn't they would disappear into a kind of jello and slop all over the floor. And all that you see, all that constant sense of I should control what's going on is completely wasted energy. For the simple reason that conscious attention is not really the effective controlling force in your life it's merely the lookout. It's merely an information sauce which warns the organism as a whole of unusual features of the environment unusual changes that's why conscious attention tends to notice things that move rather than things that are relatively still, why it tends to notice figures rather than backgrounds. Because it is the radar of the organism, it is the troubleshooter. And if you identify yourself with your troubleshooter, well then you become one-sided and you'll become a perpetually anxious person. Whereas on the other hand if you see that you are identified principally not with that troubleshooter but with the whole organism. Then you become identified rather with that aspect of your being which is in a constantly harmonious relationship to its environment. We can of course explore at another moment in the seminar, those peculiar times of relationship to the environment. When the organism is being burnt up in a forest fire, or something of that kind. And how it responds to all those changes of circumstance that are as we say from the relative point of view, destructive to the organism. But actually, the organism and the environment are not two things. The environment is not the enemy of the organism. Nor is the organism the enemy of the environment that behavior goes together. In a constant and rhythmic expression of the greater organism of which they are both aspects. And the more your vision is widened and the more you live from that point of view, the more you see the total lack of necessity of being on the defensive all the time all.

Furthermore, as soon as you are not on the defensive and not trying to hold on to your control of life, by reason of the greater energy available to you. And by reason of your, I would say basically friendly and cooperative and

open attitude to other people you are by this non defending attitude much better protected, than you would otherwise be, because it's people who got a chip on their shoulders and are on the defensive who are always troublemakers. Whereas people who are generally speaking friend lead to whomever they relate, they don't get into difficulty very easily. They don't create difficulty. It's the same thing as cats when cats for cats are relaxed and therefore don't get hurt. And so my father once when he was a young man was suddenly slipped on a staircase. A very steep one, and fell down and it happened so quickly he didn't have time to resist. And therefore he wasn't hurt at all. This is the principle of falling in Judo. You learn to fall in a certain kind of cat-like heavy-loose, way. And so when you get thrown you don't get. And experts can fall on concrete and still not be heard. You know not just on padded mats and things like that. So all this comes about, not so much through a system of effort. But it comes about through a clear understanding of what your situation actually is. Face the facts. We talk you know of facing facts of something difficult preachers and politicians are always talking about hard facts and down to earth realities, as if they were something very unpleasant that we have to wake up to. I would rather say that the facts of our sister situation of the world aren't so bad people that. If we did arrive at the facts we would find that many things that we call hard facts and difficult problems are simply that there is out of not facing the facts not seeing what our situation is not realizing that we are completely vulnerable. And there's no way of being otherwise, we are unprotected. And that however protecting ourselves is not the way of life that evolution has favored. You see, contrast the molluscs and the mammals. The mollusks have hard shells on the outside and the soft flesh inside the shells the mammals have the soft flesh on the outside and the hard bones in the middle of the flesh. Now this species is more viable biologically, because it is more sensitive. And so it's found that this is why it will be abandoned iron warfare. OK. It is so constricted motion and so reduced vision and Sensibility and speed of. Of movement. That if it was really didn't work out.

And so in the same way, you could think of the disastrous French experiment of trusting in a Maginot Line. What a flop that was. And all elaborate defense systems are illusions. They don't work. Because life is basically lived as an act of faith. It is an adventure into the unknown. So, to

the degree you see, that you come to your senses and see that's the way things are. Whether you like it or not. This is the, this realisation alone is the greatest help in actually attaining the attitude of let go and the understanding of let-go and all the new energy that comes with it. Don't therefore say. You see it doesn't really help what I call Think positive in the sense of repeating to yourself. All is peace, all is love. I am letting go, I'm trusting...God loves me and all that. It's easier to do it the other way. That there is no safety to see everything is falling apart I'm as good as dead already and therefore stop resisting it the same. In this way you see you are not fighting things you are taking the facts and allowing them to help.

So then, you will naturally therefore begin to find as you do this that you seem, for example, in doing everyday things to be getting happy hunches. And to be a center of interesting. And fortunate accidents. People for examples, have often found that when they stop worrying about where the money is going country going to come from it starts turning up. That you get good ideas suddenly come to you. Like a comedian on the stage, when he's making gags and he doesn't clam the situation and advance because he doesn't know what kind of a situation is going to arise but somehow something works for him so he's constantly witty and has these comebacks which make everybody laugh. I had a friend who was saved in a most desperate situation by this faculty he was. Attached to a unit in the second world war in Asia. Under the command of Melvin Douglas. And they were curious group because they were entertainers responsible for going to U.S. installations all over Asia. And they had no rank. They simply assumed whatever rank. They were going to be with. Well they especially sent my friend out to situations where there was trouble well for example of a bad relationships between the commander and the rank and file. And it was one such base inside China where there was an American cardinal who was just a beast and testy fellow and they gave him orders to go in and take the stuffing out of that guy. So his act was a ventriloquist, and he had a dummy called the sad-sack. And he got on the stage in this huge auditorium in a tent or something, was set up. And here was this colonel with a nurse sitting in the front row. And so he began a dialogue with his dummy in the sack and began making rude remarks about. The commander in this camp. Son of the colonel, said so don't get off the stage. And so, my friend said nothing but the sad sack came back with some crack at it. He said so I want

to get off the stage I.V. a court martial. And despite everything the Sacket said so far there wasn't a laugh from the audience they were frightened to come and see and suddenly the sack said Ah shut up property back in my jockstrap. My friend said he had no idea he had never premeditated such a remark that simple thing like that around the house broke up just right around the colonel just strode out of the room you must be deflated. My friend says to this day it was the sack that said it I did.

So, this is just extraordinary thing you see, that this could this thing can come to the rescue. When so often in situations of this kind we think much later of the funny thing we should have said. And at the time were completely tongue tied and you see you are tongue tied or action tied. To the degree that you are anxious about the situation and are concerned with it if you are not concerned. Somehow everything is released. When you see that's basically the whole process of training in Zen Buddhism. Which is rather unique in this respect. It is a situation where you are in an environment with a teacher who constantly challenges you with problems that you cannot solve by ordinary thinking and that you must come back with come back at, without going through the process of conscious decision. The whole idea of a koan you see, a Zen problem. Like what is the sound of one hand. All these things are thought-stoppers. Thought-blockers. Which therefore can only be. Barriers which you can only pass if you act without stopping to think. Now you see, again we think in our culture that a person who doesn't stop to think is thoughtless. And is therefore irresponsible and unreliable. But while that is to a certain degree true it is also true that a person who does stop to think is unreliable because he can't make decisions fast enough. So, we are getting to a point now, which is really rather good we are handing over all decisions which require stopping to think, to computers. Which will analyze, in a rational way these problems much faster than we can ever dream of doing. And therefore, since we will hand over these sort of responsible decisions to computers we will be left free the exercise our hunch, like in spontaneous thinking, in a much greater degree than before. Now actually, though this hunch type thinking will apply to all responsible decisions I suppose it's always a matter of responsibility when you add up a line of figures. I personally haven't got an adding machine and I don't bother with us anymore. But Buckminster Fuller was telling me the other day that he can read a line of figures like

you read a line of print. And he can glance down a line and know it's time to. In fact, he can do through lines at once. And he just says he doesn't even think about it he lets his mind do it. And he invariably comes out right. And this of course is the way in which they train people in fast reading. To simply assume that whatever you see you will remember. Don't try to push your memory and say gangbanger I'm going on remember that you see. Simply assume that your memory works. And as I say at first this will discourage us and not work because we are frightened of it. But if you. Do this in something that you are not frightened about because it is not very important, you will be able to see that it does work. And that you as an organism are fundamentally to be trusted. Because therefore in the culture where Zen has played such a dominant part. On the Japanese all sorts of stories about. How this works in relation to. The various skills I'm Crofts. The. One I like best is about Carpenter's. Carpentry in over Japan is very definitely a yoga. And a carpenter has always prided themselves in their freedom from any plan in designing a house they were they still to this day when you watch them they have the very rough sketch of what's supposed to be done. And they do incredibly complicated joinery you know those wooden Japanese puzzles you buying all sorts of skulls they are simply throw off all of the carpentry technique of joinery they're put together the beams at an angle. To the corner of a building in the most amazing locked into locked ways very beautiful. And for that they do the whole thing by feel and by I no measure. And they all get absolutely clean shit without measurements. You see, wood is a vegetable. It's not like steel. And it's got all sorts of given fluctuation of the temperature changes. And therefore they relate to it in an organic way instead of a mechanical way. I was once having a conversation with a Zen master through an interpreter, who was a priest. And the interpreter was saying the Japanese carpenter, in not using a plan for his building was very like the attitude of Zen in everyday life. So I posed a koan to those gentlemen what happens in the case of the person who makes a blueprint but doesn't make a plan for it. You always make plans to make plans and make plans to make plans to make plans. Of course you don't. And therefore what I'm talking about is a not an anti-intellectual approach to life thoughtless and that's. Because when a scholar does his work and a scientist does his work he can also do it in the same spirit. He can intellectualize spontaneously. He can be reasonable with his intuitive capacity of mind. But the Carpenters were always having the most

marvelous happy Accidents there's a great story of two rival unions of carpenters in one town. Had been contracting to build a temple. And the people who had not got the contract with very aggregate those who had and the day came for raising the roof beam, which is a great ceremony. And when the master carpenter arrived to raise the roof be Mollie one morning. He suddenly found that it had been tampered with overnight, and that they had gone and cut six feet off it. And all the people who were measuring came and said to him this is terrible what are we going to do it said don't worry it's perfectly all right. I'll fix it. And so he went up to the roof beam, and solemnly struck it because how much instead now raised the ropes and put it in position and zip it went up and fitted perfectly. So he had actually made it six feet too long, in the knowledge that some one to business would be played. So you know, the literature of what I would call applied Zen is just full of tales like that. You are perhaps some of you have seen the film of Miyamoto Musashi, [who] was a school Samurai. And he was a great master of this kind of thing because as he got older he had been a terrific swordsman nobody could defeat him but he realized that that that his last battle was one in which he was absolutely challenged and forced into killing an absolutely beautiful young man who was a wonderful swordsman and he just felt depressed about the whole thing. So he developed in his later life the no-sword school of never having to use the saw at all because he would outwit. Any opponent long before it got to the point of fighting.

So, he was one day travelling across at the lake big lake near Kyoto called Biwa. And on the ferry boat there was a very drunk and rambunctious Samurai. Who challenges Musashi and said. I see you're a saw what school do you belong to and he said I belong to the no sword school. He said are no-sword school. And sister who is sought and said let's see what you can do with your nose dogs on the side she said Now look there are many people on this boat and if we start fighting innocent bystanders might get hurt so why don't we go over to that island and we can fight it out there so he said to the ferryman take us over to the otter. And as they came along shore this drunk summer I was so eager for the fight that he leaped off the boat first under the island that was actually grab the boatman's on press the boat out of the water. He said There you see my no-sword school.

So, Hasagawa, who was a great Japanese artist and friend of mine called all that kind of thing the controlled accident. And you see in every art this is the marvelous thing well I pointed out last night in discussing my own sort of basic philosophy, that what we are always looking for in life is a surprise that we really don't want a life situation in which we have complete control over everything. And therefore all future happenings are known because if they were known they would already be past. Of such a future we could say in our own inimitable slang, you've had it. Now you see then, the accident that happens is the surprise. But pure accident is of no interest. Because you realize the accidental only in terms of there being also something controlled which contrasts with it just in the same way as you recognize a figure by its contrast to the background or light by its contrast with darkness. So the accidental is realized in relation to the controlled, or we could say the random is recognized in relation to order and vice versa. And therefore what is sort of optimal in life is exactly then the controlled accident where you can watch for example of the Japanese Potters doing designs on plates and they'll pick up plate after plate and they've got a brush with a glaze and that you're really like that and all sorts of drips of glaze fall at random but within a controlled swirl of the brush, and one after another they'll just go on the stack like that you rip your ear every one of them different because the chance falling of the drops was different each time and yet behind those falling drops there was a rhythm they played it dancing hand see that was the element of control. And you can show this to yourself by a very simple formula which I don't recommend that you put this on exit, but you can have a wonderful time if you proceed as follows You take a black heavy a black brush full of ink or a. Felt pen and you make on a piece of paper completely random squiggles. Then, in a very careful way, you fill in all those squiggles with planned and highly controlled coloring. And you will see that you've made a rather interesting design it may not be a great work of art yet, but it will certainly be something interesting because of that combination of the random element and the planned orderly element. But you have to allow the random to occur. And then, the very skilled artist of course finds that he does control things in a random way. As he gets to being able as he won't know how to steer a car or ride a bicycle or whatever it is or swim quite thoughtlessly, because the control is completely in the hands of the unconscious non attentive functioning of your mind or nervous system. So then, I'm saying that this way of functioning, not as an ego

fighting and wrestling with the world, but as your organism, working as an expression of the whole energy of this universe of God or whatever you want to call it, will work at anything that you do far more effectively that way, than your present ideas of forcing it to do its job. And one has to be willing to take the risk of being a complete fool, to make the transition from one way of working to the other. All right, let's have an intermission. I thought that in discussing the yogas of everyday life, I should get rather specific and speak in detail about one of the yogas of everyday life as an example of all of them. And I could have chosen something exotic like learning judo, or archery or something like that you've got a book Zen in the Art of Archery. Which does this for archery but I thought it would be much more interesting to talk about something nearer to home. And discuss Yoga in terms of cooking. Now. This is an art and a religion, which in the United States we know a little about. Especially in the last maybe twenty years. During which there's been an absolutely phenomenal sale of books on cooking. Cookbooks of all kinds. They are among the best selling books in this country. And...but for all that, what we might call our public standards of cooking have not very much improved. Although you can find in homes and in individual life a great many excellent and accomplished coax me still. There are very few cases where the art of cooking itself becomes something of a yoga. And that's because we believe that so much [a] practical and everyday an affair. Cannot be spiritual. I've sometimes said scratch an American and discover a Christian Scientist. Because there is a kind of universal feeling that the process of biology which involves. Absolutely fundamentally eating, and eating of other living organisms, is something we are rather ashamed of. To have to be in the situation where you depend for your continued existence upon the destruction of animal and vegetable forms. And that is a formidable situation to be. And it's one which we tend to gloss over. And not really meet the challenge which this predicament office to us. We would like to in a way meet the challenge and we foresee perhaps an age. When all food will be compounded synthetically in labs, and be assimilated in the form of pills. And all he will have to do will be to take so many pills a day of different colors as prescribed by offices from dietician. In Richmond accordance with your needs. And you will just take those particular small pills and that will be that you won't have to go through the crude material and vulgar process of eating. Now this would be very dangerous indeed, if we got to that point because it

would let allow us to imagine that we do not belong to the biological process. That we do not either have to eat other creatures, and what is still more important to be eaten by them. Human beings are trying, and have been trying for years to be top species. And top species means the one who eats but does not get eaten. And therefore, we are the only species of life on Earth that hoards its own dead. Isn't that a fascinating terrible thought we haud. Our own dead as if they were buried gold. And try, and have tried since the time of the ancient Egyptian so to mummified and preserved dead human bodies that they are not devoured by worms and do not become manure for the ongoing process of life. And I feel that that's an extraordinarily ridiculous feature of our existence, and is somehow connected with our failure, to know and to feel, that we are continuous with the rest of the universe. That we are one lifehood. But to the extent that we don't feel that, to the extent that we I have been brought up to consider ourselves as external observers. And controllers of the rest of nature, the heads of nature chieftains of nature to that extent we resist belonging to the mutual eating society in which biology is. And to the extent that we refuse to belong to it, we become the most predatory monster on the face of the earth, who is destroying itself and its own life in directing. More effectively and swiftly than even swarms of locusts. There are of course, from time to time in the biological world and nominate, the predatory animal insect or mouse or rat or whatever it is, simply eats itself out of existence. And we could very easily do just that.

We could become a species of life which conquers this planet. And which has no natural enemy that is to say no other form of life which leads on us. And the moment you're in the position where you have no natural enemy nothing that feeds on you and I think you would if you can offer your body, and say this is my body which is given to you do this and remember me. Once you're in that position you are in a fatal position. Because you want nothing will then stop you from devouring everything in sight. And a new start becoming a cannibal, eating up your own kind, in one way or another, and that's going to be the end of you. It is therefore not insignificant that in this particular culture where. Cooking is not really an honored art, except among really a rather small segment of elite. Dilettante, That there should be a popular. Way of Death. The way of the American mortician, which is aimed at preventing the human corpse from being assimilated into the life

cycle. They are all pickled in formaldehyde. And put in enormous bronze caskets and concrete. Graves so that the beneficence officers of the world. And the maggot shall be frustrated. Now you've spent all your lives absorbing into your system the products of the soil. And therefore it is your biological duty to return. To the soil what you got from it. Both in terms of sewage. And in terms of your own corpse when the time comes to die. For the most fertile field. I've been found in times past and the fields of battle. Many corpses lay dead and were absorbed into the soil and they grow magnificent wheat, [and] the cycle of life goes on.

But we are resisting this. And the resistance to giving our bodies back to the earth goes hand in hand with our general disregard of what we call ecology. Ecology is the science of the relationship between living organisms and their physical environment. And it's one of the most important branches of science that there is. If we do not pay attention to the science of ecology, we more and more tend to be beings who follow our own nests, and who create, what we would call spoiled environments. Would be tourists are always asking about various foreign countries is it spoiled yet. That means doesn't it, have enough of us it is it is the place to make it no longer worth visiting. Have we turned the Hawaiian Islands, the Caribbean. Japan. Burma, Silan. Anywhere you like. Have we turned it into a new tourist trap? A Place In other words where you can no longer find human beings in their natural state. But find them in a new state of the tech the what I would call the. Early technological state of being at war with nature. Of the continuing the Jewish and Christian superstition. That man. Is to be top dog. That man. Is as it were and not a feature of nature. But a stranger in the earth who has as it were come into this planet. As an embodied spirit. And whose nature as being spiritual is alien to the nature of the earth. It's curious, you see, that even since the nineteenth century since the rise of what we call scientific naturalism. Since the rise of a philosophy of life in which supernaturalism and the supernatural origin of man are repudiated and we look upon ourselves as products of an evolutionary process, rather than a supernatural process. We evolved, Yes, according to the doctrines indeed the dogmas of scientific naturalism we evolved from our lower animal friends. But the people who believe in the philosophy are even more than traditional Christians and Jews antagonistic to the processes of nature. The outcome of scientific naturalism is a technology which is dedicated to

the conquest of nature. Because it's based. On a doctrine which we deeply resent even though most of us believe it. And this doctrine is, that the natural universe is a mechanical process. Which because it is mechanical, and nothing other than mechanical that is to say because it can be described then accounted for in a strictly logical way. We curiously therefore feel that it is essentially stupid. All machines, even though we revere them and depend on them, are regarded as stupid. In the sense that they have no heart. In the sense that they are purely logical and therefore do not care about the things that human beings really care about. They have no love in them. And we believe you see, if you are brought up in the tradition of thought of nineteenth century science, that the universe is fundamentally lacking in love. It doesn't give a damn. It has no feeling. And it has no intelligence. The human being is an evolutionary fluke that has come into this world as a result of a chance permutation and combination of biological elements. And we therefore, this superstition about the nature of man goes hand in hand with some of the superstitions of science. Not that these superstitions are any longer held, by really understanding soundest but it is a fundamental true scientific superstition that if the human being can stand in the situation of an objective observer of any given situation. That you can as it were, be impartial and view what is going on with a cold calculating intellect that sees what is as distinct from what one might wish to be. And a person who is the victim of what I would call scientism, as distinct from science is very large boulders the pose. That we are afflicted by wishful thinking. And that if you are the kind of person who is reliable, objectively and clear you are one. Who must necessarily take a grim and dim view of the universe. Because that will advertise the fact that you are tough-minded. And to be tough-minded will be your particular andona, or point of honor. And so, you will look upon all those who regard the universe as being in some way vital are intelligent as woolly minded. Because you will give yourself a case of extreme intellectual porcupinism, of being critically I mean your attitude to all facts. Analytic. Hardboiled. Definite precise and a rigorous. And that will advertise the fact that you. After all someone has come to a sense of. Actually, you've lost your senses. And you've only found your mind. And it's very truly said that you have to go out of your mind to come to your senses. That is to say you, you have to be liberated from the confusion of the symbolic world with the real world, and I've talked a great deal about that thus far. But here is you see the great problem after twenty a century

man basing his way of life on one thousand century ideas which are today the common sense of most educated individuals. That there is an implacable resentment against our biological situation. We endeavor in myriads of different ways to conceal the fact that we are biological beings. Our clothes. Our social institutions in ever so many ways are trying to say, we are not mammals. And anything that emphasizes our mammalian qualities is really considered vulgar. Of course we can't resist the truth that we are mammals and that's why American men are absolutely fascinated by female mamma, by breasts. Because you know, truth will out.

So then, when it comes down to a very very fundamental biological science, art. The art of so rendering food that it becomes extremely well absorbable. We have our qualms. And we don't really go to it. And yet you see as I suggested in a previous talk, the human being is like a weld pool. In water. The human being is a pattern of life which is a particular form of activity in a stream but the human stream consists of water. Milk. Wheat. Cow. Vegetables. All foodstuffs whatsoever in the process of being processed by us. In your lifetime, you have processed innumerable tons of groceries, and therefore, you are what you eat. Every fiber and cell of your bodies is beef steak and potatoes, and so on in the course of being processed humanly. And therefore, all those people who stand at the entryway. Whereby the stream enters the human organism and becomes changed into our form is in a very responsible position. For as cook, standing at the kitchen range you are most veritably a priest at an altar. And if you do not realize the priestly and magical nature of your function as a cook you are doing the human race a great disservice. But the trouble is of course that the average person who cooks in our culture is a harassed housewife. Who has to do this every day to get meals ready for our children and adults. Who are fundamentally in a hurry to do something else other than eat. Breakfast in the morning is usually a madhouse. Because everybody has to get up to get the children off to school in time and get the husband of the family after work in time. And this is usually postponed to the last minute. Among other reasons because of course of going to bed the night before was flown to the last minute. Because there was some fun going on the night before. Over which because of which one had to hurry through dinner in order to get out to it whatever it was. When we do tend to regard meals as medicine rather than diet. We would take packages of all the new foodstuffs. And we will find on them in

small print the same sort of chemical analysis of what's in it as you get in a bottle of pills. Every package of food has to have its contents spelled out, you see, as if it were medicine. You buy say an ordinary envelope of gelatin and there's a chemical formula on it. Because, we are looking at this this food. For what good it will do for us. We are firmly of the opinion that awful that we eat in order to live rather than that we live in order to eat. Therefore the pleasures of the table the art of the kitchen is simply relegated to being a means to an end. It enables us to continue our biological existence in order to, in order to what? Make money. Or be cultured, and people who listen to music or go to plays all read books with the motivation of becoming cultured people never listen to the music, don't understand the play and don't really read books, because they always have one eye on what kind of person this activity is turning me into what status it gives me. Therefore one never really does it. So in order to be human, in order to be cultured and civilised in the highest sense of the word. It is that absolutely necessary to everyday life that we take the art of cooking. Sincerely. That we regard the process that goes on at the table, as one of fundamental spiritual and religious importance. And make it a yoga. Not only the what goes on in the kitchen. But also what goes on at the table itself must for us become an occasion where we regard ourselves as involved. In one of the most important worthwhile things that we do. Because you see if you only eat in order to live. You will not digest your food properly. You will both wolf it down just to stop the knowing. And so I misquote Henry Miller. Throw anything down the hatch to stop the gnawing feeling and swallow a dozen vitamins. If that doesn't work see a surgeon. If that doesn't work get a Hollywood funeral. They're the duckiest, the cutest funerals. Why? You can have your beloved propped up, reading something like the Bhagavad Gita, and smoking a cigarette forever, cigarette guaranteed not to rot away before the lips or the buttons. Oh Death, where is lies sting Oh grave where is the victory jolly what a.

But that's the problem you see, of using this food merely as a means to an end. I was in the airport. Trying to find something for lunch just before coming down here and there were three goals in their late teens sitting at a table next to us. And their lunch consisted of French fried potatoes, with ketchup and Coca-Cola. They were putting down. And this sort of thing goes on all over the place. Lucius Beebe, who was a great gourmand, once

said the south of the Mason-Dixon line everything is fried in rancid axle grease. And that's pretty much true. I remember, not so long ago that for my sins, I was lecturing in the state of Virginia. And I was, in colleges most of the time, you see, and I was condemned out for to eat the offerings of college cafeterias. And sorority and fraternity house cooking and it was so abominable, that I literally starved. You may say I'm fussy but I will not eat. Unless I am literally starving and have been starving for days and days when anything will taste good but a normal person should not be asked to eat the incredible messes of ruthlessly boiled vegetables. Meat that has suffered in electronic purgatories for hours. And is served to you in a gravy that was made of water, bouillion cubes, and library taste. This is simply not fit for human consumption, and the fact that the whole academic world without question faculty and students eat this notorious garbage is of course rotting their brain. And making them highly uncivilised. That it just unpardonable. There is no excuse for this at all ,and part of the reason is that college kitchens are supervised by dieticians as distinct from cooks. And these two classes of persons are really mutually exclusive. Because the dietician thinks saw food in terms of its chemical contents, in terms of its calories its vitamins its proteins, and so, thinks through a test tube well as an accomplished cook thinks with his tongue. And with his belly and with what fundamentally is good for his gut. And he comes an accomplished book comes from a long tradition be it of French Cooking Chinese cooking or of Indonesian cooking Indian cooking or whatever it is has a long long historical tradition behind him of excellence and the French cook, no one is more proud. No one is more delighted with his art and the dinner [that] goes with him is also equally important as a person in seeing that human beings remain civilized at the table and at the table is not simply treated in the same way as the boss from the bathroom is the output room. And is always sort of relegated to unconsciousness, because we don't like to admit that we do these. Things. And the so where when you are you you carry the bathroom attitude to the kitchen as I suggested already the kitchen begins to look like a bathroom because it is just the input room. And no real reverence is accorded to the art of cooking. Well I think that. If we want to have a true civilization we want to be people of great culture, great humanity, a lot of it begins in the kitchen. And goes on around the eating table. In Christianity, after all, we have the mass as a central right. The Holy Communion. The eating of bread and the drinking of wine because in

Mediterranean civilization the time when Jesus lived bread was the staple food and wine was the staple drink people didn't drink water, for God's sake. Because you could never trust water what was in it therefore if you had a sudden alcoholic content in the water of his drinkable. But beyond that of course the nurture of grapes and the production of very fine. Loved and matured wines was a way of bottling sunshine. And you will find to this day, that in any restaurant where wine is not in Western culture, they do not now understand food. Food and wine in the Western tradition are inseparable. And wine is not alcohol in the sense of vodka or whiskey or whatever is hard liquor. Wine is food, and when an Italian family is asked the question is to put die. What it spends on food. What it stands on drink they will always include the wine under the food expenditure they don't imagine that it's spent on drink. Yes they would say all right if we bought some whisky that would be drink as distinct from food but wine is food. And so, these things blend themselves together and when anybody who really understands wine opens a bottle of wine you will notice that they always do it with a certain ritualistic attitude. They will carefully draw the cork and they will sniff the cork to see that the flavor is all right then they will pour a little wine into a glass and allow it to roll around the glass and you should always use their rather for table-wines like carrots, burgundy is shabbily so to an all those wines you should use a rather large glass what the French call it by long a balloon glass so that it almost like brandy you can catch the past few more of the wine in the glass. And you roll the wine around and sniff it and you may take a tiny step to see that it's all right. Meanwhile, the wine pourer stands beside you to see if you approve it maybe yourself as host of the table and you put it down and then you serve the other guests but you don't for the glass fill this kind of glass to the top you fill it about one third of one half so that an area is left above the wine to catch the perfume. And then you gently savor it, you don't wolf it down in a gulp.

Now you see there's a ritualistic attitude to that wine is something precious and valued. And if you follow wine and are interested in it. If you can learn the art for example of being. Almost blindfold. I don't mean that literally it's the bottle it's blindfolded because you need your eyes as well as your nose and tongue to test why you need to look at it. How it clings or doesn't cling to the side of the glass and so on and experts of course can do that yes

rather accurately what wine they're drinking. Where it's from. It's not easy to fact it's probably a fairy tale that people can pin down the actual Vineyard. But just they can do so occasionally in a fluke way, if they happen for example to. Be the manufacturer of that wine itself the might pin down the actual in. But you see, wherever wine is revered the serving of wine is attended with a ritual now I'm pointing out what is good cooking also is attended with a ritual because you are as cook a priest at an altar and you are a vital moment in human life in the point where. Other biological existences be they animal or vegetable are being transformed so as to enter the human system and to become us. And so as Lin Yutang once beautifully put it, a fish who acts which has died for you and is not well cooked has died in vain. Here you see, we face in a serious ethical problem since we do depend on all these other creatures for our life what is a response. Billed towards them. You can't avoid this, you can't become a vegetarian if you're squeamish about it. But that's only a gesture you're still destroying living beings to eat. Apples tomatoes cabbages lettuce. All those things, cereals. You're still destroying other forms of life.

And so the only possible good ethical response to finding ourselves in this Situation, is not only of cross the obvious one of putting to good to use the energies which we derive from them but also the immediate respect shall I say the grace, the Thanksgiving of honoring what we eat. By cooking it to perfection. And perfect cooking. Will involve, therefore, ritual, because ritual is actually. Any activity whatsoever done. With full attention and care. When you watch a surgeon or even a lowly dentist at work and he is a good surgeon or a good dentist you want out just that he has a certain ritualistic attitude to the way he disposes his tools, and to the order in which he does things. There are certain dentists, who you recognize at once as having surgeons fingers. They are loving, quiet, peace-giving things. That work with a kind of quick but on a hurried expertness. And you can see, the same thing in a driver of a car. Or in any expert work at any craft whatsoever. And you will always see he goes about what he's doing with a certain. Way of behaving that is very much like the behavior of a priest at an altar.

Now, I don't know how many people know much about what priests do with all those. Even Catholics don't always know very much about this.

And they think ceremony ceremony ceremony, a lot of empty gesturing. But actually, the way in which a priest celebrates the mass. It isn't quite practical. All the ceremonies connected with it were originally functional activities. Why are the candles on an altar. We think candle is a way of lighting a candle beside something in the way of paying respect to it. Well yeah, but originally one needed some light to see what you were doing, to read any book you might have. And, why was incense offered at all when you think Protestants especially have what we call Protestant noses and find incense in church very repugnant. But that is all connected with our putting down of the sense of smell. This is one of the most interesting things in our culture is our repression of smell. It tells a great deal about us taste depends to an enormous degree on smell we can actually only identify four kinds of taste with a ton of four dimensions of taste, and the real savoring of food depends on its texture and be on its mouth that is when you get a very bad cold you notice that you don't taste of food. But yet, in the English language we have only three words to distinguish qualities of smell. Acrid, pungent, and fragrant. All other words which we used to denote smell are borrowed from other senses. We are noseless. Chesterton put it in the line of one of his poems and goodness goodness only knows is the noselessness of man. Dogs, cats, all creatures very conscious of smell and find their way by it. But we when we say it is like the person who is alleged to have got into a coach with Dr Johnson this fastidious lady. Being in the eighteenth century when people went very fastidious about washing she looked at him and said so use that old. He said On the contrary, madam, you smell. I stink.

You see we don't like smells. And particularly, we don't like the smell of the human organism. We would rather smell of disinfectant. Of laboris, or something chemical like that, then we would smell of people. And therefore, the clean good healthy Western civilized type of person, smells of chemicals. In fact he smells like a public toilet. Rather than smelling human. And the to be smelly you see, is to be stinky. Means the same thing. And therefore Curiously the sense of smell becomes the transmission sense of the unconscious. You becomes immensely important just because it's repressed. And we get all kinds of messages which, for reasons that we don't understand, influence our likes and dislikes of other people. We like the people who smell good to us and dislike the people who don't smell good to us although this never passes through conscious analysis. An

enormous amount of communication comes this way. Memories for example, are wonderfully evoked by smells. Up all sorts of situations in childhood when we weren't so unconscious of smell. Our evoked is why we like the smell of freshly cooking coffee so much which reminds us of the wonderful breakfasts, long ago, of home. Of mother, of the kitchen. The smells of freshly cooking bacon, you know, all that sort of thing goes with the smell of burning autumn leaves. And all these really a cherished smells. And immediately evoke memories, and that's why you see in Buddhist and Hindu and Catholic worship the incense is used. Because there are certain smells connected with the shall I say the religious consciousness which evokes that consciousness. And in a very very powerful way.

So then, this is the sort of mystery that goes on at all to those. Where people are doing things. That indicate basically a reverence for life. Albert Schweitzer. Reverence for life. This is the sacrificial bread, and the sacrificial wine upon which your life depends and therefore on it is done to that. The Christian idea of the Communion is really very very simple, because the meaning of the mass, which Jesus was trying to point out, was that the Christ's sacrifice was basically, the grinding up of wheat, and the crushing of grapes. The sacrifice of every living creature which maintains the human species. This is my body, which is given to you. Therefore the death of all creatures which give other creatures life, is the ongoing process of love, of self-offering, which constitutes the very nature of the biophysical world. And therefore, if you say grace before meals what you should really fact is the dead cow, the dead fish, or the crushed grain which you are about to eat and say to this thank you very much. For allowing your life to be transformed into mine. And so, the natural outcome of grace is eventually to allow your life to be transformed into the life of other beings still be they ever so humble, be they merely bacteria or worms. Because they in their turn are a sort of beast. From which life continues to go on.

So now, all those of you who are at any time in gauged in cooking must become aware of the high dignity of this art. And all the possibilities in it for yoga and self realisation. No more must you ever throw something together to stop the gnawing feeling. There is no point whatsoever, in cooking without giving yourself adequate time for it. Because you will find that time spent on other things. To such an extent that it affords no time for

cooking is a way of wasting your life. On abstract fripperies, instead of things of true material consequence. Anybody who cooks, should therefore set aside a sufficient time of the day to do it to perfection. There is no point in cooking at all, unless one cooks perfectly. Because to do anything less than that is a serious a reference to the fish to the dead animals, and to the crushed grains that we use. I don't want to sound moralistic as if naughty naughty to be irreverent to these creatures. I'm merely saying if you aren't reverent towards them ,you will not eat well. Because the process of transforming these valuable living elements into great dishes is really worth it. But the basic thing in being a good cork. Is that you must love the natural elements which grow into it. And other words when you get spread out on the chopping board. The various meats and vegetables, eggs, and so on. You must start by feeling of love for those things. Roll the vegetables in your hand. Look how exquisite they are when the slice say a Purple Onion look at the lines the patterns in what is then displayed look at a fish laid out in front of you the wonderful music of it scales. What a beautiful thing it is, the way the bones are formed. When you slice meaning to look at the marbling in it the quality of the color. Relish all that, sniff all that. And if you love those raw materials, you will be able to cook because cooking is a process of loving it is loving it. It is a transformation through love of these raw materials in assimilable and truly edible form. And a person therefore who is engaged in the ritual of corking will never make the mistake of hurrying. Now, there are moments in cooking where you have to have your wits about you because timing, is terribly important, as in boiling an egg, as in making a souffle. As in making certain sauces as in frying with butter where the batter has to be at a certain temperature and mustn't be allowed to burn. Cooking certain kinds of pastry requires perfect timing but perfect timing and hurrying are two completely different things hurrying in cooking is always a failure. Instant coffee is a punishment for people who are in too much of a hurry. There is only one way of cooking coffee that is perfect, which is jungle coffee where you put coffee into cold water. And you allow you but you see you've got to watch it. And the moment it comes to that begins to come to the boil you turn it off and it was never boil and then you stir it and you put the lid back on the pan to keep the heat in and you allow a little time for the grounds to settle. And then pour it off through a fine strainer in case any ground should be done through and you have got absolutely perfect coffee. But it takes it takes your presence of mind, it

takes watching to do it. Our store also does boiling eggs which is a very subtle art yield there is no formula for boiling an egg. Because there are too many variables enter into it where, what is the temperature of the egg? What is the quality of the egg? How hot your flame is how high you are above sea level? When you think water begins to boil. All sorts of questions like that going to the boiling of an egg. And no egg timer will by itself teach you to boil an egg. You have to get a feel for your own stove for your own kitchen for your own climate or the kind of eggs you buy from the market and then eventually you will know almost instinctively how to boil an egg. So, I would say then, the basic attitude is one of concentrating. Not by sort of forcing our attention on things that's not the way to concentrate. I think the attitude of concentration is very well shown if you watch the conduct of the Japanese tea ceremony. The whole idea of which is that the simple act of serving powdered green tea in hot water which is whisked can be so utterly delightful. And that the contemplation of the bowls, and the bamboo instruments that are used in this procedure can give such aesthetic relish, that it is worth dallying over. And spending two or three hours just doing that.

So in the same way, you will find that very good cooks have extremely interesting kitchens. That they will, for example, have the kind of kitchen where there is not one single utensil not one jar or sauce which is not an object to be using. Such people will go out of their way to collect Mexican bowls because they are so warm-feeling and lovely. To have the most beautiful jobs for example they will buy the wonderful jobs that are made for use and lamps. With. The ground glass stoppers fit very snugly beautiful functional shapes. They are much better than the ordinary kind of glassware for such purposes it is served in supermarkets. Go to a lab manufacture and buy all sorts of bottles and beautiful instruments. They are perfect for use in the kitchen. So you will find that a good cook always has an interesting and colorful kitchen. Because a good cook makes the kitchen the most attractive center in the house. A good cook will find that the company invited for dinner will tend to gravitate to the kitchen while dinner is being prepared. This may be an embarrassment to the cook if you're doing something extremely complicated which requires that you spread yourself over a quite an area and you have to move rather swiftly from part of out of the kitchen and don't want to be interrupted by conversation. But that is true only of

certain very complex dishes. Everyone who really enjoys cooking tends also to like showing off. And to like to cook under other people's eyes and they instinctively also like to watch it being done because it stimulates the appetite. Therefore, you ideally should have an arrangement in your home where if you don't actually live in the kitchen and have like a big farm kitchen it's always a good idea to have this the kitchen and living area separated by a bar where the actual stove is in the bar under a suction fan. So that people before dinner can come with their drinks and sit at the bar and watch you make things right under their noses and you can carry on conversation and not be separated from your guests. This is likewise the principle of cooking say ski aki, yakitori, tempura and all those various Oriental dishes which are served at the table or funded Borgen Yar or Swiss cheese fondue and all those things that are cooked right right there.

Now, as you are of course a tyro a beginner in the article thing. You will find that you depend on the recipe book. On instructions as to how to go about it and that's quite right and proper because the recipes have been worked out and tested over many hundreds of years and. Are things to learn from. But as you, the more you begin to understand and get a feel for cooking the less you will need recipes, and you will find yourself in the delightful situation being able to invent all sorts of different meals, where you are not following recipes but you're creating your own. Especially is this true in the art of dealing with leftovers. This is a real test of mastery in cooking. A good cook should not waste anything. Should find out how to convert all things that are left over from the kitchen into something exciting and that you see a real test of your inventive genius. And eventually, you come to know in your bones, in your nerve centers and the nose. What goes with what, how to treat certain things. And you've been comes therefore increasing increasingly difficult for you to explain to anyone else how it's done. The Chinese Taoist book written by Chuang-Tzu has a number of examples in it of the yoga of everyday life. And to the ones he mentions in particular the art of the wheelwright. And the art of the butcher. The wheelwright is an old gentleman seventy years old, who makes wheels with absolute perfection. That do not wobble on the axle and do not grip on the axle but revolve quite evenly but he because he doesn't know how he does it, he cannot explain to his son how to do it as well as he can therefore still is working all those seventy years old. Then there is the butcher, who uses

his knife so skillfully that it hasn't been had to be sharpened in seventeen years. Because it always goes exactly through the joints in the bone. And that which is infinitely thin can enter whether is no space this is drunk as chance of a way of putting it. But that knife that goes wish to see and never has to go crack is always in sharp form. So in this way, he says there is something incommunicable about all great arts. He says also following his mentor Lao Tzu, the five colors make the eyes blind the five tones make the ears deaf. That means if you think there are only five colors you are blind. If you think there are only five tones you are deaf. In other words. I'd say we have the Spectrum seven colors. The Chinese think of five. We think of so many twelve terms in the musical scale, but if you think that only twelve terms are deaf. And so, in taste, in all the parts of cooking. If you depend on the recipe you have no tongue. You could say then in Taoist fashion, recipes spoil the tongue. That's an exaggerated way of saying something it's a half truth it's a truth that is imperfect but it's there that way in that violent way as it were to attract attention. Recipes are very useful. But you will eventually come to the point where you will not be able to explain and therefore you get those awkward recipes where it says simply season to taste a pinch of this, a dollop of that, and you don't know how big a pinch or a dollop is well that's because you haven't yet developed the feel for the way in which certain ingredients will go with others. But you will find as you cook in that attitude, that you will become deeply aware of the miracle of the transformation of the world into humanity through your careful ministrations, and therefore will become more aware of your ecological going with all other forms of life and therefore be more fundamentally enlightened.

Well now, last night, I was being specific about one of the yogas of everyday life and applying it to the art of cooking. And as a concluding session, I want to discuss the way in which consciousness of your essential oneness with this whole universe and what we call every day consciousness, go together. You... if you read a great deal about mysticism, you will find descriptions of ecstasies developed through the practice of yoga meditation or whatever, that seem to be so completely absorbing installing ecstatic and rapturous that you cannot conceive that anybody could be in that state of consciousness and at the same time carry on every day life. And we hear our great Hindu mystics like Sri Ramakrishna Sriram on a Maharishi who spend hours and hours in Samadhi. They sit there with

their eyes closed in sheer rapture. Out of this world altogether. And if that is the ideal state to which man should attain, that kind of contemplation obviously it is inconsistent with everyday life.

But there is a strong tradition not only in India but also in the Far East that there is a higher state than Samadhi. And rapture. And this much higher state is called in India Sahaja. S A H A J A. And that means the natural state of these to the state in which the elimination is quite natural and fits in precisely with everything in the way of ordinary consciousness this is very much a strong feature also of the Zen Buddhist tradition. Where they have the saying your ordinary mind is Buddha or is the Tao, the way. And in Zen, the poet, has said, supernatural power and marvelous activity. I draw water I gather fuel. So that I saw Zen There is no no distinction whatsoever between what we would call the normal consciousness of the everyday world through our five senses and the Supremes state of consciousness of total awakening and life and. Indeed going back to the fundamental logic of the will punish ods the great texts upon which all Indian wisdom is based. They insist again and again that the Supremes state is without duality. And without duality means without exclusiveness. They would say for example, that to experience the highest state of consciousness is not merely to experience the oneness of things you would think you see if you experienced all things as one that somehow the differentiations which you perceive in the world outside you would disappear. And that you would experience, all around you, in every direction a uniform luminosity in which all differentiation was dissolved. And I can assure you that would be an extremely boring state of mind to get stuck indefinitely. That's not what to expect. Because the non-dual means the non-exclusive. That which does not have any opposite. And if the ultimate reality behind this universe, the fundamental energy or essence or whatever you want to call it has no opposite it is therefore not incompatible with all other states and manifestations of life.

So you could say the Supreme Consciousness is much like a mirror because a mirror is always clear and pure. And yet it will reflect anything in front of it there is no in compatibility between the silver purity of the mirror and reflecting the face of a lovely girl or a dirty old ashtray. it will take in both and still remain pure. So in a rather similar way, the enlightened state of

consciousness can contain any subordinate state of consciousness. So first of all, I must give some attempt to describe what the awakened state of consciousness is like. And this naturally is a very difficult thing to do. Because it is in a way like trying to describe color to someone who is congenitally blind. And you have to do that by analogy. You can tell a blind person that color is an experience of a certain kind of variations in the world that could be likened to the variations of temperature we speak about hot colors and cold colors we call red hot color and blue or cold color. And that there are vibrations in a sense, that he knows nothing about. These variations and their characteristic of all sorts of things but he must not confuse what we call color with what he experiences as hot and cold, it's only like it. It's a little bit like that you see it I have to describe a novel state of consciousness. And in a way, it's more difficult than that for the simple reason that. The consciousness of the total unity or non-duality of the universe. Is not really like having acquired an additional sense. Because it comes through all one senses. It is very much like a sensation. It's more like a sensation than it is like anything else. It's more like a sensation and it's like an idea. Because it's very concrete very understated All the moment you slip into it and I don't doubt that there are a number of people in this room who have at one time or another slipped into it. It happens quite commonly in adolescence. And again in the dangerous forties. People are liable to have spontaneous mystical experiences. And sometimes in childhood. Others of you may have come into this by a discipline or by L.S.D. or something of that kind and so you'll know what I'm talking about. Although you must not, if you experiment with these things, you must not confuse what I would call visionary states, with the state of enlightenment. They are quite different. Visionary states when you experience overwhelming light or a sea of great mandalas sort of have visions of the cosmos and total harmony they're not quite at the at that the state of what Buddhists call Satori. Because there's nothing about it which is so to say visionary it doesn't consist in seeing any particular forms. Or visions that you can specify. Satori, which is the Zen word in Japanese for awakening is just exactly like what you're feeling now. Except that as Suzuki once put it it's about two inches off the ground. That is to say. You feel that the same old well that you see outside you. Is not upside you but is you. In other words the trees waving across the swimming pool and the flowers blooming red, the sunlight playing on the water the people sitting in

the room and all that. You know that that's just as much you with your own body. And you don't therefore defend yourself against it, you don't resist it. It's all you. And you are therefore doing all those things out there only are not doing it as we say we do voluntary acts but we're doing it in the same way that we grow our hair. Or breathe, or beat our hearts. And so you feel all this as the functioning of your own your own self. Simply that the whole issue of experience is one single process unified process, and there is no differentiation between the experiences going on and the one who experiences them you are what you are experiencing that becomes absolutely clear. And this as I say, it reduces the resistance factor it ordinarily exists between the experience and the experience the feel and the feeling the thinker and the thought. That disappears. You are no longer standing back and looking at a panorama of events going on as if you were outside it. You know for example that what you see outside in front of you is actually located inside your head. The optic nerves are in the back of the head. And so all the colors and all the shapes that you are aware of with your eyes are in here. They're you, because you know the external world only by translating yourself into it. Or translating it into yourself there's no other way of knowing it it has to become you for you to know it. And when you follow that out you find out that of course the external world exists in relation to you and you exist in relation to it in the same sort of way that a back is related to a front. There are inseparable and without one you don't have the other. I don't care which one you take away take away the external world the individual vanishes take away the individual the external world vanishes. There must, in other words, be some individuals some living being around for there to be an external world at all. Just as if you slap a drum which has no skin it makes no noise because noise is the relationship between the hand and the drum skin. And the hand can hit as hard as hard can be and it will be no sound and if the drum skin doesn't have anything to hit it it still won't make a noise, you have to have both. And so all over this universe the universe is called into being by individuals in it. It does not exist except in relationship to perceiving individuals. Because everything that exists is relational. You can only establish movement that is energy if there is a relationship between a body in motion and a body at rest. And that's the, what the whole thing is that the whole thing is relationship. Relationship is existence, and relationship between the knower and the known, the still in the moving, is a polar relationship. Polarity means that

the opposites whether we call them to be and not to be or alive and dead are light and dark or North and South. Opposites, always imply a unity between them just as the magnet is the solid unity that lies between North and South Poles. Yes, just as the coin is the unity between heads and tails. Just as a sheet of paper is the unity between back and front.

So in the same way, there is a unity of the organism and the environment the now I am the known. And without this polarizing unity there is nothing happening, nothing doing. So this is what you become aware of, you see, absolutely visibly. That the differentiations that you notice between solids and spaces between different spectra of color, between form between figure and ground all these differentiations you are normally aware of you experience as not separating things but rather joining. The differences show the unity. And therefore, don't expect in the state of Satori, everything to dissolve into uniform light or something like that they stay just as they are. But, you hear and see everything in a state of go-with-ness. Where every inside goes with its outside. Where every I goes with every thou. Where you see that at this moment that everything that comes to you, is your own doing or as Hindus would say your own karma. Your own doing that doesn't mean your fate. To someone else was putting it over. You know it doesn't mean your reward or your punishment. It simply means your own doing, because you feel this different sense of you. What you are the only ordinary limited ego-sense, in which you feel that you're a separate part of the world accepting or rejecting things that are going on elsewhere. You are doing it all.

Only, be very careful at this point. That you don't get into the state which you call inflation it's very easy for a Westerner to get into an inflated state about this because of our conception of God, as the governor of the universe the political government of the universe the supreme monarch. And then as a result of that if an individual feels that he is really doing the whole thing and is therefore one with God he's apt to give himself airs and graces and to feel that he is really personally in charge of everything that's going on. And people who get that kind of sensation and interpret it in that way are rather unacceptable socially. And we usually regard them as crazy. Well that's because they make a god of the ego instead of an ego of their god. They identify the limited ego with the whole universe in such a way as

to say I could change it if I wanted to. I could, on the prompting of an egocentric whim, show off in some way or other by. Turning the water in the swimming pool into champagne. But when you have the Hindu idea of God, you simply, say naturally one doesn't turn the water into champagne. Because it is the will of God that it be water. And you feel that the center of yourself is no longer in this superficial wishing faculty that we call the will. Although it's still you you discover that you run a great deal deeper than your own will your conscious will. You have a cause an unconscious will we know that fundamentally from all that we've done in the West in psychotherapy people's we talk about people unconscious which is unconscious drives. And of course, all that exists and that is you at a deeper level than you normally know so what has happened in this process is that you have discovered. You have center just selfish your own deepest level. Instead of centering yourself as it were somewhere out on the circumference of a wheel you found your center at the hub. And you have therefore to find the hub of your own organism where do you take from? Well from the hub, but the hub is not ordinarily the conscious center from which you operate. But as you see you try the experiments I've been discussing as you try trusting your own brain. To decide what to do as you try trusting your own nature and following your own natural grain. Shall I call it that? You will very soon come to act from your data center. And you will at first get the impression that what goes on puts you in a passive position. You seem at first, to get the idea that you are relaxing to a current two way with life motion above and beyond yourself or deeper than yourself whichever analogy you want to use. Sometimes we say that prefer the great thoughts are lofty Sometimes we think they're profound. There's two opposite metaphors. But, whether you want to call it high or deep it doesn't matter the point is you feel at first that you are responding to something in you but other than you a beyond within. But later on you discover that this isn't other it's simply you at its deepest level. And you don't feel exactly passive about it that's what you feel at first. As if you were being carried by a great stream. As if you were responding to a current of like a leaf. But later on that duality between the sauce and the one who responds disappears and it all becomes a single activity. And the fascinating thing about it is that you realize there is no way of doing it any other way. You can be under the illusion that you are opposing this energy which will call you views. Say the Chinese name the Tao, the course of nature. And

you can be under the illusion that you're acting against it that you that by your egocentricity you somehow create waves in the thing that shouldn't be there but you can't. There is absolutely no way of going against the Taoist, you can imagine that you are against it, because the Tao is complex enough that within its possibilities it includes imagining that you're going against it. That's all part of the game. But actually, you can't. There is no state of mind you can get into. There is no kind of consciousness, no kind of emotion whatsoever that will actually go against it. Now that's the important thing to understand. As you come to the point of realizing that there's just no way out of this story. Then you understand it. Because you don't look upon it then as something you can get. That is to say in some particular state of mind, happy-mood, peaceful-mood as distinct from sad mood depressed mood or anything it isn't some particular state of mind that you can acquire. And make the object of an ambition. To the degree that you are ambitious to change your state of consciousness by any means whatsoever whether it's yoga whether it's drugs whether it's... I don't care what it is, prayers, anything. So long as you're ambitious for another state of consciousness than the one you have now you can't get this thing. Because you can't get it but as explained in the Diamond Sutra. Oh so beauty when I attain unsurpassed complete awakening, I attained nothing whatsoever. And there was no one to attain it. This is trying to say, what I'm trying to say and I may be fumbling in my words about this but you are when you understand that there is nothing to be attained. Just as I was explaining last night, there is no way of being secure of stopping the process of change and transformation which we call life and death there is no way of separating yourself from the whole field of universal process.

So as you understand that there is nothing to be attained, and that's the whole point of this thing. Then you see as a kind of your mind as a flip. And that flip is called Satori, you see that everything is it. And therefore, you can within that understanding live your everyday life. You are as it were set free to forget about religion. And concentrate on anything you want to concentrate on. But the curious thing is, that in the moment when you see there's nothing to get and nothing to attain and there's no special state of consciousness your mind ought to be and the moment you see that there is something in a way added to you. It is different. It's not the same as you were in before. And also it's not another. That's a hard thing to explain.

One can use analogies and say that it's like you became aware that the moon is three dimensional, instead of a flat plate in the sky. You see what you always saw but you suddenly understand that it's three dimensional so in the same way more or less the same way you see all that you ordinarily see but you see the new dimension in it you see that it's all you. And that nothing, not even the unconsciousness or death makes the slightest difference to that. In fact, death becomes an extremely important way of understanding this. Think about death. Imagine the end of consciousness. Imagine going to sleep and never, never waking up again. Consider that, you see, carefully. Well, you very soon after thinking about going to sleep and waking up never waking up it occurs to you that when you were born you woke up without ever having done sleep. And you realize then that the state after death and the state before birth of the same state. They are the off period that polarizes with the on. When you know something is happening when there is knowledge when there is a feeling when there is a vibration. Obviously. If there is going to be if we don't realize that there is something called it is we can only do so in contrast with the is not. And so let go of let go don't resist this thing you don't need to ensure that you will survive death. Just let it happen. Because life death, life death is the pulsing of the energy which you are. You really want to die that's why you die that's the truth in Freud's idea of a death wish. You like you want to go to sleep. You may try to resist it with this part of yourself. But basically you want to go to sleep. And you want in the most deep sense, of the sense of karma, you want everything that happens to because it's all your situation and you are seen.

So, in coming to understand this, you might say to me well, you've made a lot of statements. About this kind of consciousness. But I really don't see that they mean anything because it doesn't really make any difference. Anybody who analyzes this sort of thing logically. Anybody who takes a logical approach to mystics will come to the conclusion that the mystics are talking about a nonsense. Because what difference does it make? Now is perfectly true. That this is not exactly logical. If I say, all things all the manifestations of the single energy. They would say, all you're really doing is you're making a statement about all things and you can't make a statement about all things. Because any one thing that is true of all things will be meaningless. It's like adding a number the same number all the

same letter to both sides of an equation it makes no difference if. I say everything in the world is moving slightly up, you will ask up with respect to what. And since there isn't anything else but everything I can't locate that relative point in respect to which everything is moving up so they would say in the same way by say everything is divine or everything is a manifestation of the Tao, they would say, well it did it you said it about everything and therefore you said it about nothing. But I can't help it that may be true from a logical point of view but nevertheless, when you experience this to be so, it makes a great deal of difference. It's a shattering experience that absolutely. Sometimes it makes the sweat poured out of you it's a startling. And can make you jump for joy absolute total delight. And so I have difficulty in explaining that logically but that's what you see you see as we say in our weak words it's all one. It doesn't make any difference. And what this does, it has a very very marked psychological effect, because it immediately cuts down the resistances you put up all the time. And it frees your psychic energy to do all sorts of things that you don't normally have the energy for it all. Because you waste it in fighting your experience the thinker fighting his thoughts the thinker is the source who's going to fight it. Show me you. That's always the question of the Zen teacher you say you have problems you say you confront a world which is threatening to you show me you bring me out the separate you that has these experiences. And of course the more you look for the separate you you can find it. You go on around and around and around trance a who is myself Where did I...Where do I start all this? You can't find it. Because you can't there is no separate you. The quality you see, you say you look at something else. Someone else. But you see the color of the other person's face, the color of another person's eyes when you look at them. That is the same as you. There would be no such things as eyes and no such thing as color, except in terms of you. So, wherever you look you are looking at the real you there is no observer separate from the color of somebody else's eyes. You see that. All these that you are... You see, we come from a scientific point of view a desexed brains and say well there is this nervous system and there is that nervous system and there's the other nervous system when they get into contact with each other they reflect each other like mirrors you see. But the guy who is saying this. And analyzing it all out is in a certain relationship himself, with all these separate brains he's looking out and plotting out. And he can never unstick that relationship

that's scientists know today they talk about the myth of the independent observer there is no such thing because every time you make an observation. You interfere with what you're observing by making the observation. You can't unstick yourself, you can't disentangle yourself, from the total web that is this universe. And say, to stand aside from it and observe it as if you were an outsider is ridiculous. And the reason why is it's you all study of nature is simply self observation. Only it's you, in a much greater sense than we ordinarily give to this word we ordinarily give to the word I the sense of something that is an independent observer. But the I which is actually operative is in no way different from what it's looking at. The I-ness of you. See, if I look around at you and I want to find myself as you and in you well you have dark hair you have blond hair and in the blonde color and in the dark color that's me. In other words, we are in a situation where we are mutually vitalizing each other. It isn't that I'm in this body or the only one that's real. But we are all shall we say tits on one sow. We all raise from one center. And mutually calling each other into being like the back in the front and the new jewel aspects of the car in all the sheet of paper. And in this relationship of course, everyone is necessary. Everyone is an essential part of the whole goes on, even if you, if your bodily appearance is only very brief. That brief part of the appearance is an essential part of the eternal universe and the eternal universe could not exist without it. So just as a big weight can hang on a thin rope, so eternity, can hang on a tiny short time.

So, now, this is very important to understand in a time when an enormous number of people, are interested in the mystical experience. And are using every conceivable means to try to get there. Although I don't deny the value of all those and all specific ways of approach. Whether they be the meditation exercises in the old fashioned way, or whether they be the use of psychedelic chemicals. These all have their value but but but but, you finally have to understand that this state of consciousness is not something to be attained. Because you have it. You're always there. Only you need some sort of a jolt to see that. And so often it is limited Taishan exercise of the Opera we call these various means that means a stratagem a device a gimmick. And these various means to jolt us into understanding that we were there all the time. That it isn't anything special There's a phrase that's used in Zen of this kind of consciousness called in Chinese whoosh or when

Japanese buji. You can probably remember buji more easily. But it means nothing special. It also means no fuss. And mean no business sense of business. And a person who is shall we say perfectly religious is wusha, that means he doesn't look as if he's religious. He fits into the landscape. Not compulsively, I mean it's not like the kind of person who is a self-effacing out of timidity. When necessary, the person who is in the state of set or he can come on very strong, or suddenly vanish and leave no trace at all. It isn't that you feel a compulsion to be modest. It's rather that you feel the incredible richness of the world as you are experiencing it now. Because that's the point.

Let me try and put it in some other ways, because perhaps through talking about it from different points of view, I strike a bell of recognition and someone. It's often said that one of the great ways of yoga and this is particularly applicable to the every day yogas, the yoga of cooking, the yoga of accounting or whatever it may be. That you concentrate in the present. Some of you will read the writings of Gurdjieef and Ouspensky have read about the self-remembering exercise, where you are vividly aware of everything you do all the time. That it is happening now you live in present time. That's one of these exercises a very interesting exercise. Always be alert are you here or now or are you wandering or your thoughts off somewhere out sizzix Are you completely with what you're doing because naturally when one is engaged in something very important like a surgical operation you have to be completely with it. Now or do you do everything that way you eat your breakfast that way you make love that way the are you absolutely with it. And so this meditation exercise is practice in being completely with it. Now the funny thing is that the end of this exercise is the discovery that you can't be any other state of consciousness than that one. Because you are everything you're conscious of in any way is the present. The memory of the past is the present it's like an echo of something that happened a few seconds ago the echo goes on and the Echo is here and the Echo is the memory of the noise and that of your brain is full of Echoes, but they're all present there is no way of being anywhere else than the here and now. But that's what you find and discover through trying to get into it. You have to try to get into the eternal now to realize that there's nowhere else to be. And you do that you see by analyzing by carefully watching what you're doing, and you discover that

your memory is and your distractions your thoughts about the future, your thoughts about the past, they're all happening now I am thinking about the past. I'm anticipating the future. And that then for if I that that's what I'm doing then I really do it you see get with it get with thinking about the future get with thinking about the past and you'll find it's all present.

Now then, this is a marvelous feeling when you catch this you feeling that the present moment is like a great stream that's carrying you along. See, how can you get out of the present moment just try. Can you avoid it? Can you be somewhere else? No, well if you see the present moment as the same thing as Satori. You see what I mean this is the present moment this now that is somehow always still in the it, always moving that is the doll that's God that's a tunnel now eternal life you can't get away from it just try public institution against the child against it trying to such a self against it has no way of doing it. And therefore, I can use this image, the symbol of the present moment, as a way of illustrating what this kind of consciousness is like. Other people might use the symbol of space. That's often use the Chinese word for Sunyata, a good term for the great void which is the ultimate reality they use the word that originally meant sky or space. And just as you can't get out of the present moment, you realize you are, everywhere in all directions, you are contained by space. And space what is space and space is your own mind. Everything that you are aware of occurs in space. And let's first of all relate space to the eyes. Space are those areas of the retina not being stimulated by something, and therefore it constitutes the background for every visible form. Space is the groundwork of optics. Let's consider it from the standpoint let's consider space in the standpoint of hearing. It's the silence in your ears against which you hear sound and can distinguish. Let's consider space or in the sense of touch. It's where you move your hands in the dark and meet no obstruction. And you have a kinesthetic sense of space in that way that space is fundamentally the in globing background to all specific sensations so there's visual space auditory space tactile space probably there's all factory space but as I said that's a sense for which we don't have any many words. And smell-lessness, against which to distinguish particular smells. But that space is the way in which we experience the availability of our consciousness for particular sensations, it is the room in consciousness of this and for that.

So, everything that if you experience this space, this vast, vast outgoing space to the limits of the universe. That simply you let your mind. And, just as every point in the universe because it's a curved spacetime continuum may be regarded as the center of the universe so every living being may be regarded as the center of the universe the center of space which is as it were multi-centered It's easy to think about that mathematically, but difficult to think about it in sort of ordinary three dimensional terms. So then, you may from the impression that I'm saying. Just as I can't get out of the present moment. And I'm always moving with it that therefore. The dial. Is something to which I am related in a deterministic way. My ego then, becomes nothing more than a puppet, which is pushed around by the great energy of nature. And all I do is sort of dangle on the end of it right along again like the leaf on the wind so let me remind you that that image of the leaf on the wind or of the person floating in the stream, is only analogy that what I'm trying to say is that the leaf is the wind. There is no, nothing in this universe, which is being moved by something else called the cosmic energy or God. All these things that appear to be being moved by it are it. It's just like you have difficulty in understanding that a pattern can exist without being made of some substance. That the pattern is the same thing as the substance. When you for example, touch anything solid. You say well I feel that I am touching something substantial but what is happening what that feeling is a pattern. The sense that you call hard it is just say for the exact argument it's a dig dig dig dig dig in consciousness as distinct from dig dig dig dig dig which would be what we call soft. All sensation whatsoever is patterned. Different kinds of patterns. And therefore that there is no substance involved in this the pattern isn't made of something as we would think that a pattern of wire had to be made of metal because when we analyze metal and what we mean by metal it's a patent only it's on a smaller scale than what we call wire. There's nothing else but that now there's a certain difficulty to our common sense in seeing that we say you can have a pattern unless it's made of something. So it is but in the cigs actually the same way there is not the universal energy as something distinct from some stuff behind out of which mantle pieces and people and birds and trees are shaped. Like we make so many carvings out of wood, it isn't like that. It is that the shapes are the energy. There's no duality at all so you when you feel this, you will as I said a little while ago at first feel passive because you're not used to it, and the initial impression is one of

passivity. But the thing you actually get on to is there's no difference between the energy and you object when what happens and what makes it happen it's all one. Things are not forced to happen. Unless you insist on abstracting the thing away from the totality when you do that you say what makes the thing behave the way it does. Well you've answered your own question because you asked the wrong question in the beginning you started by falsely separating it from what goes on and then forget you've done that and then say well what makes it behave the way it does. You created the problem by making the separation. As soon as you divide the universe into a lot of separate things and think about them that way, then you have the problem. How do they fit together or it was you who took them apart. So the answer to How do things fit together is simply the counterquestion, how did you take them apart? Why did you I don't lies the universe into a lot of separate behaviors. Well it became convenient to do that in order to talk about. That's calculus. Calculus analyzes curves into point instant. Curves don't come that way if you think about them that way. You forget that that is the technique of thought, the methodology of sought then you create all kinds of false problems. How did you, what is the meaning of life? How did this universe come into existence etc etc etc. The answer is it didn't come into existence some time off in the past. It only came into existence now. This is the point when the universe comes into existence. And what we call the past is its wake its echo result duration like the wake of the ship the wake starts from the nose the bow the ship that's where the wake is created.

So in the same way, this whole cosmos is created from this by God here and now this is the part of the Big Bang. Everybody is looking backwards to try and find out when it started you don't look backwards to find out you look at here to find out see if you're starting it now. It's all slowing out from your consciousness. Only, because you don't know that and you've forgotten it if you're looking back behind you and saying you know when I got involved in all this maybe it was my father mother maybe their father and mother go back you pass the bucket of blame for everything all along down the line then ha-ha, you are looking in the wrong direction. Just start again now generating all of the past is just echoes of what you did before. Draw your way your father. Their fathers and mothers and so on all the way back. Same old you. Like you know when they, when you're over you my father still alive, he says his name's I, and he feels Central just the same

way I feel central. [He] sees all the world going on around him he'll just like just the way I feel when it's the same fellow, you see, only doubling up looking at everything from all sorts of different points of view. And so long as you feel that way you will, you are the here and now you are the point from which creation begins. Beautiful. Well, we're going to stop now and have an intermission.

The Arts

Bushido

I decided that I should talk to you about something with relevance to your careers. And those of you who are in a religion class have recently been studying Buddhism, and as a subdivision of that you have been studying Zen Buddhism. And you may well know that the practice of Zen Buddhism has a very special relationship to what the Japanese called Bushido, which is the way of the warrior. It may seem surprising to some people that Buddhism could have any concern whatsoever with the military arts. But let's face it. If we are going to have a military arts, and if we are going to have military people at all, they must be as effective as possible. It is a very bad thing to cut off a person's head half-heartedly. Leaving our enemy with a half-severed head is not gentle money at all. I never thought of asking the extreme swiftness of action. Are saying at lunch with our friends here that Germany lost two world wars because of the goose step. You should never hear a soldier coming.

Well now, this has unexpected consequences because of what I'm really doing is giving you a talk on Occult strategy. Because I think one of the difficulties that we are having in this country today in its foreign policies is a certain defective strategy. And this is strategy or the very modest. Because it's an idea that it's not which sentimental people tend to avoid. You have to realize that these things do exist in the world and have to be. And you cannot be a good strategist unless you are also a philosopher, and you cannot be a good philosopher unless you're also something of a mystic. I know that's a sort of dirty word in intellectual circles and I sometimes refer to mysticism as ecological awareness. Makes it a bit more respectable in the academic world.

Now, for those of you don't know what Zen is I would just say read it that it's the sino Japanese thought absolutism which evolved in the time dynasty which was shot after 700 A.D.. It had Indian inspiration. But it was largely

a mixture of Indian Buddhism and Chinese Daoism because of this last bit of nature and China it is best exemplified in our own culture by the art of sailing. Go to the wind. And if you need to go in a different direction from that in which the wind is going, tack. But it is a much more intelligent way of negotiating oneself than rowing. Rowing involves undo strain. And the absolute principle that is involved in dollars and and which enters into Zen, is that all fine effort never strains. Anybody completely accomplished in the use of force by which I mean energy. 'Cause force sometimes means strength. Knows that who achieve your best results by following gravity. Or by going with the grain of things. And you notice if you practiced surf-riding, you know this if you've ever flown a plane and you know this in every kind of athletic discipline. You must not strain. Use your weight properly. Its weight that counts, and intelligence. Weight plus intelligence, because weight is mass and mass is energy. So that the darkest point of view dollars in the originated in China probably between oh around four hundred B.C.. And is associated in particular with a lovely book called in Chinese, Tao Te Ching. The Book of the Way and its power. And you should all read it in Lin Yutang's translation in the modern library. Called the wisdom of Lao Tzu. It is a book written as a manual of instruction for rules. And it has a great deal in it to say about military tactics. And it shows you how to do more with less. It is of course like Zen, in common with Zen, the philosophy underlying Judo. Do is the Japanese way of pronouncing the Chinese word Tao, meaning as I said the course of nature and do their own means the gentle way. The way of defending oneself. Without losing all using strength Yes but you never force it. Like when you put a key in a lock, of those difficult into if you simply use brute muscle you will bend the key or break the lock. In good stead or you puts an oil and jiggle to get it and you find the easy way through.

So then, Zen being a combination of that philosophy of going with the stream, and Buddhist philosophy. Comes out of something like this. But is philosophy is concerned with awakening with waking up with being awake. And the word Buddha means simply an awakened man or the awakened man. Now what is it to be awake. We have to contrast this with what it is to be asleep. To be asleep in a way as to be hypnotized. To fail to actually be sufficiently aware of reality. Adequate in which all civilized people hypnotize themselves, and get into terrible trouble is through too much of a

good thing. That is to say, through being enchanted or spell bound by words, concepts, and measures, which constitute a system of description of nature which we confuse with nature. The map in other words is not the character. The word is not the event. Water is a undrinkable noise. And it's tremendously important to observe that distinction. This is the basis of course of Korzybski's philosophy called General Semantics. That we as a culture significantly fail to observe this distinction and that's why we are taught. For example, we confuse money with wealth. You can't eat money, no a lot of stock certificates and dollar bills of the slightest use to you on a desert. Their value as wealth simply disappears. But you can add figures to each other indefinitely. And pile it up, pile it up, pile it up, but you cannot eat five roast of beef with one me. Or driving three cars at once all into cars at once. There is a limit to the material one can consume. And the United States, which is regarded all over the world and by itself as a materialistic civilization is nothing of the kind. A materialist is a person who loves material. Do our cities look as if they were made by people who love the material. Is it materially smart to live in the middle of poison gas?

So military men, who [is] supposed to be realists above all things, should have their eyes on the tears. And rot. So that's what Zen is all about. But in order to be really aware of the real world, you have time time back to the sun. I don't mean that kind of sign you know there's been a. Some very important citizen and somebody gets up and says let's observe the minute of silence in his honor, and everybody frowns and thinks very grave thoughts. That's not silence. Silence as they practice it in Zen, it is called Zazen, and what it means sitting Zen, that is the temporary suspension of thinking. And by thinking I have been specifically, talking to oneself inside the skull. Using descriptive symbolisms to put them all whether they be in words or numbers or whatever in fact that are looking directly at what it is. I got it. Because, if I were to talk all the time. I would have nothing to talk about because I wouldn't hear what you have to say. Likewise, if I talk to myself all the time if I think all the time I have nothing to think about except thoughts.

And that is the great academic fallacy. I'm not against the intellectual life. I'm an intellectual. I make my living by writing books and giving lectures. By being a philosopher. But to see how many things were lost sides of

bought you must occasionally be silent. And I'm going to explain and why, in some detail. The desk says primary concern. Is the cultivation of inner silence. Now you might ask me then, what is reality? What am I talking about? Experience through silence. Some people say that the material of the real world is material. But that is really a philosophical concept. It's a sort of seventeenth, eighteenth century form of Western philosophy called materialism. But it's purely conceptual, the idea that all this is some sort of stuff. Composed of our time a billiard balls of matter, is pillar a minute not. That is the alternative idea that everything is meant as in subjective idealism, as in Christian Science. That it saw us as reality a spiritual mentor or psychic, that also is a conception.

Reality itself is [claps]. You could say that is a clap but it wasn't. A clap is a different noise. So wake up. To wake up, you have to be quiet. So zazen involves the discipline of stillness, mental stillness. I say discipline, I suppose that would shouldn't frighten you. It doesn't many people. I really prefer to call it a skill. Cause discipline so often indicates something where you are forced by superior authority to follow a certain course of action. That is not real discipline, because it itself has. It's mere submission. But real discipline is a delicious thing. It's-you can't have any pleasure without discipline, you can't even get roaring drunk without a discipline of the distillers art. There is no pleasure without discipline.

So but it should be, all disciplines that are followed are delightful. Often you know it is the facade form of that let it be like fall if you like writing about money. And you give it something it extremely interesting to do. And that's why you devote attention to it and develop the skill and so on. So this discipline of interior science is practiced by that gentle students and has been so since the twelve century.

Now what happens is that every curious thing, because this discipline differs from all others in one very odd respect. It has no purpose. Because if you do it for a result in the future, you are not doing it. Because he will discover in the state of mental silence that is called in Japanese Mushin meaning literally no mind. Or no moon or no thought. You will discover that in that state that is no future. And likewise no past there is only not. The now out is all there ever was and all that that of it will be. And until

you know that secret. Making plans is of no use to you whatsoever. Because when your plans mature you won't be there to enjoy them. You'll be making plans for somewhere else.

Plans are of use only to those who live totally now and realize of course that their memory is happening now, and that their expectations are like now, there is only now. And that insight comes as a result of clarifying one's mind as if it were unpolished— I mean it a completely clear mirror. Or an unruffled pool, reflecting the sky and showing balances what lies at the bottom and that top of mind is what is achieved in the practice are then meditation was awesome. It goes also along with learning how to breath. Because zazen doesn't involve a kind of forced elimination of sorts, is all or of any sensory input that one may be having. You begin by letting everything happen what is happening. Let your ears you know whatever they want to hear, let your eyes see whatever they want to see let your lungs breathe as they will. And let your nerve endings distributed all over your body and feel anything they happen to want to feel. Let go. Don't interfere. And then say as you listen, without naming, without describing the sounds, without a scribe write the songs that are going on all around you as you. Feel. Without trying to identify what these feelings are. As you let your mind think about whatever it likes, but you listen to your own thoughts as it were they were birds chattering outside.

Then you begin to discover reality. You don't get a concept of reality, you get reality itself. Now that's tremendously important, because all our concepts with reality, all our descriptions of it, whether that it was all a mathematical formulation are linear. Words are strung out in a line. Thoughts are strung out in a line. And I always say you can only think of one thing at a time. But to be affected in life it must be able to think of innumerable things at once, or at least deal with them, but you cannot do that with linear thinking, because nature is non-linear. Nature is everything happening a together everywhere it wants. To put it in scientific language nature it involves billions of variables. Whereas in thought, the average person cannot entertain more often fall that enables at once without using a pencil. We cannot comprehend the millions of variables as in physics by using statistical methods. But average human problems involve say one

hundred thousand variables. Maybe even twenty five hundred. How can you think about twenty five hundred variables at once.

But the point is, although you are thinking systems cannot do this, your brain can. Your brain takes care of the organization of your body. Every single process of the human organism involves the nervous system. How do you grow your hair? How do you color your eyes? How do you make your glands secrete what they should? How do you beat your heart? How do you breathe? Incidentally, how do you manage to be conscious? Nobody knows. Except a few neurologists and they admit they know very little about. That means the brain is smarter than the science of neurology. How do you open and close your hand? You say, I know how to open and close my hand but you can't tell how it's done in words. But you can do it. And therefore what is necessary. Is the greater facilitation of the use of the nervous system. And we may miss that by paying too much attention to description. It may be much more important for us to neglect mathematics and physics a little bit. You know, I don't think they should be thrown out of the window by any means. But they will get in our way, and we will make serious mistakes through technology if we do not study the spontaneous use of the brain. And learn how to act spontaneously without any thinking. Now this is where Zen comes in very strongly. Zen operates, aside from cultivated mental silence in a kind of interchange between teacher and student.

An example of such an interchange is the following story. A Zen teacher, or Roshi as he's called in the Japan was walking through the forest with a group of students. Suddenly, he picked up a branch and turned by his students and said 'What is it?' And the student hesitated, so the Roshi hit him with it. He turned to another students and one of the students said 'Give it me so I can see,' and he turned and hit the Roshi. 'Ah,' said the Roshi, 'You had me there.'

Another story that's like it is the teacher was entertaining four students to tea, three students giving them tea. He pulled his fan out and tossed it to the first student and said 'What is it?' he said it's a fan. You have it to the next to the opened it and found. Not bad. You tell it to the first of the first student only put a cookie on it, and handed it to the teacher. You see, he had no fixed idea of it is a fan. The word, or this use only, it could become a tray, it

was a magical object. He could transform it seems into many different things and all inventive and creative people. Wired to creativity because they're not hung up on fixed definitions of any form of life or reality may be. Filled in as a result of that kind of insight it became very valuable to the Japanese some right. To study it. First of all they wanted to overcome the fear of death. And they found they couldn't frighten Zen teachers. Now why not? Why are we afraid of death? Obviously because we're thinking about it all the time, because we've been taught to be afraid it. When we were babies we had no fear of death we didn't even know about. Yet when we got sick. Ah parents and people came running and we were having a gas enjoying some sort of trance or weird fever state, the parents come on 'Oh it's awful it's awful it's awful poor baby, awww...' And the baby learns from this that something horrible is happening. And the baby can't do anything about it, it's no good teaching it worry. And furthermore if you do know about disease and your surgeon you don't want to be something sound about your patient but your hand shakes when you're operating. So we've made a bow you are out there. I mean. How do you know you're alive unless you were once dead? How do you know you exist that existence is something there! Unless you once didn't.

So existence and nonexistence, life and death are only vibration, it's like the crest of wave and the trough of the wave and so on, you can't have a trough without a crest to correct, so you can't have existence without nonexistence. It just doesn't make any sense at all. You may be afraid of the way of dying. Be burned up or something. But that becomes a problem to you if you think about it in advance. Sufficient to the day is the trouble. But it's because we have this overemphasis on the talk talk talk talk talk talk program going on inside all the time that we we worry. And then we worry because we worry. And we know that's not doing us any good.

So that was the first thing the Samurai wanted to discover: how not to be afraid of death. And so the Zen teachers taught them. How to act without thinking. And this requires an enclosed discipline, because if you start you're always used to acting on the basics think. And you suddenly switch to the other method, you may make some very foolish mistakes. So it's always done with another kind of encouragement like this is an academy there is a special school is that everybody understands the rules and

outsiders are into fairly by the process of what's going on. They're not bugged by. Outsiders would be very easily bugged by people who acted spontaneously, without due consideration. That you see it's absolutely necessary for all the samurai to act without due consideration. Because when you're in a sword fight, there isn't time to think. But also you have to be intelligent. It isn't simply a matter of learning etc reactors. Those of you who started to do it you know very well that it isn't merely a matter of learning a routine at reactions, and they are all being able to bring them on for almost any kind of assault maybe made against you. You never completely know what kind of assault may be made against you.

So if you go out routinely prepare for different kinds of assault and something that you never ran into before you lost. It's like the I mean, the beginning psychologist, and he's read old textbooks and notice this kind of case and that kind of a case and then suddenly it gets out of practice and. Somebody has got something that was discussed. So he rings up his teachers and say now what do I do about a thing like that? So what is important, you see is not just starting it all different techniques of strategy, but having your consciousness made over, to where it understands situations without thinking about them. Just as you understand how to breathe, how to close your eyes. And so there is a wonderful essay by a zen master called Takuan on the art of swordmanship. And it is absolutely important in this art, an immovable intelligence. And in our language we would say the awakened intelligence brain unobstructed by any preconceived idea.

So he says when the hands are clapped, the sound is issued immediately without a moment's hesitation. The friend struck the spot on stop just now he says this doesn't mean that you are right because hurrying itself is a block. You know I want psychology we use the block. Where you hesitate as to how something could be done in proverb but says he who hesitates is lost. Even though another probably says 'Look before you leap.' You see is not necessarily pondering. It is just using your are at as the immediate sensor of the brain. So you can must not be involved in any considerations of either winning this fight, or losing. If you want to win, that's a mental block, if you're afraid of losing it's a mental block. You know how it is sometimes when you act in a crisis you're driving a car and the things skids.

You suddenly find something come over you, where you act without any premeditation. Often you do the right. You only get the shakes afterwards, when you think about it. So in that kind of a crisis what do. What the Zen Master Takuan refers to as immovable wisdom takes over.

So that is the primary thing that has to be learned, in those, there is athletic or military disciplines which Zen influenced. It would be Kendo, or swordfighting, Judo, karate, Aikido, which is the most esoteric of all of them. And that is the art of being unattackable. Everybody should study Aikido. Especially if you're a militant people. Because the great skill in the military art is not to be able to be attacked. And this does not necessarily mean granite and strong fortification.

We come to it in the end in the highest school of Japanese swordsmanship. And if any of you get an opportunity or can rent a three night film. Three two-hour strips called Samurai, done by Mifune, in color, it is the life story of Miyamoto Mushashi. You should show it here. It is an absolutely thrilling story done with the greatest artistry. Leading up to a final battle in which most very reluctant to engage, but he is asked to do so as a Pondona, or point of honor. Where he comes at his opponent, who has a huge longsword. On a wooden ore. And he defeats him, by timing. He walks in from the sea to the beach, to duel, and he's timed it just exactly so that at the critical moment sunrise you know it's easy for me it's art. See that's intelligence. So then, the highest school of swordsmanship is called a no-sword school.

A very kind of elementary illustration of it was that the Mushashi was once taking a ferryboat across the Lake Fiwo to Kyoto. The last minute a very drunk samurai got on the boat. He was one of these machismo types. Very aggressive, tough. You saw actually says you are aren't you was all that. Musashi says now wait, there are a lot of other people on this boat. I mean if we fight, we may hurt innocent bystanders. Ferryman, you go over that island. We'll get out on that island and fight. So the ferryman went over to the island. And this drunken fellow, all eager to fight, jumps out onto the island, Mushashi grabbed the oar from the ferryman, push the boat way let this man stranded on the island. That's the no-sword school.

But in a more profound way that no-sword school is, you must first understand the nature of power. And consider, the basic thing to know in all strategy, is what you want. Now do you really want power? Would you like to be able to control everything absolutely? You know, it would be like making love to a plastic woman. No surprises. Now be very careful about the idea of power. And this is something that you get into the culture of the West all too easily, because a lot of men aren't confident of their masculinity, and therefore make a show of masculinity. And they think it's male, always to play tough. And therefore, they ignore anything subtle. You see this is good that was an entrance test that if you knew if you could recognize divinely ourjato, you would be rejected. Probably. You see I was not afraid to who has all the strength and courage and sexual capacity of a man is not afraid of gracefulness. Of a certain sensitivity. Because if you don't have that, you can't make a good soldier Because you will be unalert. Stupid. Like people you know they just think that [makes noise] is the whole Art of War. The whole art of war is Judo.

Very very quiet, be very alert. that you don't you can't try to do you know you can't force alertness. Alright, I'm looking at the time. If that talk further away and it might. I won't make it any clearer. If I relax my eyes, imagine a velvet curtain in a dark room you know my eyes don't like Times. Now I guess that I would start. Sailing, treating the whole of life as navigation. This is about holy. You're not a man who wants some foundation. Trouble is so much of our every religion is based on analogies of the rock. We need firm ground to stand on! People get narrow minded. Because life is fluid. So the sailor understands better. The Way Things Are you don't want to. Even so even mall that you would. In a still. Think if you don't know which way is. If you don't talk about up, talk about out. Going out or coming in. There's no up. Everybody's up is different just depends where you stand on it. You find that you are in the spaceship already. It's called Earth. You don't need to go rushing to the moon and rockets. That sort-of phallic symbol. What you do, what you do, strategically, you see, is cultivate very sensitive radio astronomy. So that you get to the nearest star like in several lifetimes. You may establish a nice Space Station outside the earth, where you don't have atmosphere to bother with telescopes. That's OK. But the future of the knowledge of the universe must come to us.

So you know all those things you do which seem to require brute force. See the military. The story you know of Richard the second, Richard the first, the Lion-Hearted king, with the Sultan. Richard draws his enormous two-handed sword, and takes an iron bar, and breaks it. The Sultan draws his scimitar and floats a piece of silk in the air, and it drops on the scimitar. That made everybody very frightened. But that that's the principle that underlies Taoist doctrine of going with the stream, of not forcing it and the Zen doctrine getting to reality which is always now out and you can comprehend without always having to figure it out in words.

The Importance of Space

I want to talk to you tonight about the most important thing in Eastern philosophy and this that exists which is space. Space largely neglected by us as being nothing, even though our architects talk about uses of space, characters of space and qualities of space. And though our astronomers talk about curved space, expanding space, and therefore active space. There is a saying in the Sutra which is recited by all Buddhists practically in Japan and China, called the Makaharamita Shingo. Or the Heart Sutra, Shinjo. Which is a form precisely is emptiness. This character also means the sky and so Space This means both form and color it corresponds to the Sanskrit word Roopak. It isn't the same as our word matter which has come to have the meaning of stuff, substance in the sense of stuff out of which things are made. This refers rather more to shape because that is not in Buddhist philosophy the concept of stuff.

So what is shape? What is for all, what is outline, what is significant, aperceptible or audible form is the same thing as space. Now this is not quite what we mean by equal equal sign. When you get this kind of equation is in eastern thought, that is to say you will get a Japanese saying be oh those so called Shabbat Sioux Shabbat Sioux so called we all go soku means, what these two things mean, unity is differentiation, differentiation is unity. Now we know ordinarily that nothing could be more different than a different and the same. And people will argue themselves into a bloody fight, that by God not the same is different from the different. And the different is different from the same. And so when you argue it that way, difference seems to have an edge over sameness, doesn't that? Because

you're going to argue the same is different from the different the by God the different does different from the same more times the word different as used in this argument of the word same. And yet you realize that you don't know what the different is unless you know what the same is. And that these two experiences designate each other. And it's this business of designating each other which is meant by these two characters here which link form and space. And you could say they imply each other. That is a little better translation than are the same as.

So then, we are looking at a culture, here, which in its aesthetics shows an immense valuation of space. Also today, under the great pressures of the population explosion, space is the most expensive thing in Japan. More expensive than food, transportation or anything else: space. And it is a country which has learned how to make small spaces seem enormous. So great is the appreciation of space. So in contrast with our point of view for which space is nothing and for which space is also disturbing. Look at the ways in which we find space disturbing. Space free from suck or silence is a form of space and that is something which is to most modern people whether American or Japanese disturbing. Silence should be filled. And you know that in the Far East where people have radios, they believe that they're not getting their money's worth out of the radio unless they have a current turn down as high as possible. They should get the maximum noise out of it because that's what after all it brings you, so turn it up high. This intrusion therefore into all life, of constant noise to destroy silence. Silence bothers us. So in the same way, space bothers us, because there's nothing in it. And you remember the glorious Victorian rooms where those space whatsoever was allowed the walls had to be covered with patterns you couldn't have a blank page or say a blank area on the binding of a book but you had to fill the whole thing up with flowers, and curly-Qs, and all kinds of things and you couldn't have a surface of wood without in some way or other covering it all. All because of the feeling that space just is something that's not there. And what I want to do the see evening is to show you various ways in which space is as important as the things that are supposed to be in it. And that once you can grasp that point you have very many problems solved.

Now let me start by repeating something that I've already told you, but I want to do this for the purpose of making it fresh in your mind and also illustrating it vividly so that you can't forget it. This is a most elementary lesson in space. And it starts with a universe in which there is only one ball. There has to be of course and in this universe, space surrounding the ball. Because the ball is a solid. And the solid must go with the space. After all, if the ball is all that there is. Then it's no ball at all because nobody can see it's out, its limitations. And on the other hand if it was the space around it. It is all that there is nobody will notice the space because there won't be anything in it. So we have to start with the primordial world of ball or solid and space. These two. Poles or qualities because the human nervous system is so arranged that the neurons constituting it have two possible operations. To fire, or not to fire. To be, or not to be. And so all thought is founded on an elaborate combination of what you might call yang and yin, or zero and one, on which with these two symbols you can put all arithmetic on that and computers used nothing but these symbols, no and yes to do the most elaborate calculations.

So, our way of thinking is entirely based on is you is or is you ain't. And so we have a certain difficulty in realizing something in common between those two which is suggested you see by this phrase goes with. And about this come endless arguments but entered any rate here is this universe in which all that there is is one ball and space. In this world of course no motion is possible. Because that ball cannot be said to be moving up or down or to the left or to the right to the north south east or west above or below because there is nothing else in relation to which it can move. So we don't know even that it still. We don't know whether it moves, neither stillness nor motion can be attributed to it. It is only when we get a second ball. And now we're going to call them A and B.. That there can be any motion at all. And so we can watch balls A and B growing closer to each other off other away from each other. But we cannot say whether A is moving and B. is still, whether B. is moving a is still or whether both are moving. There is no way of deciding if they grow either closer together off that away from each other back and forth but we cannot decide which one of them is doing it. Furthermore I want you to notice this. That these two balls can only move in a straight line. In other words, any position

whatsoever in which they may be found will be along a straight line. And so they are confined to that dimension of motion.

And so now we introduce a third ball, C.. And we get a new problem. First of all, let us suppose the balls A and B.. stay together at the same relative distance from each other. And C moves off Now the question arises, who has moved? Have A and B. moved away from C. or has C moved away from A and B.. How is this to be decided you can decide it only on the rather fallacious basis of the majority being in the right. So that because A and B. constitute a majority, they can decide whether they moved away from C or C moved away from them. And so by constituting themselves the majority they can rule the situation unless. C. decides to stay with them at a constant distance. Then so long as they stay together and C stays the same distance from them they can't move. Because they can only move in relation to C the only thing they can do to demonstrate movement is to break it up. If C. decides to stay here at this constant distance from them both you see. The only way they can change the situation is to break up this and for B. to move out here. And notice this, that in this situation the three of them can only move within a within a plane, within a surface, because wherever there are three points they will always lie on a surface. Just as where there are only two points they will always lie on a straight line. So here in the first place we had a one dimensional world with two balls we now have a two dimensional world with three balls. You see that is the difficulty here. All right now look here, wherever you have three points in space supposing we're looking now on the flat surface of the black ball but in the volume here I have two fists here. And to add to this we will use the base of the vase. Now do you see that however I move my fists, I can always have the base of the vase, the bulb here and each fist in one flat plane. In other words, supposing now I use you see here they're in a plane there's a triangle a flat triangle which joins all these three points if I move this one I've simply turned the triangle. If I move it this way, I've turned the triangle again. They're always in a plane. Yes but that but even with that you see you can see the three.

Now these fellows say look at we can decide. Where we are. In relation to each other this really this majority thing doesn't give us the real truth it's only popular opinion. And furthermore since we're only thinking in so.

Offices our judgment is rather superficial. What we need and is thinking in-depth. Somebody profound, somebody who can stand aside from the situation and look at it objectively and tell us what we're really doing. So we now invent a fourth ball, D. D for depth. And immediately you'll find that D. can move into a third dimension. And stand underneath A, B. and C.. Because once I have the three points fixed I can take a fourth and move it out of the plane into a third dimension to see that and from this point of reference in the third dimension. See all these all these three on the surface but this lies underneath them and looks up at them. Each. And this is the object of observer who will now tell us how these three are moving. And so you've got now your third dimension. The dimension of depth. Thickness, which gives us substance. All this was hither to rather abstract.

But problems keep cropping up. Because three dimensions aren't enough. This fellow D. can tell us how these three are moving, A.B. and C., but it can't tell us when they're moving. Do you see? The rate of motion is going to be quite as important as the how or shall I say the where of their movement. When do they do it? And so we're going to get a fourth dimension into the picture which is not however a fourth a fifth ball but a scale in. A way of marking off any motion as from here to here, like this. You see? And if we've got this way of saying how much they move in such and such a time, we have a better way still of describing what they're doing than from this point here. Alone. But you see once you've done that, that you can take step after step after step after step, dimension after dimension after dimension after dimension, and there is no end to it. You will never really finally be able to pin down what all these people are doing in reference to each other. You can only do it going back to the three situation, where we haven't even got D. yet. We constitute a majority, and therefore what we say goes. But we always know that that is fallible.

Now let's look at it in this way. All of us here have two eyes, two ears, one nose, one mouth and approximately the same sense organs all round. And therefore because we have these organs the same we all more or less agree as to what sort of a world we're in. Because we are in the majority about this. But there are some people who perceive the world differently from us. And the great problem that we have to decide is do they have diseased sense organs or do they have extraordinary sense organs. Are their organs

worse than ours or are they on the way to an improvement. We don't like to have to face this question. Because wherever somebody perceives the world in a different way from us, we feel threatened. We may not be right. You remember in Kipling story in the second jungle book called *Cars Hunting* the monkeys tribe, the band a log used to get together and every now and then they would all shout in unison "We all say so, so it must be true."

And so every great majority which has formed a consensus a set of conventions commonly held about the nature of the universe feels terribly threatened by somebody who suggests that it might be different. Is this person a genius or a madman? And we try to find out ways of testing it and we say by the fruits of his acts we will know whether he is a genius or a madman. Because if his new way of perceiving things of seeing things destroys the kind of order which we agree is the right order, then he's a madman. But if his way of seeing things in the long run agrees with the kind of order which we think is order, then we'll say he's a genius. You can't win against this. But there is this to be said. The crazy man has perceptions of a world which he gets lost in, and he can't relate to the world of the majority of the ordinary people. He can't talk the language. He's got lost. Whereas the genius who has a new kind of contradictions can always keep in touch with ordinary everyday people and explain or try to explain very clearly his point of view in their language so he is as it were a bilingual person a crazy man is simply a monolingual person. He can only talk one language is own language and if that doesn't happen to be your language in my language, then he's crazy. But the person you see I think we can decide this goes beyond craziness into something quite else becomes bilingual. He can talk the language of convention of ordinary everyday society and the language of the world seen. Beyond that or transcending that.

So this is what bothers us when we are confronted with new concepts and with revolutionary ideas of the nature of the world. We wonder whether the whole structure of sanity is being threatened or not. Whether this is a crazy man uttering ideas, or whether it is some kind of a new evolution in the structure of thought. Even perhaps in the structure of the nervous system. So the crazy idea which I wish to commend to you, which I will try to put into conventional language, assuming that all of you understand

conventional language, is that of the reality of space. Let's go back to our problem here where we have three balls moving in relation to each other. And look at it again from still another point of view. Let's suppose they all seem to go outwards from each other in this direction. Uniformly. We can consider two arguments about this, the balls are all on their own or moving away from each other uniformly. Of course it must be that way. After all it's common sense the balls are the things that are solid there what's real and things between. Only things that exist as a solid can do anything. But then there's another school of thought altogether say those things can't move! They're just balls, they're just solid things they have no vitality. And furthermore there are three separate ones they have no common mind how could they possibly arrange to move away from each other a uniform speed the thing that moves is the space between them. After all we say the distance increases and that's using the verb increases transitively or rather I mean it's a verb that is being used to indicate an action and it's the distance that does the action apparently when you say the distance increases you use the the noun distance in the same way as you say the man walks. So the this school of thought says So you see what is really moving is the space.

So you get the idea in astronomy because all the nebula in the galaxies are apparently moving away from each other uniformly. This is put in the form of saying that it is space that is expanding. And these things float in space. Then it's terribly disconcerting because when expect people wanted to feel see that space was something. And so we had ideas about the ether. And light would have to be transmitted through an ether in the same way that sound waves are transmitted through air. You can't, according to common sense, have the transmission of something through emptiness. There must be something in the emptiness to support this transmission and so we invented ether but as you will all know the Michelson-Morley experiment showed that there is no ether. That you have to think about the propagation of light and about the properties of space. Not in analogy with some fluid or liquid or gas which lies between all these things. You see we keep wanting to invent ghosts. To invent a solid. We can't accept the idea of space. Now air is a solid, water is a solid, ether is a pseudo-solid. It's something we had to invent to fill in this gap and say, 'No, although these solids are real good material solids there must if they are to be related to each other be some kind of a tenuous filmy gaseous sun and the joins all these things together.'

We've got to have that thing we got to have the strings attached to see. We couldn't stand the idea that space. Just made there's nothing but space you know was important.

So then you've got these two theories then, that the solids are moving. Or that the space between them is moving. And both sides of got good arguments I've tried to present them. But what both sides overlook is that they are each one one sided. That what is moving is neither the solid nor the space, but the solid space. There's a Zen story. Two monks were arguing about a flag that was flapping in the wind. And one of them said the wind is moving the flag and the other said the flag is moving the wind. And the six patriarch Wei-Nung when he was asked about this and he said you're both wrong, the mind is moving. And so what you might say here is the point of a. This is when you get down to this question which one is moving the mind is moving, because what is meant here by the word mind, is the necessary into dependence of the concept space and the concept solid. That is, of the of the nature of mind. That you can't have the one without the other and so, the mind used as a word to signify the into dependence of these two poles one of which is solid and the other of which is space. This moves.

And so, mind in this sense, is the creator of the world. I'm not saying that you imagine the world, each one of you out of your own private whimsy, imagines the kind of world that there is. What I'm saying is this. That the construction of the nervous system selects a world. You see your senses are selected. There are certain vibrations which they receive, and others that they don't. Then on top of your senses comes your noticing what your senses tell, because you don't notice all of that again is another act of selection and then on top of that is how you interpret what you notice. What patterns of sense you fit it into, what patterns of reason, or patterns of thought you call good judgement. And that still another level of selection so constantly the world. That and we are aware of is a selection of our mind.

But the way we have in our culture selected has always left out space. And rejected that, rejected the interval between things as something relatively insignificant. But now, let me try and show you that it is the interval that matters immensely. Let us take another kind of space altogether. Not the space of distance between objects, nor even the space of distance in time

between events, but let's take musical space. The difference between in the major scale of C.. the notes C. and G.. forming the common chord of the scale of C. Now, you have intervals between these tones. The notes C. E. and G. are tones. But the intervals between them are something else. Da-da-da. And you can hear in that three intervals the basis of the melody. Are la la la la La lalalala. You see it begins to make a tune. But if you hear only the tones and you don't hear the intervals, you don't hear a melody. There are people who are what we call tone-deaf. And they only hear noise, they don't hear melody because they don't hear intervals.

So here's the fascinating thing, that when you hear a melody, and sound begins to make sense to you, what you are actually hearing to constitute melody is the space or interval between the tones. It's the same as this. You recognize that. The Big Dipper. All right the why do we recognize it. Because we recognize the relative spaces between these points. If it was just da da da da, we could arrange them this way. Whatever, you know. But it is how they are patterned. And there are no strings joining these points in the sky, in just the same way as there's no would join between, but nevertheless you hear that pattern. And that's what makes sense.

So, in the same way, if we increased enormously the magnification of a human hand, we would find a huge multitude or flock of molecules. And we look can look and look and look in an in an inn and we find there's enormous spaces with no strings joining. And yet when I did this suddenly all those molecules would move together. Why? See, what has moved is not only the molecules, but the space. There is like birds in flight moved together in the same way. They don't seem to need a leader, who gives a signal and says follow me and do as I show you. They seem to have one mind so that they all move together. All right. Now, let's translate this into another thing altogether a problem which is quite fundamental to far eastern culture. And that is the question of birth and death. In popular thought, in India, and to a slightly lesser extent but nonetheless powerful extent China and Japan, people tend somehow to believe that they have many lives. There is a prevalent philosophy of reincarnation, although it's interpreted in many many different ways. According to some theories there is in each one of us a soul, which is a permanent and enduring principle. And that incarnates itself in body after body after body, gradually progressing or

regressing and we hope eventually progressing to higher and higher levels of spiritual Evolution. But in Buddhist philosophy, the existence of any such soul is denied. There is no permanent ego or permanent self which moves from life to life, and yet, the funny thing is that most Buddhists for all that they don't believe in any transmigrating soul, they still believe in transmigration. And they talk about the karma. Which you have been working out from your many past lives and the column by which you are now creating for your lives to come.

And yet, how can they possibly say this, because they don't believe in any soul which moves from one life to another, any entity that is as it were, the bearer of this Karma. So, to see how there might be a philosophy of transmigration, you've got to realize the importance of space. The importance of links or relationships between points that don't have any strings tying them together. So let's imagine first of all a river. Here is one bank and here is the other bank. And in this river lie many rocks. See.

Now, I am looking at this river from above because I'm standing on a high cliff. But I see that down below a man, and he is wanting to cross the river, and he looks at it from the immediate point of view. And he does this and he does this, he DOES THIS, THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS. Let's trace out that course he did THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS THIS. See. He found it all the quality the whether he could connect these pebble these rocks depended on how far his legs could stretch. He took that way over that was the way he saw. But I from my own vantage point can see that there were other ways he could have gone. He could have gone from here to here here here here here see so he could have had as an alternative this line. Three and you can pick out other possible ways which he could have gone. And so, when you look at the sky at night, you can think of the stars in certain groups of constellations. But that's not the only way you could figure them. You could figure the stars and other groups and they would be just a satisfactory, provided we all agreed about them and how to figure them.

Now that I want you to imagine that each one of these pebbles in the stream represents the biography of a human individual. This bank of the stream represents the year one thousand nine hundred sixty five. And that this bank

of the stream represents the year fourteen hundred sixty five. And that between these times there have been human lives lived between certain spans of years. You see what I mean? All those stones constitute biographies. And now we have a historian looking at those biographies line between these two points in time and saying By Jove. It really does seem doesn't it that where this life left off. This one seemed to begin. And there really does seem to be a logical connection between these lives. And there also seems to be a logical connection between these. Although when it gets to this point, to this one here, it seems equally logical that this one go that way and this one go that way. Or it seems really here that it could have gone that way just as well as it went that way. You see what we're doing here we're looking at human lives. And we're making the same kind of sense out of their continuity as we make in the patterns of the stars. By figuring out constellations. And that is the doctrine of reincarnation. Now you say, is that just projection? Is that just a way we have of figuring things out like when you look in a Rorschach blot, you make your own sense of it and because you project. Yourself into it that's what's so important to the psychologist who interprets what you are, because that was your projection and to this blot, and as it were the blood itself had nothing to do with it the.

But actually, the whole world is a Rorschach blot. Only we have forced each other to agree about how to interpret it. Because you see when some abstract figure is drawn. See, what is it? What have I drawn? What is it? What does that look like? Anybody, no-nobody wants to be forceful about this right if you're not going to be for it. You saw flames as I was going to say the same thing. Now I see you and I agree, and we're going to lead this group we're going to tell him it's all flames, they say and so they're going to say yeah I see that after all it's strange isn't it they are. So basically in this universe, where little brains and nerves and to kitty kitty kitty things come into being inside their little little pods called skulls. Some of them say I around here this is the way it is. And it doesn't make any difference you see whether they are a succeed or whether they don't as a result of saying this because if as a result of saying it flames, they survive longer. Then they say that was success because we survived longer. If on the other hand they didn't survive longer they survive shorter they would say that success because the important thing is to survive a short time sweetly rather than a long time not so sweetly where you would want to go off with a flash or

you want to draw your life out of the steady glow. See, it's any way you want to interpret it. So everything's a Rorschach blot. In everyday life, only we've all agreed about it and so it doesn't seem like a Rorschach inkblot. Because in strongly human beings people like Jesus Christ, Mohammed and the Buddha and the man who made up the laws of Manu, and Moses, and all these cats have throughout the centuries impressed other human beings that this is the way it is, and the Lord God says so. So if they can invoke that authority, then this is the way it is, here we are.

Now what we do in other words we convince ourselves who we are, that we are the same person sitting here now as came into this room fifteen minutes ago. All this is interpreting a Rorschach blot in exactly the same way as one sees a continuity between one set or other of these though in the river of these biographies lying between the centuries. And you can't say you see, that that is something merely imaginary or merely arbitrary which you project onto the external world and that it's your own imagination and nothing more than that because your own imagination is something in the external world. In other words, you couldn't have that kind of imagination, or the kind of nervous system that you had unless you lived in this particular kind of universe. Your being an imaginative being, projecting all sorts of ideas onto the external world is in its own turn something that is a function of the external world, something the external world is doing.

So patterning, finding connections between points, is the whole operation of life. You can call it, there are two principles that correspond to space and two solid. One is called continuity, and the other discontinuity. In one place we see a connection. In the other place, we don't see a connection. I get your point. I see the connection between one thing you said and another thing you said of between something I thought and something you thought. I don't see your point. I don't see any connection. So if I want you to see one I have to be very ingenious to get you to see it. And then you recognise it. In other words, I can get you to see these connections, but it's going to be difficult for me to persuade you about this connection here, simply because my fingers won't stretch that far.

Now in this you can see that in this theory of reincarnation, there could be for any one individual life several individual lives at the next step. For

example, you see, by stretching of the, of the fingers, this fellow here could go here, here, and here for the next time. So we could say he has this individual in his next life incarnates as three individuals. In the next step he can go here. This one can go here or here. This one can go here or here or here. This one could become three. Sometimes there are situations in which three of them could only become one. Because there's only one that is consistent in the pattern, by whatever rules you are making up the pattern of connection.

'Let me ask you a question. Are you suggesting or saying that this pattern is in the eye of the beholder. This pattern is in the eye of the beholder but also that the eye of the beholder is in the one. And the way the eye of the beholder seems has something to do with the structure of the world which knows itself through the eye of the beholder. The identity of it is in the identity of a pattern, which you can see as linking them. All right, let me put it exactly in this way. Let us consider the University of California. The University of California has endured for many years and will endure darkness in many many years to come. And in the course of its endurance the all the students and all the members of the faculty and staff and indeed all the buildings will change completely and yet the University of California will go on. What is it that goes on? A pattern. Which is identifiable as a university and in particular actually University of California. In that geographical spot that's one of the rules of identification. Actually the the University of California one hundred hour seven campuses, and its geographical location is somewhat vague. And as compared say with Harvard. Nevertheless the thing is recognizable, because the pattern. Well I'm talking in this case I mean that's posing. Yes In other words we're going to say. There is a pattern of personality and character behavior between this one and this one and this one and this one and this one all this one and this one which makes them look as if they were continuations of each other. Yes right of course of course in other words there is a pattern that links all of us, because we wouldn't be here unless there was. Our being here together indicates certain common mindedness of a certain degree a pattern. We are in a sense therefore sitting around here all reincarnations of each other. [And the same thing is true for all human beings' Yes, but you can see patterns in other words. When you look at the sparks in the sort against the back of a fire and they're all coming and going

coming and going coming and going and you can see all sorts of patterns in the sparks and all of them are right there all the legitimate. They depend of course on your vision but you in turn your brain your neurons is part of the same world in which those sparks a coming and going on the back of the fireplace.

So, the fundamental thing then, that one needs to see though, is that what I've been talking about as the links here. There are no links, except spatial relationships, just as between the stars in the Big Dipper and as between the tones in music, there is a spatial or interval relationship between them. And this is what makes the sense.

The Way of Tea

Every religion in the world has a drink appropriate to it. Christianity and Judaism are wine. Islam is coffee. Hinduism, milk or maybe pan. Buddhism is tea, appropriately enough, because Buddhism is the way of awakening. The word Buddha means the awakened one, and tea keeps you awake. Especially the kind of tea that is drunk and tea ceremony where you don't drink steeped tea, but powdered tea very finely powdered which is whipped in with the water so you drink the actual tea. And there's a kind of it called Koi cha, which is drunk very sick almost like spinach soup, and that really keeps you awake. I recommended instead of methedrine.

The legend is of course that Bodhidharma who is supposed to have brought the zen type of Buddhism from India to China, somewhere after four hundred fifty AD perhaps, if he would really was a historical character. That one night he was meditating, and fell asleep. And in a great fury when he woke he cut off his eyelids, and threw them to the ground and they sprang up as the first tea plant. Or as you know the leaf of the tea is rather shaped like an eyelid. And in the course of time it became customary for Zen monks to drink tea to keep themselves awake during long spells of meditation. And as the behavior in a Zen monastery is rather ritualistic and formal, the way they drank tea became in due course ceremonious. And then, much later, the drinking of tea in this way became a ceremony also for many people. And it was modeled in this way by the great Sen No Rikyu. And from him descend at least five different schools. Of the tea ceremony

through various branches of his family. Some of them very formal and very difficult such as the common best known case cool which is the dominant school in Japan today, and which is the kind of tea ceremony that you ordinarily see when somebody puts on a performance. I find it excessively affected, very uncomfortable, and is mostly practiced by young ladies as a sort of accomplishment which they learn to be a lady. But it's painful, it's very very stiff and formal. On the other end is the Kankuan school. Which is very it's very elegant but much less formal much easier but it's practiced with enormous skill. And then there is a kind of peace out of many still so by Zen monks and literary men who are just entertaining their friends artists and so on, which is very informal indeed. And that's the kind I should be showing. Now the interesting thing is that this ceremony has no obviously religious character. It is quite secular It is just drinking tea and having pleasant conversation in surroundings of peacefulness and simplicity. And this derives from an essential aspect of Zen and I want you to try and understand the blending of ritual with simplicity. First of all there was a... Huston Smith, you know who's a professor of philosophy at MIT was traveling in Japan and a Zen monk was showing him around and he noticed that every time they passed the image of a Buddha or Bodhisattva in the temple it was in mouth stopped involved it and Huston Smith said I can't understand why you go through this ritual of bowing to things I thought he was then people were above all rituals you know I just assumed spit at it. And the master said, 'You spit, I bows.'

So, there is this question, why ritual, and why does Zen have a peculiar partial. For expressing itself in a secular way. Now ritual to begin with and something that makes Americans uncomfortable. I remember as a minister at one time whenever I went out to dinner they asked me to say grace. And after saying grace through the ghastly silence. And I had to stop the conversation flowing easily again. Because the something I don't know I can't find a proper adjective for an attitude which Protestants have to ritual. They don't have much but they have some but when they do it they look down their noses and feel that somehow an element has entered into things of a Godhead who is wagging the finger at you and saying you should at this moment think seriously about whether you've been good or not. And so, everybody is then reminded on comfortably by some words addressed to the good lord, that they really are all too human after all and somehow got

makes everybody on comfortable that's why they're getting rid of the mounting the debt. Because that kind of God would never live even except in people's imaginations.

But this idea you see of being watched all the time by a loving but severely judging father you know how it is when you were children in school and you were writing a job desk and the teacher however much you respected the teacher wandered around and looked over your shoulder while you were working it puts you off completely. If you want to show the finished product and leave me alone while I get it together. As a saying never show anything unfinished to children or fools. So, in the same way this God makes everybody feel uncomfortable and therefore any ritual in which the lord is invoked it makes people feel uncomfortable and it passes on from that to many Americans are quite uncomfortable as a formal dinner. You dress up in black tie and tuxedo and everything is in order wine is properly handled and a lot sort of thing very beautiful. People feel that somehow it's affected and Americans like to give the impression of be folksy, sincere, down to earth, no nonsense. And so frivolous are regarded as an essential but we have thereby impoverished our life enormously. And also, we don't handle things skillfully as a result we a clumsy. Because actually, ritual is a mood that comes into any action performed with complete awareness. I don't mean that you step up what you're doing and concentrate on it with. A ritual to a thing helps you to do it in an orderly way. Just as a practical matter and also it is a way of turning every day action into meditation and Zen is particularly keen on this that meditation is not just sitting for so long and concentrating on a koan on nothing.

Zen is everyday life, and the enlightened Zen person doesn't make any distinction between the Nirvana world of final reality on the songs our world of everyday life. Therefore to understand this, you must first realize that it is a basic principle of them, that you are it. That this whatever it is to which nobody gives a name because well it's been called suchness, it's been called emptiness it's been called the Tao, the way of nature but its fundamental flaws then. That you do not think about it. That is to say you don't have any concept of it because that which we really are and which all things are, you might say the fundamental energy of the universe is so basic. That if you have an idea of it it must be wrong. Just in the same way

that you cannot bite your own teeth that you cannot look into your own eyes without using a mirror. That you cannot see the color of the inside of your head. So, that which is absolutely fundamental which is you, must not be conceptualized, and you don't need to get it. You don't need to hang on to it you don't need to cling to it Rock of Ages, cleft for me, or anything like that. Because it's what you are and it's what there is and all that there is and that's you and it is subject to all rather it appears as. Something and nothing. As solid in space, as light and darkness, as life and death. The Yang a positive force and the yin or negative force, are it's outward manifestation. And as you well know you can't have your own without you know you and without again. You can't have life without death or death about life or solid without space or space without solid. They are polarized, like the north and the south pole of a magnet.

And so, just because they go together, however different they may look nonetheless they are inseparable and this indicates that there is something mysterious between them a sort of conspiracy. But nobody can say what it is because all thinking is either black or white or grey which is that the muddle. What it is in common between black and white between inside and outside between up and down. That can never be stated. Because everything we can talk about we talk about it by putting it in a box. Called classification. We sort our experiences into pigeon holed animal, vegetable, mineral. You see. Is you is or is you ain't. And watch it is that cannot be sorted into any pigeonhole because it is what is in common between the inside of the box and the outside and. We have no way of conceiving, and therefore for this reason, Zen does not take any image any idea or any doctrine with essential seriousness. It has nothing to say. Only to show, and what it shows you is what you see all the time and you can't miss. Because there it is and here it is. I am it and you are it and he is it and she is it and it is and this is it and that is that. And that's the poem by James Brown.

Now, but you see, in the ordinary way people don't feel any confidence. Because we are beguiled by the multiplicity of things that we see around us by this is distinct from that by life as distinct from death by life as distinct from darkness, and we think that the universe is an energy and energy is a thing that that to get time to wear out run out like an electric battery runs out of the gas runs out of your car, and therefore we always feel that the

universe is very precarious and that the positive side may easily lose and fizzle out and only the negative side will remain and that blackness and nonbeing may swallow everything up. What are the Chinese at the perfect fantastic notion. Because the moment you get to the deepest dark, you generate the seed of the brightest light. That's why in the union the circle with the through the middle you see the black cop of the white. And in the boat of the circle like the eye of a fish that is a dot of the opposite color that is the seed the seed of being within nonbeing and the seed of nonbeing within being. Lao Tzu says to be and not to be arise mutually. It isn't that there is fast nothing and then something or it might come in that order but that's like thing that the the egg come before them and. In a way it does and you can say that the hand is one a way of becoming another egg.

But it doesn't make any difference where you begin it's always the same thing because life is a pulsating process the tiniest pulsations of the propagation of light. Through deep sounds where you can hear the policy. Too much longer policy actions day and night. And finally the coming and going if you. So, one has beguiled, because you see, what is common to everything that you see. Well of course, we say sight is common to everything that we see but we don't see the color of our eyes, I mean of the lens. Because we say that's transparent if your lens was rose colored everything would look rosy, until you got used to it. And then it would be just ordinary except that you wouldn't be able to differentiate reds very clearly. If our eye lens has a color we don't know what it is. But it's basic to everything what is the sound of the ear. It's and the. Same way with the color of your head it's empty doesn't black it isn't white just empty and so too when you hear music on the radio or talk on the radio, that is all a vibration of the diaphragm. Every kind of sound visit that the diaphragm vibrating. But the diaphragm's own sound isn't heard. And nobody announces that the sounds that you are hearing the vibrations of the dial.

So you see, what is basic absolutely basic to all experience to all our senses to everything. Cannot be named, cannot be classified, and therefore because of that you forget about it you lose it you think that the reality is all the multiplicity of things. But the substrata, called the Ground of Being which is these decontaminated word for God. Seems not to be there at all. And so we've forgotten that that is you. And the object of Zen is to rediscover that

about to rediscover it in such a way that you do not grasp it in terms of some formula in terms of some ideas or even in terms of some particular practice. Because this thing has no terms. And therefore, you have to find it by ceasing to grasp yourself or your life in any way. By totally letting go. And of course that takes a lot of nerve. And the discipline of Zen has various functions but one of them is to convince you by hard work that that is no way whatsoever of getting hold of this thing. I remember Krishnamurti saying the same thing when I was having a talk with him once he was sitting on a couch and he had a couple of cushions. And he took one question and put it over here and said Now this is the real meditation. This is Mom he said it comes in wave after wave after wave it is. Marvelous beyond belief. Now this he said this is a sort of preliminary meditation and this he said is to understand beyond any shadow of doubt that that is nothing nothing nothing nothing you can do about it. But you see, until you know you can't, you always have a sneaking suspicion that you can.

So then, when you have discovered through hard work, that nothing can be done. Then you let go. And you discover it. Only as the moment con and then textbook says you are like a dumb man who had a marvelous dream. Everybody who's had a marvelous dream wants to explain and. Tell the story but you're dumb. To say your mouth isn't big enough. It would have to be so big that your head would disappear when you open. So then when this is understood, two things happen. One, all the energy that here the two expended on holding onto yourself and being anxious becomes available to something else. And you feel the zoom, this huge influx of energy. And it's available, for just living. Second thing is there's a curious kind of interior quietness goes along with this energy. A sense that there is nowhere to go, where is your rush. It's here. In other words that this room in which you're sitting now, and this particular time of day in New York City in November one hundred sixty six, is what there is. Because this, the basic reality, is not in time, it always is now. You can't measure it with a clock. Any more than you can catch space and this is. It eludes all measurement. But it is just now, and here it is you see. So we are here. And the thing is actually this is no different from us I don't want you to imagine some sort of formalism gloop that underlies all particularity. The particularity is not different from this. Nor is it quite the same. Sameness and difference don't apply, to this which is beyond all categories but in a very real sense. This here, now, is it.

And so please. Here you are see there's nowhere else to go nothing else to attain. Or anything you have it, it's here. So enjoy it.

And then you see, when that happens to you although you have an enormous energy which is available for anything you want to do, nevertheless you just don't feel compelled to get up and fidget with it you can also just live. And then you discover, that your mind stops scheming. To seek in the ordinary way when we just let our faults run around as we ordinarily do we are constantly scheming. How to get this thing arranged, how to control that. That you shouldn't be sitting here now because of something more important to you to do at least be improving your mind by reading a good book. And so, this constant scheming goes on and because that is in the head every a long long chattering, you only see the world in a very limited way. Because when you think your thought is always selected. And it picks up this is the thing that is the thing to notice and the other thing is the thing to notice and this is something important to do and that is a more important event than other events of C. and as a result you only notice what you think about. And so you are hardly noticing at all. In fact, you are there's a certain noticing you see always mean selecting. Selecting something as being important to look at all think about. But when you stop doing that you discover that life is much richer than you thought it was. You see, we, when that when tailor went to see the pope. They often what is it like always it is about a size forty. Because he sees from the point of view of his interest and every one of us has a certain kind of interest in terms of we see and select what we think is important to look at. But the world as an infinity. There are innumerable ways of looking at it and then there is no way at all of them. And that is of course the maximum vision.

So when you let your thoughts go. You do this by allowing them to think of anything they like. And so when. Thought is not being pushed in a certain direction it eventually subsides. And you find yourself sensing as hearing, seeing, but you don't think about it you just see you let your eyes see look at whatever they want to look at you let your ears hear whatever they want to hear. And you let your sense of touch feel whatever it wants to feel you you let go of it all. And then in the quietude that follows from this you make some very surprising discoveries and these discoveries are the basis of the tea ceremony. Namely, that the most ordinary things are magical. The

great masters of the tea ceremony are kind of the taste setters in the whole of Japanese culture because it is at their bidding that architects design rooms in a certain way. That part of those make certain kinds of pottery that. Bamboo crops and make certain kinds of labels and do. That painters do certain kinds of painting and couldn't do that gardeners make just such a garden. And so on so they are conductors of an orchestra. But what it was all based upon the original was that they discovered the marvelous quality of the everyday utensils used by peasants. Some of the most valuable Tea bowls in the world which now would sell for thousands of dollars in Japan where originally nothing about the cheapest kind of rice bowls used by Korean peasants. But there is a tradition of Korean pottery, so that even the humblest article carries with it the genius of the great Korean artist, and this was originally derived from the Chinese Potters of the Sun Dynasty. And they saw in that simplest most ordinary rice bowl. Which was not to see anything like possibly. But definitely a ceramic, with a rough glaze. Because these things were just turned up by the thousands. But every so often in those thousands, one as it were, escaped the infected. Wasn't quite all of them. And it was a work of genius, but unintentional genius. Nobody had thought that he was making a marvelous bowl at the time. But the tea steps which sees eye was free from conception. Could suddenly see that boat.

So also they found that nothing in the world could be more pleasant than listening to boiling water. The sound of the rain on the roof. The thing I learnt when I went to Japan was still be buys and mouth them the most important thing I learned in Japan, was that the sound of the rain needs no translation. We were discussing translating Zen classics into English, and he said Don't bother, the sound of the rain needs no translation. So listening to that, listening to water boiling smelling charcoal being made. And finally, making a fire. Drinking tea. Very ordinary secular everyday pursuits. They discovered that all this was really marvelous. And therefore, they went against elaborate art. Very ornate lacquer well very on a cost and very ornate clothing. And they induced in that spirit into Japanese art which today we call Shibuy. And she buoy is Zen taste and it said that the taste of then and the taste of the same it's a pun in Chinese tea is cha, Zen is Chan.

So then it is from this basis of quietness that derives pleasure are not only in the most ordinary things. I mean you have this everybody loves the smell of coffee on. The smell of leaves burning on an autumn day and the hazy blue smoke that comes from. My father takes intense pleasure in untangling string, because he is a real contemplative. And things like that can become for a person who is awake as rich as anything you could buy with a million dollars. Although it is said that when you are awakened, and you are competent to spend ten thousand gold coins a day. Now, also, going back to ritual out of the state of appreciation of the most ordinary things the ritualistic attitude in using them comes. Why? Because in doing, anything you are not in a hurry. After all, it's all here, and the preparation of a feast should be as enjoyable as the Feast itself. And you can tell when you taste people's food whether they enjoyed preparing it or not. Most food in our world tastes as if it had been washed in detergents and boiled to be disinfected, and served out of a sense of duty because it's good for you. Because you see, we don't have any real relationship to the material world, to the present. We're always living for something else for some abstract good. When you say something is good for you what is this good. Well, you'll survive you're see, you'll go on living if you eat food that's good for you but there's no point in going on living just in order to eat more unpleasant food good for you. And you know, people have kitchens that look like bathrooms, because it's a place where you do something that sort of necessary but you don't want it out in front of me and do it and they have no color and. They're just places to do something utilitarian, and when we do something utilitarian, boy does it look at. You see the kitchen should be the center of the home. And no food tastes as good as food that has been prepared under your nose. Watch it sizzling thing.

So we have to return to a thorough appreciation of this, because otherwise we would just be eating for the future. So, the great cook always. Loves the raw materials. Like what could be more beautiful than an egg or a potato. Or a slab of beef, or a beautiful long silver fish. And you arrange these things on a broad in your kitchen and before cooking, you should always lay things out and enjoy that appearance sitting. And then, cooking is the art of loving a thing into super that edibility. And you have to hover over it you mustn't switch it on look at your watch and go away and read the newspaper and when it's done and you have to be there, and this therefore

induces the ritualistic element because it's important too to have all the things you're going to need laid out or hung in some orderly way so that you can get them exactly when you want it and enjoy picking the spoon up in the room or the knife the beautiful feel of slicing something and all that is a sort of a ritualistic thing and all that attitude is in every moment of the preparation of it is as important as the serving of it. And in serving of it, you're not just passing someone up top you know here I have this as if the cop were my own part and vessel in which the thing was good for you is that. It is that the very act of having a pessimistic as it is. We don't have to say it that would be too bad to say it or even think of it but this is the play of the cosmic energy. This thing's going wammo, and there it is right there.

So don't, it is saying don't fritter away the moment. Every moment. The present moment is sacred. And live it. There's nothing else to do it was a matter of fact. You can't escape that. About so many people vote their lives like voting food. And then they wonder where it's all gone. You can you know slow down time everybody feels in a rush of time time is a roaring Robinson Jeffer says time goes faster in California than anywhere else in America. Because that's everybody's been following the sun and then they got stopped by the Pacific Ocean. In the summer and down and are still going west as far as possible to lengthen the day, to lengthen life to hang on to this in the hope that somewhere along the line someday somehow that great good luck was good to you we're looking for is going to turn up. Never does. Because you can't seek it tomorrow. You can only find it now. So then, the ritualistic attitude is simply a delight in material things. In handling them, borne of inner serenity, which comes from knowing. Only. We can't say what it is that we know but just that you're it. And it's very funny people say they don't know but I can look into your eyes, and I can see the mother goddess of the universe looking right at me. People blinking their eyes and think what me? I don't know anything, but those eyes wowie, look down into those.

Now I was explaining for you this morning the basic connection between Zen Buddhism and the secular everyday world in which there is no obstruction, no barrier, between the sacred and the secular. The transcendent, and the everyday worldly. If you see, you relate to the transcendent. To God, or whatever as something that could be an object of knowledge, then you put God down among things. To relate to God as it

were to another person, is to ungod God. And make the absolute one thing among others. On the other hand, when you leave the transcendent transcendent, you can't think about it at all, and therefore you could say how could I relate to it. Often Christians complain that you can't love an undifferentiated aesthetic continuum. Or necessary being of that circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is no where.

But, when you look for the ultimate reality as an object of love, something to love, you must find it, not as one thing among many, but as all things. And of course that is the root of compassion as an absolutely cardinal energy of Buddhism. But the fact remains that Buddhists do not relate to the absolute as something apart from the ordinary finite world. Although there is no way of thinking about it, and no way of speaking of it as it is in itself nevertheless you mustn't forget. That it is you, the real you. You are not some people who came into this world from somewhere else altogether. And it's very silly when we identify ourselves with our particular small separate bodies or something inside them, and then say to our parents you got me into this mess. It was your fault that I was born. And always we are blaming our condition on someone or something else, but that's only because we have made a very arbitrary definition of who we are. You were actually the evil gleam in your father's eye when he went after your mother. That is just as much you as anything that sprung from it, because it's all a continuous flow of life. Like the leap of a wave true when it hits the rock it bursts into a thousand droplets. But every droplet is the wave bursting, and so every human being is the it, the cosmic energy playing, and in this sense, just as you do really, although we don't acknowledge it in our social conventions you do really beat your heart you don't know how you'll beat it. Nor do you know how you open and close your hand and yet you say I can I know how to open and close my hand and pick up something. But you don't really know these two don't know if you really know but you don't know in words how it's done you couldn't explain it in the coding read is a few words are a form of coding experience and we can't possibly put everything in words because there wouldn't be enough time. For a million years you couldn't put everything in words because you'd have to code it all it would be like trying to drink the Pacific Ocean with a fork.

But still you see, if you do beat your heart, and if you do indeed grow your hair. Then you will find out that if that is true it is also true that you are blowing the wind and shining the sun and twinkling the stars in just exactly the same sense that you are beating your heart. [Because] it's all you, it's all the action of that energy which is you. So we need to overcome the sense of irresponsibility of being in a world which isn't our place which isn't our home, and we're not responsible for it, and we had a bunch of ancestors who were fools and got us into this mess. When you were a grandfather. I'm a grandfather, I have five grandchildren, you begin to realize that you're just as stupid as your own grandfather. So but the thing is we do not need to find the highest reality, the ground of our being, as something we can feel or know, as if it were some sort of object, you just be content with the fact that it is like sight, the substratum of everything seen. Like hearing the substratum of everything heard. But deeper than that, it is the substratum of everything that is. But don't differentiate it from everything that is because that puts it in a category this and not that. It's outside all categories. It's both this and that. Here and there. But it's always now.

So, I went on to show you that if this is realized, there is possible a kind of quietness, in which very everyday things become marvelous. For example, such a bamboo ladle as this, very cheap. Costs maybe one hundred yen which is forty cents or less as the three hundred sixty end to a dollar. But this is one of the most beautiful objects ever made. Look at that. It was of course just an ordinary dipping ladle originally, for the kitchen, or for drinking water. Take it in one of those stone bowls that they put. They get a big stone and hollow out the top and then with a bamboo pipe it comes from a mountain spring, and water is always falling into this cut out bowl, slopping over the sides and then drifting out through a bit of gravel so it doesn't get muddy. And you can just have such labels as this and they're usually a little bigger but that's the same principle lying on the well and you scoop it up and take a drink of this gorgeous fresh spring water. But that's all, it's the simplest possible kitchen object. And yet I think, probably the most beautiful thing used in the whole Tea Ceremony. And then, bowls such as these, which are called Raku wear. And you see immediately this is nothing special. Actually looks as if it were made by a child. Was just starting to learn pottery. It's rough, look, even the top isn't smooth it's bumpy all along. It's been made by hand. You know this was made on a

wheel but sometimes they're not, they're just shaped. And the glaze is very, very rough and crude. But this goes back to a fundamental aesthetic principle of the Taoist philosophy which underlies this whole thing it underlies Zen. It written a thing from Lao Tzu and Chuang Tzu, and lived somewhere around four in three hundred B.C.. And very important in their thinking was something they call the uncarved block. And the uncarved block is of course wood in its original state. Before human beings have tried to shape it into anything. And just as today we have learned the beauty of pieces of driftwood which we put around our homes every piece of such driftwood is the uncarved block. And then there was something else that Lao Tzu talked about which was unbleached silk. You know how shun Tung silk is which got a little nobbles in it and it's rather rough. Well that sort of silk a natural color which hasn't been dyed or bleached at all that is sort of this effect you see of this curtain. The spirit of the uncarved block and the unbleached silk enters into a bowl of this kind. And it seems that for that such a bowl is more in accordance with the nature of clay. It really looks like it's made of clay. Than something that is white porcelain almost translucent.

Now, this is this way, because the artists feel that a bowl of this kind is more natural than something elaborate, and here we have to consider a very funny problem, because after all, no distinction is more artificial than that between the artificial in the natural. You might say the distinction between the artificial in the natural is a very artificial distinction. Because surely, a bird's nest is no more no less natural and the Empire State Building. What about a bee's nest, with all those little cells and things in it. And so truly, everything that human beings do is natural. Only we're looking at each other rather closely and critically. I was looking at yesterday, at a wonderful movie, of fish of carp which a friend of mine took in Japan. And when those fish swim they never make a mistake, they're always elegant. And in the same way when the foam breaks on the water it never makes an aesthetic mistake. Beautiful every time, never fails. And there's only been one person in history who ever complained about the arrangement of the stars. And that was a man living in the eighteenth century you know, when they arranged formal gardens and made all the tulips form fours, and they cut all the trees into symmetrical shapes, and they planted everything out with box hedges around the edge in geometrical patterns. And this

particular French scholar complained at the time that the Lord would have manifested His glory far more surely if he had arranged the stars in some sort of orderly fashion to declare in geometrical figures the inner workings of the Divine Mind. But he was some sort of a nut. Because nobody else ever said that there was anything wrong with the arrangement of the stars they're beyond criticism. And we think they're gorgeous, because of the way they are scattered. And it is strange isn't it, how very often scattering produces the most fascinating and beautiful arrangements the random beauty. But, there is some problem about this, because by scattering, you can sometimes also make messes. And a lot of people don't understand the difference between random beauty and mess. And therefore, the art that goes into the tea ceremony is partly accidental. That bowl is partly accidental. But it's also controlled. And so, the trick of this whole art form is to arrange for a controlled accident. And that's the whole thing. When you combine the quality in man which enables him to master things and control them and yet within the context of that discipline you can allow accidents. Then you have the best of both worlds, the world of order and the world of randomness, and skill in life is always in combining these. For example, in games. A game that was perfectly or orderly would be too predictable. And when we know the result of a game, we always cancel the game and start again. If it's clear in chess after a certain stage that one of the people is obviously going to win, then we stop the game and we say well you're the winner and we'll start again. But on the other hand, the game of pure chance is not so interesting, as one in which some skill can be introduced. So throwing dice or roulette, it actually has a certain skill, but the skill is connected with the way you gamble on it, rather than how you spin the wheel. So, we always want somehow, to make this extraordinary combination of control and uncontrol. That is to have a dragon by the tail. Nobody can really control a dragon. And yet, you can do something with it. And it's marvelous.

So, great sages in Chinese iconography are often depicted riding on dragons or more frequently on tigers and sometimes on water buffaloes. A water buffalo too can be a very obstreperous beast. Lao Tzu is frequently shown playing a flute and riding on a water buffalo, because his intensely calm spirit didn't bother the buffalo and when he sat on its back it hardly felt him. So then, this whole approach is based on a subtle combination of order

and randomness, which is exemplified in the Chinese term Li which means originally the markings in jade of the grain in wood, or the fiber in muscle. And we when we see these things, when we see say the markings in marble, or rather patterns of sand, or the outlines of clouds or the structure of mountains and rather warm rocks, we know at once the something marvelous and beautiful about them and our artists do them the honor of painting them. But we cannot pin it down, just what it is, this beauty. And that's the excitement of it. If you could explain, by some geometrical reasoning, the beauty of any painting or any natural object, it wouldn't be beautiful because you could explain it. If you could train in [an] art school, every student to become a genius. Then nobody would be surprised by it any more. Everybody would know just exactly how it was done and what was the right way to do it. And then as a result of that everybody would be bored, and they would look for some artist who could do something quite unexplainable. And it's true, the great artist really can't explain how he does what he does. When he becomes a teacher, he's often a very bad teacher. Because he himself doesn't know.

So there is a Zen poem which says, if you want to know the flowers where the flowers come from, even the god of spring doesn't know. So the great creator always surprises himself, and if this is true in art. How much more true must it be in Zen. If we could get an enlightenment, an awakening and I could tell you exactly how to get it. So I would have an infallible formula. It would become very ordinary. So don't please, think that there is any such way. Anybody who comes to you selling you an infallible system is a fraud. And of course there are crowds of them. You practice these exercises, you do just this what I tell you, so on so forth you will get it. If you could you wouldn't want it. Not that way. So then, in superb beauty, there is an element that cannot be defined in analogy with the fact that the root and ground of the world cannot be defined. If it could be, if I could put it in our own language, if God understood himself completely, totally, through and through was absolutely transparent to his own knowledge and absolutely subject to his own control he would say to himself man get lost. Because it's surprise, that's the essence of life, and that's why the fundamental game of the world is the game of hide and seek. Now you see it but now you don't. And it's that you see, it's the hide and seek that keeps the world

going round. And generates the yang and the yin. Positive and negative. Controlled and uncontrolled order and randomness light and darkness.

So that principle of order plus randomness equals beauty as distinct from mess is basic to all Far Eastern aesthetics. And connected with it there is another principle surrounding everything here which is called yugen. And this is made up of two characters one of which means mysterious and the other means profound, or obscure even. And what is yugen? Well the great playwright Iwanoano gives some definitions of you again but they're all images he doesn't really tell you what it is sometimes it's called a flower growing from the rock. But he says. Yugen is to watch the sun go down behind a hill covered in flowers. It is to rock ships far out in the ocean. Being sailing and concealed by far off islands. Yugen is to watch wild geese seen and lost in the clouds it is to wander on and on in a great forest without thought of return. What is the connection between these images? Well I think you can feel it. Even if you can't put your finger on it. Another poem with much yugen in it is Basho's haiku: This is all there is. The path comes to an end among the parsley.

Now do you remember as children, mysterious paths that you often wondered where they went. And you never explored. And do remember sometimes you got the feeling that when you a path took you to a fence from there appeared to be a dead end, that there was actually some sort of a secret door which you couldn't quite remember how to get through, but there must be something there. And I have seen a Japanese garden and temple all designed and put together so as to give the impression of gates going somewhere or other. Even if it only just went round the building, there was always the impression of the lead up to something beyond beyond beyond. I've seen in a suburb where there are houses for miles nevertheless because of the trees down the street you could look over the ridge of the houses opposite and use all those tree branches sticking up beyond them. And it suggested that beyond that row of house there must be forest and fields and the open. Don't you look out to see. Way way down to the south say there are great clouds floating and your mind is drawn out across horizons. To Heaven only knows what islands, what mysterious places. And it's that feeling of ooh, like that drawn out into the mysterious, you see that is yugen. We don't give it away, we don't take the journey. It

always remains there as a potentiality. As a bottomless mystery. And it's true you see, that that is always there one will never get to the end you will never finish psychoanalysis. You will never get to the bottom of the unconscious. Because always there is another place. And if you follow greedily and think I'm going to grab places and see where things, well, you become a world gobbler. Leave it alone. Some people cannot leave mysteries alone. They have to prove it all and find it all out. And see everything, and touch it. And then they spit on it and say well it wasn't anything after all. So it is very important for example if you have a friend. And you are very much in love with your friend, you must not probe to find out everything. You must always allow another person reservations and secrets, because the moment you think that you know another person through and through, they become a robot in your eyes. You know exactly how they're going to tick under any given circumstances or you think you do. So always leave something alone. Don't explore everything, don't ask all questions. I know I have had students. I had one once on a trip to Japan. And ask ask ask ask ask all the time is it this way, is it that way, is it just so is it like that is it like this. I remember once somebody talking like this to the great artists Sabro Hasegawa. And finally he got mad and he said well some matter with you can't you feel? Because they want to know say the exact method, to do this do that to do the other thing.

Now, naturally, description has its virtues, and saying... I mean there is a point to be able to give concise instructions as to how to put together a bicycle. Fine. But on the other hand, when it comes to these things for which we can't give instructions, because we ourselves don't know how it's done, then you have to get it by feeling. And so, yugen. Don't inquire too closely. Let that path disappear up into the mountains. Heaven only knows where it goes. Maybe to some fabulous Hermitage, maybe to a hidden waterfall. Or maybe, just over the hill and back to the suburbs. But always leave something untouched, something unfinished just like the painter in this, you see, he leaves a lot of it untouched, and he doesn't fill in all the details. So that your imagination can play with it but not the sort of imagination in which you actually in your mind's eye fill in the empty spaces and see something that. This is something more suggestive than that you are on the brink of filling it in but you don't do it. And therefore the quality of yugen prevails.

And then, very important for the atmosphere of tea, is a feeling that the Japanese call Sabi. Sometimes they put it together with the word wabi and say wabi sabi. Sabi is a feeling of solitariness, as distinct from loneliness. A person who is lonely, as I would use the word or as I am now using the word is unhappy about it and one's friends and feels unloved and left out. But of course when you get many many friends and it all becomes rather too exciting then you look for solitude. Solid odd. And so Sabi has the meaning of solitude. But you must understand that the solitude of a hermit and this is [that] one of the great ideals of both Chinese and Japanese poetry is the mountain hermit. You know that famous poem. Looking for the master, it's called. I asked the boy beneath the pines and he answered master's gone alone, herb-gathering somewhere on the Mount cloud hidden whereabouts unknown. And you see, you have this magical evocation in the poem, of the old wise man who has a secret knowledge of herbal medicines, and he's gone up into the mountains. Nobody knows where, above the clouds, following a trail with a long row of pine trees on either side, digging about in the bushes, and nobody knows where he is. And that altogether adds to his wisdom in some way it makes him a yugen quality, you see. But he's also sabi, solitary. You see ever so many Chinese paintings of sages. Alone with a bottle of wine drinking under the moon. Or wandering along a lonely mountain path. And in such a crowded country as Japan, all kinds of stratagems exist for giving the illusion of solitude. And all sorts of politeness is exist so that people living together like sardines in a can can get psychological if not physical space around themselves. And manners, politeness, are a form of creating a way of creating psychological space. So, sabi is sometimes represented in the painting of a solitary crow on a branch. And when you... sometimes in the late autumn, you're out in the fields in the evening and there's just one crow, you know, goes overhead. You think maybe he's going home maybe, maybe not. But that feeling of the one crow creates the sensation of sabi.

So for the tea ceremony, the whole setting in which it's given is intended to create the sense of sabi. Our solitariness, of being away from it all. Now, today among the Americans, and indeed the British and I suppose the French and the Germans, sabi is regarded as a sort of escapism. If you go off to get away from it all, that's a little bit ignoble. It's like getting drunk to forget one's miseries. And people are constantly lecturing each other on

how they ought to face facts all the time. And because if you're escaping, well an escape shows that you're weak. It shows that you have a defective sense of social responsibility. I think this is a lot of nonsense.

We need to get away from it all, just as we need to sleep. And don't please sleep because it's good for you. And this whole thing that I was explaining this morning in connection with food about doing things because they're good for you, is in fact not to do those things which are supposed to be good for you. If you get away from it all simply because you feel that you need a rest and this will help you to get back to work with greater vigor, you are not getting away from it all. If you play in order to do your work better, you are not playing. I had a friend who went to Japan with me last time, and she had a girl who worked with her in the same office. And she said, 'Well now what did you learn from this trip?' And she said well what difference did it make to your life? My friend said this made this difference that every morning at dawn I get up and I clap three times to the sun. That served her right, an answer like that. Because of this we have a terrible intensity of being useful, of being constructive. This dreadful word creativity is being kicked around, you see, or that you should be making the world a better place than when you came into it. Now that's one of the ways to make it a little worse than when you came into it. It is necessary for us to their innocence and to let up and stop being on a special crusade to improve ourselves in the world. We should escape from that very often and not have any sense of guilt about it. Because when we carry on like this, with this crusading attitude that we're always improving something always making it better and so on. It shows again our extraordinary lack of relationship to the physically existing universe right under our noses. We improve things before we even know what they are. And you know like you go to a foreign country and you take a superficial glance at it and say well they haven't got this they haven't got that them but the other thing and so immediately they have to have it. They don't want it necessarily. A lot of people don't want refrigerators don't want television don't want cars, because the moment they got all that they would be paying for it and they'd be in a rat race to make more money and then sell them faster ways of getting around still so that they could make more money to pay for those and so it all goes.

So please, for sabi, for solitude for a kind of delicious loneliness. Don't feel guilty for going into it. Then, simplicity comes as next in the order of aesthetic canons. This is sometimes equated with poverty. Only poverty in a very special sense of the term rather like Franciscan poverty. There is you see such a thing as grinding poverty. Where people are starving and there's nothing to eat. This is not that kind of poverty. It's a different kind. Do you ever sometimes wake up in the morning in a hotel room and look around you and see there is nothing in sight that you own? It's all rather a relief. Because you're not responsible for it. And there is a kind of poverty you see, that really is equivalent to freedom. I'm not tied down with all these possessions. A rolling stone gathers no moss. He who travels light, travels fast. The first sort of satori experience I ever had was connected with poverty. Because what happened was that I abandoned and gave up all beliefs and threw the whole lot out of the window. And then came this sudden sense of sea of being immensely relieved. And I felt exactly as if I was leaves being blown along in the wind. You know how happy leaves in the autumn go down the sidewalk like children let out of school. Well I felt like one of those. You know, they can they go cart wheeling down t-t-t-t-ch-ch-ch-ch-ch.

So this is the sense of being the leaf. Of the drifter. In Japanese eighteenth century early nineteenth century there was what is called the Iko Oay attitude to life. Iko means floating world. And A, painting and so the great color print artist like hokus I and he or she get all represented in the Japanese Bohemianism Hokusai was a sort of very very high class bum. And they never saved any money, they didn't have much, but what they had they spent, and they just went along to take each day as it came and not worrying. It's amazing how you can get by with that you know. Something will turn up sort of thing because worrying about it makes very little difference to actually getting anything or getting anything done. It in rather on the contradicts in the way. So this attitude of the simplicity of poverty is to be free-floating, uncluttered. Now, as a matter of fact it isn't always successful I've been in a tea master's house. Where in the main rooms everything was beautifully shibui and empty and lovely spaces but my wife Jane-O was snooping around, and across the garden she went into a small tea room and saw there was a sliding screen at the back and she pushed it open and peeked inside and there was a great big room furnished in Western

style, heaped with boxes and papers and mess all piled high. And the master was right by her, and he closed it, and he said oh no no no, you mustn't see that. You see, in almost every household there is a closet skeletons and a sort of unconscious or repressed property where things have to be stored in case they come in useful someday. I don't know if that can be avoided. It's like the bag carried around by Hote, the fat laughing bum, and he is like a child because he picks up everything that's at all interesting and puts it in the bag. But he gives it away to children. So he's a sort of Far Eastern Santa Claus. Poverty is called in Zen, filling a well with snow. That is to say, and laying no claim to the meritorious deeds that you do. In other words in Zen Buddhism, you are not like most Buddhists trying to pile up good karma for your next incarnation and therefore doing all sorts of meritorious deeds in the hope that you will be rewarded in the next life. So, when the emperor Wu of Liyang interviewed Bodhidharma. The Emperor said, 'We've endowed monasteries. And that ordered scriptures to be translated and done all this, and what merit?' And Bodhidharma said None whatever. And the emperor horrified because he thought the whole point of part of Buddhism is acquiring merit so he said then what is the first principle of the sacred doctrine? And Bodhidharma replied in vast emptiness that is nothing sacred.

So that vast emptiness you see, again implies the idea of spiritual poverty. Or again simplicity it's as if you see you suddenly became simple. You don't know your name. You don't really live anywhere. You don't claim anything, you're not that anybody special you have no particular virtues no really sensational vices. Because that's a way of recognition too. You just, you're just what they call in Zen an unsui, that means cloud-water and is the name given to his Zen monk because he drifts like a cloud and flows like water. This you see, is the life of insecurity. The life of not constantly defending oneself by possessions against inevitable mortality. Because the world in Buddhism is seen as a flow, and get with it. Because if you resist it, you will be a mess. So this leads me to another quality. It's called In Japanese furyu. It's very difficult to translate it means literally wind flow. Although who, wind, has the general meaning also of atmosphere. What is your household wind means in Zen What is the particular style of your school of teaching. And so who has the same atmosphere of style. Ryu means flowing.

Now *furyu* in the dictionary is translated as elegance. But this is misleading. *Furyu* is when, for example you see somebody fishing. Now of course, if he's a serious fisherman he's just fishing to catch fish. But there's something kind of unconscious about that, in this is so often true you see that peasants don't appreciate the countryside at all. I remember in England, the fields being filled by peasants who were wearing an old Sunday suit, black, with a striped shirt. With a collar button no collar and a derby hat, old derby hat and they looked about as incongruous, out in the countryside as you could imagine any good luck. You know no business while you were climbing the fields in the bowl of Derby.

So in this way, the peasant often doesn't recognize what he's got. And the fun of things, you see is to know it. So *furyu* is the fisherman for example, who is sitting there fishing in the evening, not seriously trying to catch fish, but just digging the seed. The quietness. That's a kind of *furyu*. But basically it means, flowing. The style of life in which you flow with the Tao. A follower of the Tao is called a *Taoyu*, do it in Japanese *Doyou* in Chinese value and that's a fun new for you in Chinese *Fung you*. But he who is flowing with the Tao, is the person who never forces an issue. This is very strange you find in life if you don't go around forcing issues all the time, a lot of people will accuse you of irresponsibility. They'll say, 'Well now, if you leave you you've got to make up your mind, you've got to make a decision and if you don't make a decision one way it will be made for you the other.' Never this isn't true. It's very important sometimes not to decide, and to say let's wait and see what happens don't rush in to decide. Because there are more factors in any situation than you ever counted up. And you don't know really which ones are going to be operative.

So, if you don't force keys in locks you see. You always jiggle till they go of their own if you force it you're liable to bend the key break the lock and goodness knows what else. So the *furyu* or *furyu* man, is a kind of high level drifter is very good. But you see it comes also to mean elegance which you see elegance is a word for highly conscious, almost affected beauty. The way we use elegant in saying of someone over he's most elegant. So that means he's too self-conscious. About so if we stop short at all of that meaning, even though a crude translation would tend to bring it to that,

when we get to is right we require uncontrived elegance natural elegance as of a tiger.

And then there is another mood peculiarly related to poems of autumn, when one naturally has his mind on the dying year. Surrounded by all the gorgeous leaves, and some bare branches. Well when you turn the clock back you know. And it gets dark early. You feel the sort of sadness of the fall coming on. Entering into winter and this is called in Japanese aware. And this word aware isn't quite nostalgia. It's a feeling of sadness. Not as something unpleasant or that ought to be avoided but very good sadness a sort of wistful sadness at the dying of the foliage the end of the year, the end of human life. When it's all going on. There is an English poem which mentions the strange atmosphere of a banquet hall deserted after the party, with all the plates strewn around and paper caps and blow whistles and everything's got of the over the place and it's forgotten and gone and everybody's gone. There it remains and that evokes aware. The sigh in things the Japanese saying [Japanese] which means to penetrate to understand the a lot of things. There's a Latin phrase *Lacrimae Rerum* the tears of things. When you see some object that belonged to someone you loved who is dead, and this evokes tears This is locked in my room. How pitiful some things are and even things that didn't belong to anybody things thrown away. A doll discarded in the gutter. A thing that not just like a beer can you know but something that is pathetic, a thing that has become pathetic has *Lacrimae rerum*, and that's aware. And aware is very much the mood as I indicated of autumn. And seventy ceremony one follows the seasons and has moods appropriate to the various seasons suggested by everything that you use. You arrange whenever you give an entertainment you think carefully about who's coming about what their tastes are so far as you know them and you arrange all sorts of symbolic things supposing a person is born in the year of the tiger. Well you might very well have a plate with a tiger on it. There are all sorts of little things that touches like that that enter into this with the object are both pleasing and surprising your guest and bringing out all these various kinds of feeling and aesthetic appreciation that I've been discussing.

Now, are there any questions? Sabi is solitariness, peaceful solitude. You must remember..somebody in the previous session raised the question about

the noises going on around here. Mr Rockefeller's cars that are broadcasting so-called information, and all that going on. Now, I'll give you an example of aware and sabi combined, which you can hear around here so often. You're very quiet in the afternoon, and you may be sitting here very still, and you can hear the sound of somebody practicing the piano in the distance. And the music echoes through the buildings, or somebody is straining to sing and sounds as if he was being strangled you know, every so often. This terrible attempt to sing a tenor voice... play it all these things are funny they're like cow bells in the mountains. And if there's little noises that bring up the quiet there's a Zen poem which says the wind has dropped but the flowers keep on falling the bird calls and the mountain becomes more mysterious. And it's all those little far off sounds. That the hermit really gets to understand. The hermit might go into the hills, but as things become quiet around him he hears all the beads and insects. And very far away, the noises of human life.

And the whole point of becoming a hermit is to discover that you are inseparable from everything. There is no way of getting away, really. But you have to try to get away to find that out all. You're in a complete continuum of life all the time. You cannot isolate one part of the universe from the rest. So as you live in your solitude, all these little things will gradually begin to come to you. Of course if you go a long long way away and so on it will be take longer for that murmur of human existence to reach you.

Buddhism

Net of Jewels

Now, this understand, please, is a continuation. The third in a series of for seven hours on Mahayana Buddhism. And I try it as far as possible, to make each seminar self-contained, so that if you miss the ones that went before you don't find what's being said completely unintelligible. But what we're going to take up this time, under the title the Net of Jewels, is the most, I would say, advanced and mature form Mahayana Buddhism. Which is known in Japan as Kegon. K E G O N. And in China as Hua-Yen. H-U-A, Y E N. And in Sanskrit as Avatamsaka, A-V-A-T-A-M-S-A-K-A. And these words all mean the doctrine of the garland. Of the garland, of the wreath of flowers. And this was an attempt to make it a synthesis of all Mahayana Buddhist doctrines, and including also the southern school the Hinayana, or Theravada, so as to show that all these points of view well consistent with each other although apparently conflicting. It was perfected by a Chinese gentleman by the name of Fa-Tsang. F-A, hyphen, T-S-A-N-G. who died in 712 A.D.. A man of absolutely extraordinary genius. It's curious that he's a contemporary of Huineng, the six patriarch of the Zen sect, who died in seven hundred thirteen and a year later. You might say in a way of course that the doctrine of Kegon is the intellectual content of then, because all Zen people, insofar as they don't have any intellectual interests in Buddhism, study the Kegon doctrine. And one of the patriarchs of the Calgon school known as Shimit so. Was the patriarch of both schools. He lived in the Tung Dynasty rather later than part some.

Now let me remind you of one thing that Mahayana Buddhists don't have the same attitude to historical events that Christians do. For both Jews and Christians, history is enormously important. And the fact that Jesus did in fact live at a certain time, and that he taught thus and so, is considered immensely important. And therefore, all Christians tend to want to find out what Jesus really did teach, and go back to the original sources. It will forever be impossible to find out what the Buddha really did teach. It is

hopelessly overlaid, and nobody could ever figure it out. Besides, the Hindus have absolutely no sense of history whatsoever. It's impossible to date the great manuscripts of Hindu tradition and scholars have the wildest why a wide variations in their guesses as say to the date of the Bhagavad Gita, or anything like that you got a generally attested assumption that the Buddha lived shortly after six hundred B.C. and that somewhere in the succeeding years. Let's say, well, by about two hundred B.C., the Pali texts call the Pitakas, the three baskets of the doctrine had been formulated probably, probably. But nobody really knows. But then you see we have a whole succession of sutras, which represent the various points of view of the Mahayana, which may have been written or we might say forged, anywhere from 100 hundred B.C.. To 580. Most many of them don't exist in the original Sanskrit we only have them in Chinese or Tibetan translations. And. Here is why everything is so vague. The Mahayana theory is, you see, that when the Buddha first attained his and his liberation. He preached the complete inner Mahayana doctrine, but nobody could understand it. So he had to come down a step and preach something to simple people.

Well, this sort of thing went on. He had a deep doctrine and a simple doctrine, but as time passed those monks who had treasured the original records of the deep doctrine released them. And so, the Avataksama Sutra which is a whopper of a thing. Very very subtle. Appears to be in circulation. Roughly. About four hundred fifty A.D. and goodness only knows where it came from. Nobody can possibly tell it was simply found it was revealed. And in the same way of course let's take the Book of Deuteronomy. The Book of Deuteronomy purports to be by Moses although it describes Moses on death. It was as a matter of fact in the year six hundred twenty one B.C. when as a matter of fact it was written. Because it reflects opinions and attitudes of that time but naturally it had to be attributed to Moses and this was not because the author of Deuteronomy was a fraud intentionally, but because he was modest. If you expound the law, you must not do so in your own name that would be very very cocky. You must attribute it to Moses because Moses is the archetype of all law. So in exactly the same way, when you have very profound ideas of your own but nevertheless you feel that you got them from a depth of consciousness which was deeper than your ego you call that depth of consciousness, that

level, the Buddha. And so naturally, you attribute it to the Buddha. I must however explain. That there are many senses in which the word is used in Mahayana Buddhism, among Mahayana Buddhists. It is used as the title of the historic go to Mr Tata. Who we know as the Buddhist Shakyamuni, which means the sage of the Shakya clan.

But then in the Lotus Sutra which I was discussing last week. The Buddha explains that his appearance as Shakyamuni after six hundred B.C was a mere sort of illusion. It was an Upaya, that is to say skillful means, for helping sentient beings because the true actual Buddha, is eternal. And manifests itself again and again and again in myriad universes. And so you see these glorious Tibetan and Japanese Mandala paintings. Where you have a central Buddha surrounded with Buddhalets. You find for example, Kannon, the Temple of Sanjusangendo in Kyoto, where there are a hundred and one thousand and one figures of all in gold and each one of them has eleven hands. The main head that you see from the front and then one on each side looking this way one behind looking back and then a pile of little heads on top all the heads being different aspects of Buddha. The center figure has one thousand arms, literally. All carved wood, lacquered in gold. It's the most astonishing sight. You wonder what this is and you are reminded of Argus with his many eyes of some sort of cosmic centipede. Or sea urchin, or something of this kind with tentacles all over the place with. So this by then is that behind the historic Buddha, it is worked out there on. The eternal Buddha, but this eternal Buddha is diversified in many different ways. So the evolved doctrine of Marianna which is connected with this kind on doctrine is that there is at the center what is called Mahavairocana, which means the Great Sun Buddha Japanese die and it's in your eye. And this great somebody. Has some interesting historical origins. Because one suspects that it comes from Persia, and is some form of Ahura Mazda, the great Sun Buddha. The great light. Nobody knows. But there it is, Dainichi Nyorai, who is always shown wearing a crown unlike the ordinary Buddhas, which were a sort of round cap of snails. And it's in your eyes crowned, and has got great blazing Oriel of flames around him. And holds his hand thus. Well, it's pretty obvious, isn't it? You know, that's what's going on but in humans, it goes one way, in the cosmos it goes another way because the structure of a spiral nebula is this you know. Let's hold hands, you know, let's play.

Then around Dainichi Nyorai, there are either a four other Buddhas and these are all called Dhyani but as D H Y A N I. There is a Amitayus, who is the Buddha of boundless life. There is Amitabha, opposite to him, who is the Buddha of boundless light. Then there is Amoghasiddhi, which is the Buddha of power. Siddhi meaning in Sanskrit, psychic power or spiritual power. And there is Ratnasambhava. Who is, ratna means a jewel. And Pava is completely developed, and the they all are assigned different colors, different sounds, different meanings, and these five Dhyanis, but as I suppose, to constitute a symbolism of everybody's Buddha nature that is to say they are all in you, constituting your fundamental self.

But when there appears in the world someone who is highly in life and is always considered you see to be a manifestation of one of these five Yanni Buddhas. Or of all of them. So this is what the Buddha explains in the Lotus Sutra. That Buddha nature is the eternal principle and that furthermore, everybody has it. Trees and grass also have put in nature the very grains of dust have it. And so one of the sutras says, 'When every phase of our mind is in accord with the buddha mind there will not even be one grain of dust that does not become a Buddha.' So Buddhism does in fact, contrary to popular ideas, in this form of put is and which I'm talking about this weekend look forward to a consummation of the world in which everybody and everything becomes enlightened, and where the whole universe operates in total harmony. Now it's difficult to understand in what kind of time this is expected to happen. I don't mean in what length of time, I mean in what kind of time. It doesn't seem to be that it will in be in what we call the future. But you see the kind of time that we're living in is only one of many possibilities of time. You know, we think so especially I think some scientists are too apt to assume that what we call the physical universe as it is is really what there is and that there's nothing more than that. I find this an inconceivable assumption that this is all there is because we know already to say that there are all kinds of levels of existence outside our senses but within the reach of our instruments goodness knows what there is beyond the reach of the instruments and also in directions that we have never thought of. In spirit people develop. These things in science fiction they love to make up the idea of worlds corresponding to Riemann spaces. Because Riemann invented equations for the being of a so many different kinds of dimensions and spaces and you can theoretically conceive this.

And so the, the Hindus and the Buddhists feel you see, that there are infinitely many times and kinds of time, kinds of space kinds of world. That they may from the point of view of our space, be coincidental with each other that is to say all in the same place but there's no need for them to be all in the same place at all. You just have to let your imagination run a little bit and there's no harm doing that provided you know what you're doing. Because if you're letting your imagination run even if you know it's fantasy will often turn up with extremely interesting results. ALL of mathematics for example is simply playfulness. People who do high mathematics. Are not in the least bit interested as to whether they're going to attain any practical results. They're just doing things like very very involved crossword puzzles and seeing how to manipulate them. Well this is simply really a use of disciplined imagination.

And so in the same way, many of these Buddhist fantasies, disciplined imagination going to work on the world. Well so in some state which they would consider the goal of things. But you may also understand the goal. Not as being in future time. But as being in what you might call basic time. Time behind time, time beyond time. There is the state of total fulfillment. Now I want to read to you a description of this state which is rather curious it's the work of a very famous Buddhist scholar John Blowfield. Who was adventurous enough to take some mescaline. And suddenly got a real shock. Because he found out, practically everything it all was known in theory. And this is a very interesting experience. Because I'm not going to read all of it. He says after some time, that he tried to visualize the Tibetan mandala of the peaceful deities. That you find in the Tibetan Book of the Dead what I was describing to you and Mandela My viral Khana in the center and the Dhyani Buddhas arranged around it, you see them sitting inside a circle Well there are all sorts of these Mandalas it that you see in Tibet in art and we'll go into this a good bit next weekend but. The model of the peaceful deities is used as a support for meditation exercise, so he tries to visualize that. But succeeded only in countering up some rather metallic looking demons. Although they were far from frightening, and not even very lifelike or realistic being something of a cross between metal statues and living beings. But they did convey to me as though mockingly that to expect a profound religious experience as a result of taking mescaline was too presumptuous. Soon after that, the sensation of a rapidly fragmenting

personality returned to me with frightening force. I grew alarmed for my sanity and should have hastened to take an antidote for the mescaline had one been available. Then my friend persuaded me to eat some lunch I was in no condition to enjoy it by then things seen and presented themselves as independent independent visual and aural experiences with no see and hear or to link them into one of those single compositions which at any given moment form the content of normal consciousness the food went down my throat as usual but it seemed to be disappearing into a receptacles connected with me only to the extent that it was too near to be visible. The mental stress grew agonizing. My fear of permanent madness increased, and I suffered especially from the feeling of having no inner self or center of consciousness into which to retreat from the tension and take rest. An additional discomfort was the sensation of bright lights shining now and then from behind me that there's someone was standing there flicking a flashlight off and on. The movements of my man servant came in several times with dishes of food sweets and coffee occasioned great uneasiness whenever he was out of sight I felt he might be standing behind me with some vaguely sinister purpose, and since he knew nothing of the experiment I was afraid he would suppose that I was mad. Doubtless anyone else's in uninvited presence would have made me equally distrustful an uneasy that I was not bothered at all by the company of my friend because he was in the know and I felt the need of a nurse or guard. No words can describe the appalling mental torment that continued for well over an hour. All my organs and sensory experiences seem to be separate units. There was nothing left of me at all except a sort of dissin body and suffer a conscious of being mad, and racked by unprecedented tension there seemed no hope of being able to escape this torture. Certainly for many hours perhaps forever, hell itself could hardly be more terrifying. About one pm I drag myself to my bedroom shut myself away from everyone like a sick animal and fell on my bed. In my extremities I suddenly made a total surrender. And called upon my Idam. Now, in the, one of the schools of Mahayana Buddhism it is taught that all deities and therefore a man's own indwelling deity are products of his own consciousness. And that when consciousness is unimpeded. By karma. It is clearly seen not to be the property of the individual becoming to all beings to be the sole reality in all the universe. And he makes various notes on that sort of anyway this is the meaning of the ego it means your fundamental identity. Beyond all personal

differentiations. So the madness or death or anything whatever I would accept it without reservation if only I could be freed from the tension. While the first time in my life I ceased to cling to self loved ones sanity madness life or death. My renunciation of myself and its components was so complete as to constitute an act of annoyed trust in my Idam. Within a flash my state was utterly transformed from a hellish torment I was plunged into ecstasy and next an ecstasy infinitely exceeding anything describable or anything I had imagined from what the world's accomplished mystics of struggle to describe. Suddenly that dawned full awareness of three great truths which I had long accepted intellectually but never until that moment experienced as being fully self evident. Now they had best upon me not just as intellectual convictions but as experiences no less vivid intangible than I heat and light to a man closely surrounded by forest fire.

One. There was awareness of them differentiated unity embrace in the perfect identity of subject and object of singleness and plurality of the one of the many Thus I found myself if indeed the words I and myself have any meaning in such a context at once the audience the actors in the play logically the one can give birth to the many in the many can merge into the one all be fundamentally but not apparently identical with it they cannot be in all respects one and many simultaneously not logically but now logic was transcended. I they held and myself was it was a mass of brilliant colors and forms which being several colors and several forms but different from one another and yet all together the same at the very moment of being different. I doubted the statement can be made to see meaningful at the ordinary level of consciousness no wonder the mystics of all faiths teach that understanding comes only when logic and intellect are transcended. In any case, this truth even if at an ordinary level of consciousness it cannot be understood, can in a higher state of consciousness be directly experienced as self-evident. Logic also boggles at trying to explain how I could at once to see even yet be those colors in those forms how the see-er, the seeing and the seen the feel of the feeling in the felt would all be one but to me all this was so clearly self-evident as to suggest the words childishly simple.

Two: Simultaneously, there was awareness of unutterable bliss, coupled with the conviction that this was the only real and eternal state of being. All others, including our entire experience in the day to day world being no

more than passing dreams. This bliss, I'm convinced awaits all beings when the last vestiges of their self would have been destroyed or as in this case temporarily discarded it was so intense as to make it seem likely that body and mind would be burnt up in a flash yet though the state of bliss continued who what I later knew to be three or four hours I am urged from it unscathed.

Three: at the same time came awareness of all that is implied by the British doctrine of dominance. Namely that all things were the objects of mental or of sensory perception, are alike devoid of own being. That is the word svadhada existence as independent realities and whether they're divided that they are transitory combinations of an infinite number of impulses this was us fully apparent as are the individual bricks to someone staring at a non-plastic wall I actually experience the momentary rising of each impulse and the thrill of combination which it to me with which it immediately ceased to be. I shall now attempt to describe the entire experience in terms of sensory perception. Though not without fear that this will cloud rather than illuminate what has been said for the content of my experience being super-sensory and super-intellectual can hardly be made understandable in terms of originally coined to describe the mental and physical content of ordinary perception. Of reality it seems to me in retrospect can be viewed as a plasma, of no intrinsic color or form, that is nevertheless the substance of all colors and all forms highly charged with vivid consciousness energy in bliss, it is in gauged in eternal play. Or it can be viewed not as a plasma, but as an endless succession of myriads of simultaneous impulses each of which arises like a wave mounts and dissolves in bliss within an instant. The whirling colors and shapes which result, produce certain effects that recall flashes of red deities seen in pictures, dreams, or in the world of normal everyday consciousness. It can be deduced that the latter are in fact reflections of this eternal beauty I remember recognizing a well loved smile well remembered gesture of uncommon beauty. There I perceive no lips to smile, no arm to move, it was as though I beheld and recognize the everlasting abstract quality. To which such transience miles investors had owed their charm. Again, reality can be viewed as a god. dancing with marvelous vigor, playfully, his every movement producing waves of bliss from time to time he makes stabbing movements with a knife. At every stroke, the base becomes intense. I remember the plunging knife made me

cry aloud That's it that's right yes yes yes. Or else reality can be viewed as a whirling mass of light. Brilliant color, movement and get it coupled with an operable bliss those who experience it cannot refrain from laughing cries of yes yes yes ha ha that's how it is of course, of course. I felt as though after many years of anxious search for the answer to some momentous problem I was suddenly confronted with a solution so holy satisfying and so entirely simple, that I had to bust out laughing. I was conscious of the immense joy and of incredulous amazement at my own stupidity, in having taken so long to discover the simple truth. Within this play of the universe, there is endless giving and receiving that will giver, gift and receiver are of course the same. It is as though today it is while yet one are locked in ecstatic embrace, giving and receiving with the abandon of adoration the Tibetan Yabyung representation of deities into this the artists who paint them must be forgiven for that inability to indicate that give and receive or are not only one but formless there are indeed some artists manage to suggest the Oneness by blending the figures so well that the yom is not seen unless the picture is given prolonged and careful scrutiny. During the experience, I was identical with the giver, the receiver, and the incredible bliss given and received there is nothing sexual about this union it is formless the bliss is all pervading he should use the word genital not sexual and giver and receiver, giving and receiving are not to but one. It is only in attempting to convey the experience that the imagery of sexual joy suggest itself as perhaps coming a little closer than other imagery to the idea of an ecstatic union in which two are one.

Some of the conclusions I drew from the whole experience are as follows
A) Fear and anxiety as to our ultimate destiny and needless self-inflicted torments. By energetically breaking down the karmic propensities which give rise to the illusion of an ego and of individual separateness, we shall hasten the time when reality is revealed and all hindrances to ecstatic bliss removed. Unless like the bodhisattvas, we compassionately prolong our wanderings and some sour so as to lead other beings to that goal. B) The world around us so often grey, is the product of our own distorted vision, of our ego consciousness and ego-clinging. By casting away ourselves together with all longings desires qualities and properties that pertain to them we can utterly destroy the illusory egos which alone bar us from the ecstatic bliss of universal consciousness. The key is total renunciation, but

this alas cannot often be achieved by a single effort of will, because each of us is hemmed in by a hard shell of karmic propensities, the fruit of many, many misspent lives. The three fires of desire, passion and ignorance are hard to quench. Yet they would be quenched in an instant, should we but make and sustain an act of total renunciation. Such an act cannot result from effort or longing because these would involve our egos and thus actually strengthen them. Thus in the ultimate stage, even effort and longing for nirvana must be abandoned, together with everything else this truth is hard to understand. C) the Buddha's experience indicates that when unlike him and that is full awareness of that blissful reality of his attributes include inconceivable wisdom compassion light Beauty Energy and Gati is obtained in this life it is possible to continue carrying out human responsibilities behaving as required responding to circumstances as they arise and yet be free from them all so it is with a talented actor who in the pot of Romeo, weeps real tears. When his grief for Juliet threatens to overwhelm him, he can withdraw inwardly from his row long after recollect the unreality of Juliet and of death. And yet, continue to give the same for months as befall. D) A single glimpse of what I saw should be enough to call forth unbounded affection for all living beings. For however obvious smelly autonomous and they may seem all that is real about them is that gloriously blissful signing consciousness which forms the center of my experience hatred dislike disdain aversion for any being sharing that consciousness i.e.. any being that all, must amount to blasphemy and one who has seen being itself.

And now, I think anybody influenced by the weltanschauung, the zeitgeist of the twentieth century, would find great difficulty in taking such a statement seriously. Because. We pride ourselves on being realistic. That is to say, on being people who do not indulge in wishful thinking. And while at the beginning of our century, there was a great deal of what is now referred to a shallow optimism about human progress, when the true world was came and went. We decided that. Human nature was pretty much of a match. And that. You will remember no doubt. That during the Second World War there was a feel logical movement. Generally called back to sin. That is to say, back to belief in the very very fundamental reality of evil that was the time when C.S. Lewis wrote The Screwtape Letters. That was the time when Reinhold Niebuhr wrote The Nature and Destiny of Man. And

this was saying, you Westerners got to seven lies and too sentimental you don't really admit and face the fact of how ghastly things can be.

Well now, therefore, for that reason, a description like this which says the way things really are. Is a ball without any exception whatsoever and it is real and you were just on vacation from it for a moment which when you get out of it will seem like nothing. This is not a statement or an attitude that is coming out of anything like a sentimental culture. Nothing could be more different than the climate of Indian and Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism and the climate of New Thought at the end of the nineteenth century. After all, new thought Christian Science, Unity, all those movements, were conceived in the great American prosperity of New England. Among very nice, successful people, and as you see today when you go around the circles in which these very, very optimistic religions flourish. They're all composed mainly rather well-to-do comfortable bourgeoisie. No aristocrats ever went for them and no proletarians and that is the reason for this. Which is that aristocrats always live on the past. Because they have arrived long ago. Oh and therefore they have no reason to strive a real aristocrat is a very unassuming person who doesn't lot about but knows that he is someone and there's no way of questioning it that's why they're so courteous to servants. On the other hand a proletarian has no past and no future, and so he lives for the present. The boy who was he has no past but he won't live in the present he always lives for the future and therefore he is the one constantly deluded. So, he is always you see the sucker. As my uncle used to say, the rich can afford it, the poor get it given to them, and the middle classes do without. Which is a sort of a bitter comment but that the thing is that prosperous bourgeoisie did invent. And go for the philosophy that everything really behind the scenes is all right.

Now, this point of view comes from a well that is so different from that. A world of extreme insecurity. Of War of disease, of all kinds of spooks and horrors. And you see this reflected in Buddhist art. It has a class of beings in it, which are, we would say devils. The most appalling creatures with. Many heads, many arms, full of claws necklaces of skulls writhing Suppan surround them and are described in the text to be making the most appalling noise. And there they are that's life. These are not demons. They're not in the Christian sense of the word devils at all. They are aspects or shall we

say ruffle aspects of the underlying reality. And the whole point is this. And this is described in the Tibetan Book of the Dead. That you have to face these things, in the conviction that they are simply illusions of your own mind. But you don't try to push them away by thinking of something else see, as if this is not to say well don't think thoughts like that that are negative when you get negative thinking this is the different principle you don't substitute something positive. What you do is, you go slam bang into the middle of the negative. As this man did you see in describing his vision when he got this awful state he just plunged you see let go and plunged right into it. And, yes, he was helped by Mescaline, but anybody in need an awful state. Say they're in pain all that dying all something dreadful is happening will be able to achieve the same consequence. By going with it completely.

I remember. This wonderful German who wrote. The book called You know on Zen meditation it's all about belly hot I mean the belly. Bonding. Time caught Friedlander time. And he said to me you know I'm having a very interesting time because working in Germany after the awful ravages of the war. Has brought me some very interesting contacts he said I've come a lot cross a lot of people. Who had this tremendous spiritual illumination. And sort of, when it passed off, believed that they had had some kind of lapse of mind or hallucination under extreme stress and when they tried to tell anybody else about it they were laughed off. And he said of the three kinds. There was the experience of the dot bomb. You heard it coming. And there was this frightful whistle. And then there was a thud, and nothing happened. But in the meantime you knew this was it and you gave up and surrendered completely, you just. Let go and suddenly it became apparent exactly as he says. That everything is completely gorgeous. Then he said there was a second instance. Person in a concentration camp, with no sentence, no law, no nothing, and absolutely convinced that he would never never get out never. And he accepted it. And the same thing happened. And he said there was a third class of catastrophe very common to people that was to be completely operated. To be a displaced person, with all your possessions, all your money, all your career, totally destroyed. And when some people just accepted this the same thing happened to them. And of the funny thing about it is you see that. It's so queer because it's so difficult to pin any kind of morality on this. You know you see at that moment. That the other

people who are suffering. And who are resisting it. And having an awful time, are not really having an awful time at all. They are actually, you catch yourself doing this occasionally, when you nurse a grievance, and you enjoy hating somebody you know this sort of mood when. You just revel in disliking something.

So in this way, the from the vision one can see life reveling in agony. It's a very weird way of looking at things and of course you can't carry that over into practical life and say Now I should talk to you because you're going to enjoy such as exquisite agony. You don't do that. But this is how it's it is seen from this particular point of view this particular shift in consciousness and the funny thing is as he indicates. It's so simple. There's no question about it. It's absolutely clear now this is in other words what we're talking about is what is the Buddhist vision of the consummation of mankind. And of of being what what it is all about. Hard to say when, where, from what point of view but some way out rather fundamental. So you can say well, is this a hallucination that people slip into every now and then, like getting drunk or crazy or having months of measles or something that just distorts your point of view and gives you what would be called euphoria. You know when you want to use a putdown word for happiness you call a person euphoric. So, you could argue that way, and it would be quite legitimate to argue that way within the zeitgeist of our times. Because we are reassured by what I would call a rush to beer can view of reality. You know it's all comes down to a rush to be a care in the moments of that that's real that's the that's the thought of thing you see lying on the street and that's every day it's folksy and terribly reassuring.

But on the other hand, I keep coming back to the funny feeling, that if existence itself is not basically gorgeous in this way, that it wouldn't be able to exist. That in other words the game wouldn't be worth the candle. That you would have a reality system which would have cancelled itself out long ago through some simple method of suicide. Now cos here again we can say well that's what it's doing. Only it's taking an unconscionable long time to do it from our point of view. You know this is part of the God is Dead bit that you could read into that that God just couldn't stand it. This this whole thing was a terrible mistake and dire and I'm left well hanging. On For there are few logins who seriously think that God did once exist and has

actually disappeared. And died. This is unbelievable but it's his sorrow is more or less as I understand it the position of all ties I'm.

But, I suppose this is a quick one of those things that. It's like nerve. A lot of people by having nerves get away with all sorts of things that they shouldn't get away with but succeeded in doing so and we call them the successful. You know they shouldn't have succeeded, because they really didn't have the proper qualifications or educational background or whatever it was but they did have nerve. Well, in the same way you know, when you hit a golf ball, you have to have this follow-through, you can really go drilling go like this you don't just hit at the ball. Well so in a similar way when a person has the feeling you see that this is the way the universe is. It gives him a certain quality of existence and you may say well he's not really a very realistic person. But damn it, he gets on well.

Now, what I was talking to you about with morning. Namely, the conception of the universe as a totally harmonious energy system, which may be realized as such, at some time or some kind of time. Not necessarily a future time, as we ordinarily understand it, but let's just say that it is a point of view from which the whole gamut of being may be considered as completely harmonious. This is called in the loss of feel we're discussing that is to say the philosophy of the other tongues of. The Dharmadhatu. The D-H-A-R-M-A-D-H-A-T-U. Literally, the realm or domain of the Dharma, the dharma the ng this complicated difficult indeed impossible to Sanskrit word. That is used usually translated. In law in English. But which can also mean method function. Rather like our word principle, as in the phrase to get the principle of the thing. It can also have some affinity. It with our word reason, and it can also have some affinity with our word what is right. So you got to conduct that is described as the tomorrow which is right and wrong, roughly. Dharmadatu therefore really means of the order of the universe. What it is fundamentally. And I was pointing out that fundamentally this order is a harmony. And there is a point of view from which this can be seen.

Now, this philosophy of the Avatamsaka sutra makes a further analysis of the Dharma Datu. Into what are called the four Dharma worlds. And this is one of these mnemonic tricks that Buddhists always use to help you keep things in mind. They group things into four, into five, into six, seven eight,

nine, ten, twelve and so on they always miss out eleven for some reason and. So that you can memorize it easily. And the four Dharma worlds or what you might call the four ways of looking at existence let's call it that, are called in Japanese... I'll use this language because it's easier to remember than Chinese and easier to pronounce. First of all the world that is called Ji. J I. Second, the world that is called Ri , R-I. The one that is called. Rijimuge. Ri, ji mnd you get the. And then fourth, the world that is called jijimuge. Well, I will go through these things in order.

First of all, the way of looking at the world as Ji. The character Ji, in Chinese, has a very complex set of meanings. It can mean ordinarily, a thing or an event. It can mean business. That is to say, something that matters it's important I can mean a fast. It can mean affectation. So that a person who might be described as boogy in Japanese No. Physically once wrote me an autograph. And he wrote that the three characters Bu Ji Nin which means a no-fuss man. And the Virgin and as a man, of whom the poem says that I quoted you last week. Entering the forest he does not disturb a blade of grass entering the water he does not cause a ripple. You know like those wonderful South Sea Island Power fishes who can dive cutting the water like a knife and oddly making any splash at all. This kind of harmonious relationship with circumstances in which one doesn't stand out like a sore thumb that is Noji.. So Ji, the fundamental meaning, is whatever it is that stands out. That is to say the distinct the particular The indeed. The shop. So in contrast with Ji, which is one point of view toward the world, is really, really is a Chinese character pronounced by the Chinese, Li. Which almost all of you will by now be familiar with because I've explained in previous seminars and this character means fundamentally the markings in Jade. All the grain in wood all the fiber and muscle. Now at the stage of Chinese history that we're talking about which is seven hundred twelve A.D. when this particular philosophy was really matured by Fox sung. The word but really our leader. Meant. What I've been referring to all along as for the. Undefinable substrata things. Like the mirror underneath all the various reflections in the mirror. Or the diaphragm of the radio underlying all the sounds which the loudspeaker produces. All of the eye is fundamental to sight the fundamental design.

So if you could put it this way then that what Ji downfall is the individual reflections in the mirror and what Reese downs for is the narra. Hot sun himself explained it to one of the Chinese emperors by the image of a golden lion when he wrote a long treatise on the Golden Lion which if you want the whole thing and want to study it carefully you will find in volume two of fungal lands history of Chinese philosophy. This is an incidental, [that] anyone seriously interested in these things should possess these two volumes, published by Princeton. And in the second volume he has a long long exposition Fotsam on a nice thing about fun you learn. If he's a very conscientious historian. Because most of his book is quotations. He simply weaves in the original sources with explanatory help out and. Just lets you have it. And I think he's extraordinarily good, but he does is not easy reading. But he has the whole of the Golden Lion its position which shots on used to make the lion of the garland doctrine comprehensible to a slightly stupid Emperor. I said likely. Though he has the idea of the Golden Lion. Because he use the form of the lion to represent G.-D. that is the individual individual izing principle and the goal, to represent Ri, which is the underlying. And you remember we discussed this last week because in another way and from another point of view. We were talking about the Western distinction between form and substance. And how we have grown up with our common sense geared to the idea that every shape is a shape of some stuff. But we consider the shape principle, the form principle, to be spiritual. And the stuff principle to be material. In other words, form is a high order of being than matter. Because we think of matter of stuff the form of the pot is a higher principle than the play out of which it is made that's the way we think but in this district and the Hindu way of thinking it's exactly the other way around. The Gold is used to represent the higher principle. And the form of the lion is used to represent the material. Because you see, there isn't a word in Sanskrit that corresponds to our word material. They use Roopa and Roopa means form. When they, when in other words a Sanskrit thinking person wants to indicate what we call the material world. He doesn't really say material he says formal. The world of form then when he wants to indicate higher worlds that are spiritual He calls them out Arupa which are formless. So in his way of thinking the gold underlying the form of the lion. Represents a a deeper more basic order of reality than the form of the lion. You have to get used to see to these funny flips in. Metaphor. As used between Chinese speaking peoples are Sanskrit

speaking peoples and English or German speaking or Greek speaking peoples.

So, the point now that he's made he's making he's established these two ways of looking at the World. You can look at it from the point of view of all the jazz that everything is doing and see. All the forms all the dances all the patterns. And those are. Then you can look at it from the point of view of what is it doing it all what is it all happening in? What is in other words the medium, or the basis, which is all this universe and that is called Ri. Although, via a funny flit at a time later than Fotsan's. That is to say, we'll have to go on in Chinese history to the neo-Confucian philosophy, which will take us to the fourteenth century. Where the word really comes to have the meaning of the organic pattern of the world. Where the full meaning of the idea of markings in Jade which it originally had is brought out again. For a period here in under the auspices of Buddhism, Ri, roughly corresponds to what we mean in western philosophy by the word noumenon as distinct from phenomenon. Roughly. You see noumenon is based on new switches mind phenomenon is based on final which means to show, to manifest. Manifestation of mind or in Information of the formless. Because you see, fundamental to the whole Hindu Buddhist complex is the notion of the world as being something like what happens when you develop a photographic film. You look at the film and first of all in the solution it is formless, there's nothing on it and then suddenly all over the area that you're watching a picture develops. It doesn't develop across and that oughta or down and that all of it all over at once it comes out. And they feel that nature works in rather the same way. There is whatever it is you see, the vast unnamable continuum and this manifests itself like the film developing. So every Ji is a thing or event. Ri is the Continuum in which things and events occur. But as a matter of fact the two are not really different from each other.

Now this gets us to the next principle in the next step. The fourth, the third so-called Dharma talk to or Donna world is called rijimuge. And that means that between ri and ji, there is no blockage. Inconsistency the word again literally means a blockage. But probably inconsistency or. Separation you could use that no separation. No separation between Ri and Ji. Now he goes with the idea of the gold line and he puts it this way. You can't ever find

gold that is not in some form. If it's not in the form of a lion it'll be in some tongue. But you can't find a lion without the go in other words the lion even if it's a living lion has to have some. Ri underneath it as it were. This is the Oriental meaning of the word substance as distinct from our meaning which is stuff. So the gold in the Lion are in a way inseparable. You can think of them separate you can form the abstractions of gold on the one hand and lion on the other. But actually. The form the G. and the Ri would always go together. So then, really, the Muji no separation. Of the rope our world has the world of form and the formless wild is when you see there is no in compatibility between what we could call the spiritual and material.

Now this is an idea very very simpatico to the Chinese. It's not it hasn't been a very popular idea in India it did originate in India. But the Indian mind is to a large extent in popular sense. Very very disillusioned with the formal World which is always falling apart and which is painful and which is a struggle and a mess and everything like that and they long for the formless world. And so when you listen to most Hindu teachers, they will encourage you to become a spiritual as possible and to renounce the material life of family. Delight in the senses, sex, all that sort of thing is kind of out. Of the Chinese could never could see that that was a sensible point of view. The Chinese social order is essentially family oriented and they they don't they're celibacy makes no sense to them at all. So, although there have been Chinese ascetics by and large they don't dig that. So it appealed to them very much that there could be this philosophy of the view of the world in which Ri and Ji were perfectly compatible.

So then. What is being said here. Is that you get to go back to my image of the mirror and the images in the mirror. You will never see the mirror unless it's reflecting something that. There is no way of. There being a mirror which is not reflecting. So in other words, don't look for the principle called Ri, as something different from the Ji. In other words, when you wake up and understand that there is something behind existence, you are not to expect to find a big vast blank. A lot of people think that when they attain nirvana, all individual forms which they see before their eyes will slowly melt and become do it like the dissolution of the negative. Forms in the negative back into the formlessness behind as if that would happen. So that's not going to have that's not it's not going to be that way. What you're

going to find out is this. That all things as you see them, being quite distinct from each other, and all the shapes of them the differences of people and everything. That those which differences you see, what you are noticing in the world those things those events are not really separate from each other at all. They are the same thing as the Ji, I mean that the Ri, underlying it. It's important then to see that in nature. In the real physical world, there aren't any separate things. The idea of separate things is no more than an idea it is a way of talking about life. To get to this we have to go of cost of the fourth step in the series of what's called.

And this is the image of the net of jewels. And this is the central image of the whole Avatamsaka philosophy. There is a net like a spider's web covered with dew drops in the dawn. Only this web is multidimensional. In other words, it's not even three dimensional web it's more and more and more as many dimensions as you could possibly ever imagine. And I am this web every drop contains a reflection of all the other dewdrops. This is a way, an image, of saying that everything implies everything else. That take any detail any possible feature of the universe which you can in any way identify as a thing. And if you really go into it. You will have to see it as capable of existing only in the context of everything else. So, each thing implies everything, because it could not possibly have.... let's just take it this way where is anything you can only define a where of one thing in relation to the way out of all the others. You can only define the size of a thing in relation to other sizes. You can only define the length in time of a thing in relation to other lengths of time you see. So that, there is for example a point of view from which a very small thing, like this little clam shell here could seem to be enormous. And you can very easily get this point of view all you have to do is to hold this in your hand. And transfer your consciousness into a tiny creature wandering around inside this huge shell. Why it's colossal! Or else you can go the other way and you can think of all the galaxies as molecules in somebodies hair, in another world. You see it when it's really very little it's all depends on your scale. But the the point is this: that every....insofar as anything that you can possibly identify as a thing or as an event. Goes-with let's coin this word. The word goes-with. All other things whatsoever. And, I think in the seminar we mention this technique of making holograms whereby with less of these you can take any photographic negative and from any part of the negative

reconstruct the whole. Well it works the same way. That any Ji, is what it is only in relationship to in context with all other G. whatsoever and this can do is often. Also called the doctrine of mutual interpenetration. And this is the key to understanding what I was trying to describe this morning. As the experience of the universal harmony.

I remember once, a woman I met had an accident. And she was trapped in an elevator. But it caught her leg and leg was broken and she was trapped there for half an hour before anybody could rescue it. But she said I came in that time to realize, that in all this universe there was not one single speck of dust that was out of place. Because this again was, somebody accepting a situation about which nothing could be done. And that would of course include, accepting the fact that you can't accept it. That there it is. And then suddenly this extraordinary way of feeling comes to you. That everything goes with everything else. It isn't it's as if...it's curiously different from what we would call the fatalistic sense. The fatalistic sense means, I submit to a higher power. Something arranges everything and I don't have anything to do with it I have no responsibility and I just go because. I'm not I'm not an automaton I say. That is a of a rather different attitude and what I'm trying to describe, its more passive. This one is like this: My talking to you now. Is inseparable from the Gulf lying out there. Now you may say that's rather a far shot to call. This thing but as a matter of fact. Let's start putting it all together. We're living in a nice little town you know by the water. And by a combination of events, I make this place attractive so you come. And that if the world gulls around here it wouldn't be the ocean you know. Gulls and ocean go together. And so, this whole complex of things it isn't just that I'm in a vacuum, you see. But it all goes together and all goes with every single one of these houseboats and it goes with every kind of Crowley piece of falling off pain on rotting wood and off whole bit all interdepends. And if you get to see this one day, and you realize you know you felt terrible because you did this that and the other which you should have done. And suddenly you realize. Go back over your own life supposing your friends' parents and relations have never done anything wrong or what they thought was wrong. Think of the opportunities you would have missed. It fits. And there is this sense then that you get. That the whole Patten that you can feel out of your existence and one thing with another is completely logical. All goes together.

Now you see what this is, is a kind of fulfillment of what all scientists are trying to do. When we say, we ask if any behavior whatsoever in the world. Can we explain it? We are asking is there a reason for it? And what we are looking for is to be able to fit it into a consistent pattern. Now let's suppose for example that we say somebody has done something quite unreasonable. But then some psychologist comes along and says you know yes I agree from a certain point of view what he did was unreasonable but you haven't looked fully into this thing. You don't realize. All the complex of causes that were operating in the situation, and if you did understand that you would see and understand exactly why the person behaved in some unreasonable way the whole face of science is that the universe is explainable this way. That we can in other words make out a super pattern in terms of which all sub patterns make sense. If we're going to say, there are some things that will never make sense. There are some things which simply have no explanation whatsoever this is also a way of saying. Or, it amounts to saying that they don't exist. Because they're not connected. There is no rational explanation of their being there at all and so such things must be flukes. Not only flukes but complete cosmic madnesses. Now, when you call something a cosmic madness, something that is a total fluke for which you haven't got any explanation, all you're saying is My mind isn't big enough to get the point. And we have to admit there are many things going on which puzzle us profoundly, and our minds have not yet acquired a way but a way of explaining that. There are reasons for this. There are reasons that the patterns in terms of which we explain things that take for example the pattern of causality mechanical Newtonian causality is a rather limited pattern. And not everything will fit it. But as we think more and delve deeper we get concepts which are more generous. Concepts which accommodate the behavior of the world more subtly. The patterns we are using are more ingenious.

Now, there comes a point of course at which I see it all fits together, but I can't tell you quite why. Because the pattern, in terms of which it all fits together, is simultaneously too complex and too simple to talk about. Because you see we're getting back to this thing which is the the medium in which it all happens and which can't be defined. I guess that you see you get that feeling. Oh yes of course. It really does all go together but at that moment the philosopher would challenge me said Yes look here we thought

out things in terms of science we thought out orders we thought out equations We thought out patterns in which in terms of which events are predictable. And therefore we know they're fairly sure but you are telling us something which doesn't help us to predict anything. Because you're saying. That even the unpredictable is included in that. And so you're not telling us anything at all. And that is quite true. But. The most important of all things to tell, is nothing. Because that's. That's the basis that's. Why you don't pronounce the name of God. Why it's unspeakable.

So, there was a Zen monk who said I had the most marvelous teacher. I was very lucky. Because he never taught me anything. Neither was he never told me a word. All he did was sit around in a gruff kind of silence, while this poor student knocked himself out against him. And he got a point. Didn't have this is the problem that the. If there were a point you could get C. and say. Now I have really got this, I understand what the universe is what life is all about and I and now I know you see like that. We would have ended up part of it. You would say when I went a minute. Once outside of this, see, [you'll]be looking around the corner of one of the. Well what does this fit in say this thing I've got. Now for the sake of the tape recorder I have to say that I'm as it were holding a ball in my hands. And I've got to say but the something outside the ball. The really important thing which you need to get is what would never possibly be grasped. That is to say, the situation you're in, that is you. [There is] no way of getting that as an object focusing on it defining it pinning it down none whatever. And in that sense the whole situation is no-thing nothing. Can particularize it.

So, so much for that. But actually this thing that we call I don't want you to see to think of the no thing that something like Homogenized Jell-O.. You see, that that's not the point it doesn't like that it's like everything. With all of the tails and all you see this is why I must say in the matter of. People who try to communicate mystical vision. There are two schools of artists who communicate mystical visions, the precise school and the vague school. And the vague school which I don't really go for. I saw my son in law brought me over the other day a book of pictures of angels. But the trouble with them was they all looked wispy. They were all cloudihs forms, vague reflections in water, washy things now when I think of an angel I don't think of anything wishy. I think of something in which the detail is so

vivid. That you say who look at that in the same way as when you look at some marvelous flower. Or peacock feather for example. Look at a peacock feather and every kind of tiny little. Unit in it is all of that see now this is the point. That this world to be seen in its unity. Must at the same time be seen in maximum detail. It isn't a question of fuzzing the details that's what meant by jijimuge. Between thing and thing. Event and event, any detail any line you can draw there is no separation. Because you see what we call lines and draw them as clear and clean as you will. They join every line joins its two sides together it is a boundary in common between two areas they. Leave the black yang...I mean the the white Yang on the black yin are as different as can be but they go together and the boundary line S. curve between them in the thing joins them.

So this is why a great deal of high visionary art which it tempts to express deep mystical inside is fantastically detailed. And has tremendous precision. And is not wishy washy stuff at all. And so this will explain why... I will show you some examples they'll tomorrow of. The type of Buddhist painting that comes out of the school of thought and you will see what a minute rack of this world of wonder is in it, of extraordinary detail. Because this is the vision that you get. When you start exploring, you take a flower, you take a big magnifying glass. You go down into that flower, and you find out that the petals. Are composed of veins. And out of the veins come funny capillaries and suspended between the Capitol or is that the film ministers of Petal Amber stillness is a petal are made of tiny little dots that to ripple using everything like that to see then you know looking into the Lotus image, and you're seeing the details. But the point that you have to get is. That these details are not separate details. They all go together, so that every wiggle in the vein of the petal is part of the same thing that you are being they're looking at it. Just in other words as the flower may be considered as a unity with all those they knows and things moving out from the center. So in exactly the same way, least sitting here are doing something just like that. Only we're doing it with such a tremendous free float. In jazz to say we come from all over the place we've got to get a good to get a good ideas about this but we but just because we do it with that immense amount of free-floating jazz. We make the most extraordinary unity. When we sit around and talk, or whatever you do. Well it's have an intermission. Yesterday afternoon, I gave you the four views of the world which are

characteristic of the Kegon philosophy. And supply a sort of convenient summary of its general outlook. The world seen as simply things and events. That is from the point of view of multiplicity. That's the first view. And that's called Ji in Japanese. I'm giving the Japanese was because they're easier to remember. And the second view of the world is seeing things seen from the standpoint of unity. That is to say, just as the mirror provides a unity, a base, that is to say for all the separate images in it. So you might say that the mind or space, and there is a way in which the two of the same provides the unity for all the manifold things and events that exist in it. Now, there seems of course to be a conflict between these two points of view. The one and the many. And the most ancient philosophical problems revolve around this whole dichotomy, how do you get the one out of the many? How do you get the many out of the one? And it, it seems that one and many are mutually exclusive. In other words, in practical affairs we are many and we all have conflicting interests. What formula are we going to find so that we can agree and act together? This is always the most difficult task. And it requires great brains or great insight or great something or other to find the point on which we can all agree. And so work together.

So there is always an apparent fight going on between the principle of unity and the principle of diversity, because after all the diverse people don't want to be too united. You know, if we all had to wear exactly the same clothes and all had to do exactly the same sort of job that would be a revolution Say grr, stop interfering with my personality. Individual freedom is important in that and it certainly is. And what we've got to do you see them is to find a formula. Where there is the maximum of individual liberty. But all of it going on together harmoniously. And that's what we as a political historical community as have as our theoretical foundation is not fascination. To see we been trying to work out. This impossible problem, and incidentally, the theories of American politics, the basic ideas are founded on esoteric Christian mysticism. The whole idea of democracy, as we understand it, in the modern world, goes back to German mysticism in the fourteenth century. That is to say, it goes back to people like Mesiter Eckhart and Tala. Angelus Silesius, you see the brothers of the free spirit, the Anabaptists. The Anabaptists [were] people who said that all living beings are naturally children of God and therefore baptism is not necessary

to bring a person into salvation. Then there were people called the Levelers, and the Levelers...this movement migrated from Germany through the Dutch countries to England. And during the Great Puritan uprisings against Charles the First. All these groups began to flourish in England. And the British aristocracy simply couldn't stand them. Because they overthrew the whole order of hierarchy by saying everybody is equal and so they had to get out of England and come here.

Now you will see of course there is always the danger of a parity. That is to say, when everybody is equally a manifestation of the Godhead, which is the Quaker doctrine of the in a light that's what it really comes. And that's why the Quakers don't recognise any sacraments, because everything is a sacrament. While the Quakers don't have any ritual because sitting in together in silence This is a ritual. Anything is a ritual. The Quakers want to be make a complete fusion of everyday life and religion, so that you don't notice any religion around. You just have the good life. And so the Quakers won't remove their hats in court. They won't take an oath because they say, you've got to trust me because everything I say will be true. But so easy is that the Quaker idea is the direct continuation of the tradition of Christian mysticism as it flowered in Germany particularly in the late Middle Ages. The unfortunate parity of all that is that everybody is equally inferior. That's what you always have to watch out for. Everybody can be treated rudely by the police because you're all equal. And the police aren't going to say so. To somebody because he happens to be the mayor. The mayor but because you are an important figure in. Business or something you're all just Joe the city. And then that becomes everybody's equally superior. But if you could imagine where everybody is considered equal or superior This is the foundation of what we call courtesy. Good manners. Where you salute people. And you reverence their right to a certain privacy asserting it. Separateness missy. And you have to learn this art. In a state of affairs where. People start crowding in on each other.

Now you see, in a country like Japan, space is the most expensive thing there is. And it's becoming so here. Space used not to be expensive at all here there was just oodles of it. And everybody could afford to be equally rude. And now we can't. We're getting crowded into each other. And to create space, you have to create it by mountains. That is then respect to

everybody. Because for example, in a Japanese house, there is no privacy such as we understand that you can hear every bell or rumble. Because the walls are just paper and all the rooms are tiny and very close in on each other. And then they for example, they all take baths together. And they all always see each other naked, but they don't look. To begin with a so much steam that you can't really see much. But they have a way of being courteous. Nobody takes liberties in the bathtub, unless somebody wants liberties to be taken but in that in the ordinary way it complete strangers will meet together in the public bar of a hotel and male or female that there are two bathrooms one says men and the other says women men means men and women and women means women. But the family bath is always the one labeled men. And everybody goes in there and nobody is embarrassed. Because manners are preserved. The sense of...you can you sort of keep psychological hands off another person with the notion that they're to be respected you see that. You in Japanese culture everybody bows to everybody else and they have bowing contests they out by each other when you leave you know it goes on it interminably and as it where you're more polite if you bomb are often than the other parts of the other salt sort of funny from our point of view but it's still this point that.

There is a possibility in other words, of a bit of a cultural form, that will stress and get away with, the prospect and that...Not the prospect, the proposition that everybody is equal or divine as distinct from the proposition that everybody is equally inferior. And that feeling and the manners that go with it is essential. In any community where we start to crowd. And we get a population explosion. So this is one thing we have to do to solve this huge question of swarming population. Especially in the United States, which is not used to the idea of courtesy not really, that we've got to make a propaganda. For great respect to everybody. Otherwise we won't be able to to accommodate the crush at all. The funny thing about the Japanese incident is that. They've learned the manners of mutual respect, under certain circumstances. But new circumstances arise in which they haven't learned it. And one of these is the subway. It is total pandemonium. They they pack everybody into the subway like sardines, and they have special officials whose duty it is to push people in and to see that they're all jammed and they just shuffle the crowd then when they each official that the separate door has got it, he signals and the doors close.

Although in the situation the Japanese although they are shoving and pushing and so on when you are absolutely tied up against Japanese man or woman they're all right you know they're not going to pick your pocket or something like that. Then do it but they they do they fight and struggle and shove. To get place. After that, they relax. But they are not used to the situation and therefore haven't found out the proper amount of this for dealing with it.

So, this is then an example of solving a problem by seeing the one in the many. Namely that, treat every Many is the one that is to say accord respect. Then the many will be able to get along together. And that is that in some other words underlies our simplest ideas of every individual as equal rights in the eyes of the law. Only, don't invert it, meaning that every individual is equally nobody. This comes about of course, when we are in a hurry. When you're in a hurry, you can't be bothered to look at the details. And you simply wipe it out. So like naturally when you don't provide for sufficient schoolteachers every school teacher is dealing with a mass of children and there's an irony you can't be bothered with the details and you don't provide for enough judges. The courts are in a hurry and can't be bothered with the details. So always, be sure to keep your eyes open. That is to say, we have lots of teachers. And pay them properly. Lots of judges and pay them properly so that they want to accept bribe. And invest in those aspects of the community which are vital we're not doing that. In other words, the salary of a teacher. In any school is probably lower than that of the janitor. Which simply says. What it says. It just shows you what you value.

Well now, these for the use of the world, ended up of course with the fourth one which was called. The complete harmony of everything thing-event with every other thing-event. And I wanted to show you that this harmony exists anyhow. That, however wrong things may appear to go. There is a point of view from which you can see. A connection which is a harmonious rational connection. Just as if in your everyday life, you realize that, if you hadn't lost a certain job, you would never have been in the situation where you met someone you love dearly. You see, and you can in retrospect you can see all this kind of connectedness going along and one of the fascinating things in human relations is to figure out the network. You

know, there's a saying, that there are only five hundred people. This is a certain kind of joke. But it has to do with the fact that you have a network of friends. Who are, you know, the sort of people you think really are people. And they're all interlocked with each other in funny ways. It has been estimated that this should be a little larger figure, about fourteen thousand. That has something that that's a different joke and it has to do with the fact that communication has become easier than it used to be with the telephone rates and all that. And the jet aircraft. But there is this wonderful feeling of a network of people who know people and you'll get wonderful surprises because you meet someone and you find that they're the dearest friends of your old friends and so on and so forth. Now, from one point of view then, there is already existing between every single event and thing that happens in harmony. But this harmony is not manifest in terms of human conduct. It is there, even in the worst human conduct, but it's not manifest that is to say we do not have by any stretch of the imagination a really civilized society. And the Buddhists would say that you cannot have the really civilized society until you first realize that the harmony already exists. In other words, if you think you have to create the harmony socially. By some sort of moral violence. And impose it upon the world as it exists now you will only succeed in stirring up more trouble. That's why reformers that tend to be extremely destructive people. People with a fanatical mission. It is necessary first to see that absolutely nothing needs to be done to improve the world. Then it can indeed be improved. And this is another way of talking about what Blofeld referred to in his little essay as renunciation. Or complete giving up of self. Now you cannot give up yourself, let go of your own self interests and suddenly say well from today. I am no longer going to press my own advantage against everybody else. You can't do that by a voluntary decision. Because you will merely be using a new gimmick. To boost yourself. Look at me I am the most unselfish person how saintly I am. Only you may not say that to others that would be a little uncool you would say it to yourself though they look at me I'm I'm not really going to make this. There's no way they are for you see of. Being unselfish of renouncing clinging on purpose. It can be done only in the realization, when you actually come down to it you see that you cannot cling to anything at all. And there is nothing to cling to when there is no one to cling. And this is the realisation of what the Buddhists call voidness. The simplest manifestation of voidness is the fact that everything

is in a state of flux. Everything is falling apart. I mean there is it to me on this ferry boat because we are literally falling apart the hollows rusting underneath those dry rot in the wood. And it'll last a certain time and while it lasts we'll stay there but really it would be a fantastic project to preserve the whole thing and the money if such money were available or better be spent some other way but there is a sense when you live in the moving tides and watch all this junk out here growing and rotting and everything that there is and this is the Floating World. And that there's no nothing is permanent at all people create around themselves the illusions of permanence by building houses out of concrete and steel and granite and so on. And then when they get inside there they feel now that is put in order. But actually it's only a focus of your attention because the moment you solve a permanent ties a problem on one level say you make a lot of money and you build yourself a very solid house and you start worrying about your health. Because that's something you really can't control it's very fluid very volatile. Because it has to do with all your veins and intestines and and all these goofy things that don't stay put there you are about that is where you focus your attention but so if you become aware of what's happening in really in this world you see a basic proposition that everything is completely falling apart. And you think well then the obvious thing for a sensible person to do. Is to make an effort to secure it for as long as possible. And this is what we call the fitness Time Square practical attitude. This is the bush, well position you see. Make the best of the job. Do the work that's nearest though it's dull it whiles helping when you meet them name dogs over stiles. As the sort of thing you see on a plate, as a souvenir in someplace for tourists. Yeah, hold it together as long as you can. And there's something about that that we all laugh out. And why we did.

But that's not a very heroic attitude. It's not a very interesting attitude as the something else. That is the synthesis of despair and courage. In other words, that total courage arises out of seeing that there is really nothing can be done. Holding things together for as long as you can hold them together is a sort of illusion because you know time's going to run out and within one hundred years nothing will matter you'll be dead anyway. One reaction to that is of course why bother. But the other reaction is good lord if that's the truth but fun we can have now. You see if if the thing really is an illusion and it's simply falling to pieces and in every way there is nothing to grab is

the in any direction now get this now you see. No no don't say oh well I'll wait till tomorrow to face that. There is absolutely no possibility of anybody in this room being able. To stop dissolution. You can start all kinds of new evolution of dissolution by say having children or promoting a society which is going to go on beyond your death and whatever but. If you really get with the thing that there's nothing you can grab. That this is a total disintegration. And don't even try to hold on to something like God. Change and decay, all around I see, O thou will change it's not abide with me. Get rid of that, you see, because that that that doesn't allow the process to happen that I'm talking about when you don't hold even on to God There is nothing nothing whatsoever. It is just at that moment. That you acquire the curious vitality that we call Buddha nature. And that is essential energy, essential courage, and essential compassion. And remember, this can't fully be explained. You can say, that I see no logical connection. Between the act of renunciation. In other words, I've stopped thinking altogether not because I ought to, because I find out there's nothing else to do. Right now what's the logical connection between that. And the courage and compassion. It's not very easy to point that out because in order to find out you have to go through the experience. It's like there's and the parallel problem historically about the Calvinists. Calvinists believed in predestination. That there's absolutely nothing that the individual could do. To control whether he would be damned or saved for ever and ever because God had decided in the beginning of all time which individuals he would damn and which he would save. So you would naturally suppose that Calvinist who believed that would be rather dissolute and lazy people because they would say we're making a difference and nothing we can do about it but on the contrary Calvinist we're not Calvinist the very earnest people. Rather to learn is one my pillars of conventional probity, are prudence, morality and so on. Because they had to prove that they were predestined to be saved you see. So there is a difference between a theory and what you would think would be the application of that theory. The same theory in terms of experience and what will be the consequences of that experience. So here we are discussing because we are using words. A theory of the total ungraspability of the world. And that sounds as if it would lead to despair. Especially if there is no God to hang on to. Nothing at all to hang on to see. Then he would say, 'Oh well it's all nothing.' But actually, if you get on with that nothing, you discover what is

fundamentally worthwhile, what it's all about. And that's why they say Buddhists are atheists. Because when you really become one with God, Obviously you don't go around worshiping God. Or asking God for things and making prayers. There's no point in that anymore. Should God pray to himself?

So this then is a possibility here. When people see that, and are living let-go lives, that they could come into harmony with each other. In a social sense, political sense. And the question here now in practical politics is this. Is there any way of advocating a certain style of practical politics in everyday life, which persuades without preaching. See, one thing that is quite evident from the whole history of religion is that preaching doesn't work. I mean this is the great lesson of religion. When somebody says, you should do so and so because if you don't like what awful things are going to happen, nobody pays any attention. Because, they never really make the awful things that are going to happen convincing those else somewhere when you're dead or the consequences of not really amounting to being a nice person you know. What will everybody else think of you well who cares? You can always find a society a community where someone may think well of you. So you know if you are an outcast in one group in a civilization like ours you simply join another. Cause we're so diversified. And we make friends very quickly and nobody knows who you are what your background is, but they just take you in. In the old world, that's rather difficult. But in we have to find a way in other words of dealing with our great. Conflicts based on a kind of cold logic. Of seeing, of thinking a whole process through. Like that's take the Chinese. The Chinese are being stupid. The cause they've got the wrong propaganda man. They are squeaking. That they're calling out foul. And saying you record Western barbarians exploited us long enough. You're capitalists, you're imperialist, you're this that and the other had it. And we are going to. Overthrow you and we're going to overthrow our own landlords and so on and they're taking this line. Now that and that line is not going to work. It's just going to start hostility.

And exactly the same way in our own backyard here the negroes are taking the wrong line. Black Nationalism means we are just the kind of people the whites always said we were. Aggressive. Uncooperative, alienated. And if they take that line. Let's look at this is see as a matter of simply practical

politics if they take that line of black nationalism they are going to be wiped out mercilessly because who has the nap on. It is that is that. And looking at it from the other side, our white notion that Negroes are somehow inferior people doesn't pay off, because it just creates exactly that trouble. It creates that sort of saw in the body politic. It doesn't make any sense. Well suited sensate likewise to the China. Yes look. What you ought to do is instead of saying. With the put Chinese you say get up down your feet and say that so happens that we are the most ancient existing civilization on Earth, and we have cultivated reasonable as for centuries and you think Sweden is a reasonable country with a wonderful social democracy you just wait and see what we're going to do. We are going to be the most reasonable people you ever saw. And everybody will be astonished and will want to go to China and will there they'll walk over the whole of Asia. And the reason about all this that I'm trying to say... I'm not, I'll always try to emphasize the position that any doctrine of this kind is not preaching. It is not moralistic. It is simply pointing out the nature of the facts. That not that you ought to be unselfish and you ought not to cling to possessions to identity or to role to status the point is you can. And as you realize you can't you don't. Or so with other matters of practical politics when you realize what can't be done you won't do it. Or try to twist it. It's only so long as you are under illusions and think that certain things can be done which can't be done that then then these conflicts arise and. So, it is it seems to me along these lines, which I will call the lines of cosmologically. That there is perhaps some sort of possibility billeted, of brining about a practical realization of what the Buddhists call the Dharma Datu, or the state of affairs in which all individual things and events are in a harmonious relationship. Now let me though underline this point which is absolutely essential to grasp. That realization in social and ethical terms cannot possibly happen. Unless those involved in the project have understood that there is no necessity for it to happen. That, in other words, there is a point of view from which it has happened already. Because so long as it must happen, it won't. In other words when you say oh gee we've got to get this done this is urgent. Come on now everybody get in and pitch and so on with that we're going to make this happen it won't. That your life it won't. Cause people acting under the sense of necessity and constraint are not free. So this is why the. The Buddhist lays so much emphasis on the importance of what you might call the let-go personality. Person who it doesn't care. Doesn't give a damn to

use our own sort of colloquialisms. If I live OK, if I don't, so what? It doesn't matter. And that which looks from our standpoint that sound so negative. That the what they've discovered this is us that is the brightest most positive glowing gorgeous point of view.

Now, in the kind of culture and cosmology and view of the world out of which this philosophy arose historically, the general prevailing view is, that within a few thousand years, the world's going to blow up. You know Hindu cosmology works on the presupposition that in the course of time everything gets worse. And that only after it has got so bad that it dissolves. It's time renewed. And when the cycle starts again everything is as good as possible it's brand new. You know it's like a new house new car. New baby. And everything's great. And then as it gets older it deteriorates and finally falls apart. So there is, you see, about Asian politics. There's certain fundamental pessimism in that respect. That in the course of time, everything is going to get worse and there will come the destruction. Now, then what is the logic? What is the possible sense in talking about this case on philosophy? Well, they really seriously think that there might be the possibility of. In the harmonious world. The answer is this: That to get it you've got to get into a gift different kind of time. In the kind of time we are now living in everything is going to get worse. That's the nature of the time structure. But you don't have to live in this kind of time. You can live in another time structure all together. You realize this? You can. You can get out of this time. But only when you are disillusioned with it. When you see that it's not going anywhere. For example, you're all educated to believe that the future holds something for you. And you have a graded system of education where you've got step by step by step, always with a come on, saying now when you get this thing it's going to be great. And then when you get there are in your direction of the company. Chairman of the Department, senior surgeon in the hospital or whatever it is or you've married the guy. You suddenly realize that you don't have a future, because you've arrived. But then an insurance salesman comes around, and he tells you that if you buy this retirement policy there's going to be a great thing you had of you call retirement. And when you get that then you really got there you know then what they're going to do then is put you in a morgue as a senior citizen. Because you've got prostate trouble, bad teeth allows it ingestion has falling out and you haven't got the energy left to enjoy

yourself as you thought you would have but if you don't resist growing old and you understand how to grow old this is no problem. But the point is the constant illusion of that time will achieve what you are really after. If everybody brought up in this way is therefore living in of time. Now get out of that kind of time and see that by seeing that it doesn't lead anywhere. And I'm saying in another way the same thing as I was saying a moment ago that you can't stop things changing. And so there's nothing to hang onto. And there's no one to hang onto it either. This is like an illusory hand trying to hold firmly to apostle of smoke. So in these two ways seeing in and out of was that we're living in a false time and in this kind of time everything is going to get worse so forget it. It isn't profitable time. And you will be able to see that you can look at the the Everett what you would now call the everyday world see this is this this actual existence you can look at it in an entirely different perspective and live in a different kind of time. This other kind of time is vertical to ordinary clock time. It has a switch of emphasis in other words where the eternal now becomes what is supreme important. As the as we have time at the moment you see, there is no now. There's the past, and there's the future and there's a headline that which one becomes the other and on our watches you see I have a little funny watch that I open the hairlines are so fine that I have to put on my glasses to see them at all. And even then. They've really got them down to the most analytical little tiny lines would. You see what that means this is a symbol of having no present. Because the present has been abolished and made into the abstract hairline. The split second. There is no present in our kind of time. We are therefore presentless people. We have a past, we have a future that's all, but no present.

So then that's why it all of Huxley wrote a book called Time must have a stop. Now have to get rid of that time in the present is totally unimportant. What did you do it is important what will you do that is terribly important. That where are you who are you what are you now why are we not there. So then, it is only as people renounce the future and the past that they get a present. Now you the future hasn't come. Not here in the past is all together gone you can't get that. When you have no future and you have no past there is no nothing else you have but a person. And with this fundamental adjustment of human consciousness. You see the everyday world in an entirely different state, you are living in a new kind of time. And, you see

other people living in that kind of time which is of course going along this way. And you're sorry for them, because they are an illusion. But, it's a free country. And you can dig that illusion if you want to.

Now I want to finish up this seminar, by explaining, trying to explain, the way in which the Kegon the loss of faith, underlies the practice of zen. Because the earlier in the seminar I explained that it insofar as Zen Buddhism has an intellectual background. That is the Kegon philosophy. And in the first three sessions then I've tried to give you at least a partial view of what this fantastic metaphysical construct is. And if you want to incidentally explore it further. Alas, the literature is not too well available but there is an excellent account of it in the second volume of Fung Yu Lons history of Chinese philosophy. And I think that's the best place to go. There is a book that the little book that Suzuki wrote called the essence of Buddhism, published in London by the Buddhist society. And that also is an account of it but it's harder to find. So now how do we get from where we were to Zen? Well it goes like this. In the sutra of the six patriarch, the Ton Ching, which was the collected teachings of the sixth patriarch of the Zen school, who as I said was a contemporary of Fat Sung. And Sung died in seven hundred twelve A.D. and Wei-Nung died in seven hundred thirteen. In his discourse, he gives a lesson on the art of teaching. The art of being a guru. And this lesson is based on getting people to be capable of polar thinking. Polar thinking is simply, well it's not just thinking, it's a kind of feeling and a kind of sensing, wherein you see the going together notice of things that I have thought to be mutual thought to be mutually exclusive opposites. In other words, you wouldn't know you were right if unless somebody else was wrong. Normally, we think then the right and the wrong are mutually exclusive. But when you are capable of polar thinking you see that they go together a person who feels in a polar way sees figure and background going together. He doesn't see them as mutually exclusive. Now then you see when I was explaining the Jijimuge. The fall off Dharma world or the fourth way of looking at the universe which is the culmination of the school I was trying to show this point. That all events have a go-with-ness with each other in the same way as a figure in a background. So in order to get this point across when Wei-Nung explained that when a person asks you a question about something sacred. You give him an answer in terms of something secular. When he asks you about something eternal. You give him an answer in terms of the temporal. When he asked you about

something abstract you give him an answer in terms of the concrete. And so the whole way down the line. So, when you read your Zen stories which are always this apparently delightful nonsense somebody says What is the fundamental meaning of Buddhism and the answer is. A dried dung scraper. In the far East, [they] don't, they used not to use toilet paper they had a stick they used instead and this is the answer. You see here has switched completely from the domain of life that is considered philosophical and sacred to one that is considered completely profane and unmentionable. Then on other occasions. It goes the other way. A monk says to the master. And they're engaged in cooking. Potatoes I mean. This is possibly the knife. The master hands it to him blade first. And the monk says please give me the other end the must as what would you do with the other end. And this immediately has a kind of metaphysical flavor to it. So that he jumps you see from the practical question to the metaphysical, but if you ask him the metaphysical he will always answer in terms of the every day. And the whole genius of Zen is really this, that it has a way of religious life and a form of iconography. And the form of which is secular. And it has created a whole school of poetry, where the deep philosophical matters are never, never mentioned. Except sometimes by way of making a joke. Because what Zen tries to do ideally is to be completely cool. To create the religion of no-religion. So that you don't notice it's around unless you're in the know.

Now this is not actually true in practice. Many people are disturbed when they go to Japan. And they walk into Zen temples and find that they have rituals and services such as I've just been playing to you. That they have elaborate Buddha images and people are making bows to them as a matter of fact when Professor Huston Smith went to Japan. And was being shown around a Zen monastery. He noticed that his guide them you know the particular master of the monastery whenever he passed an image of the Buddha would stop and bow. And he said to him, I don't understand this he said because I thought you were present but it's wood burn up these images and as you one of your masters did in one of the stories. That I don't see why you bothered to might just as well spit at them. The Master said, you spits, I bows. But you see, the thing about all this is the about iconoclasm. There are very different spirits of iconoclasm. The Puritan iconoclasts who broke down all the images in the English Churches hated the images they

thought they were evil and wrong. And so they smash them ruthlessly. But when a chicken comes out of the egg shell. The egg shell is not something to be deployed it's certainly something to be broken. But had the shell not existed the chicken wouldn't have been protected. So in precisely the same way, images, religious ideas, religious symbols exist in order to be constructively and lovingly broken. Because they are like opening a package. If there's no package you know, you can hardly get the contents because it falls through your fingers. So something comes to you in a package. It's why packaging is so important and so interesting. Something comes to you in a package Well it's like on Christmas Day here all these gorgeous packages with colors and gold and everything and very often the package is a much better than what's in them but. You then all everybody proceeds to tell them apart and get what's inside.

So, from this point of view the Zen Buddhist Raghada all ideas. About Buddhism about philosophy about religion and so on as so much packaging. And in order to get at it you have to get rid of the packaging. So what happens then? When we get to the state I was talking about this morning, where you abandon completely, all belief. You abandon every sort of way of hanging on to life. You accept your complete impermanence, the prospect of your death, of vanishing into nothing whatsoever you see. And of not being able to control anything, of being at the mercy of what is completely other than you. And you let go to that you see in this means that you even get rid of any any god whatsoever to do this fully. You don't have a thing left to cling to. So this complete let go flips, and you discover having made it a new way of experiencing all together in which you don't need any god. Because you're it. But also, you don't cling to the idea that you're it. In other words, this is why Christian a mighty. Makes a certain kind of attack on people who are they down tests and who believe that the human self is ultimately the divine self he's as why do you believe in that. See, because if you believe in it, you are making it a thing to hang on to. And so in a way then you see all belief in God is lack of faith. That ever struck you. You're still clinging and so long as you're still clinging you don't have faith because faith is the state of total let go. So, when through some marvelous desperation, we get to the state of total let go, and then you see fantastically religion anything like religion simply disappears there's no need for it any longer. Like you've crossed the shore, [you] cross to the

other shore you don't need the raft. Get off. Leave the raft behind. Now the other shore is actually the same as this one. You know when you cross the river. When the mountain is in the distance see there's the other shore over there it's kind of different from here you can sit here and say. Be nice to live wouldn't. See a place up there I'd love to live because it looks so good from here. But then you go and you buy the house. And you sit there and it feels the same as this place feels because you are there. And how things feel. How you are near look back across here and say gee isn't that look lovely. There are mysterious trails going up Mt Tamalpais. That look as if they led to that place that we were talking about this morning the Secret Garden which every child remembers. And they'd disappear through trees and there's a kind of a mysterious little canyon and you can hear the sound of a waterfall and you know somewhere in there is that garden I know as a matter of fact where it is there is one. But, always, when you follow the road right through it leads back to San Rafael. And its suburbs, on the other side, you see. I have been years seeking the ideal place. And I've come to the conclusion that it the only way I can possibly find it is to be it. If you can find it in you, then anywhere you go is the ideal place to live. But it's so fascinating, projecting it outside and going on a look for it. I mean this is the whole of fun. Fun means.

So, when therefore, religion is abandoned, you are in a dangerous fix, because you can very easily slip into madness. We were talking this morning about a vision. Brought up this question about the vision of a fourth dimension or another dimension and anybody who looked at it went crazy. And this is a real danger. That people who have the mystical vision, whether through practicing yoga or Zen Buddhism or hesicaste Christian prayers or by taking L.S.D.. Become. A serious menace to society. And society gets really worried about them. Because they have, they they're not taking the world and its concerns seriously any longer. They know it's an illusion. And if you really know it's an illusion. If you really know I'm an illusion I don't know what you're going to do with me. I don't know whether I trust you I don't know whether you're going to keep the roots. I I just don't know about you you've seen through it and goodness only knows you may do anything and if you're not sure of yourself. And you suddenly see that all this is an illusion there's nothing you can cling to it's all relative, you may get bugged and you may go nuts. And that's the great danger in all

of this. And that is why a Zen monastery is at one and the same moment a place of total iconoclasm, of seeing through the whole thing, and yet at the same time it maintains a discipline as clean and strict as anywhere you can find. The combination of the two is simply marvelous.

Unfortunately modern Japan doesn't dig it. But what they've done is to, they've well recognized, that you cannot go into outer space and come back to this world without strict controls. It's exactly the same way when you're skin diving. You go below a certain number of fathoms and you experience weightlessness. Now a person who's not properly trained at that level will get happy. Now there's no reason why you shouldn't get happy. Provided you keep your wits about you. Nothing matters at all when your weight vanishes because after all you don't matter anymore you have no weight. Nothing is weighty, nothing is important. And a person may at this point take off his oxygen mask and offer it to a fish. In which case he'll drown, he'll never come back. And if he stays down too long he enjoys this too much his oxygen supply will run out. And he'll be lost. So he has a watch. And he knows according to discipline, that at a certain time on this instrument he's got to come. It's like when you had too much to drink and you're driving you got to watch a speedometer drive by instruments when you're in a difficult situation in an airplane and you lost your sense of gravity watch your instrument don't trust your senses. And see. This is very important.

In Buddhist imagery, there are guardians of the directions of the universe. And they are all in the figure of Chinese generals. With clubs and swords and very fierce expressions. And they are always put at gates. You know, Gates a north, south, east and west and here are the guards. They got the entrances but what they really God is the directions. Because it's absolutely important. That we can agree on our time scale. And on and off south east and west so that I can meet you. We can agree about that we all miss each other completely will never meet. And if we can't meet we can have dinner together. If we can have dinner together we can love each other. So in the middle of nothingness, which is all this space here, see, which is nothing whatever. There are nevertheless directions. And think what a beautiful thing that is easy to set up directions in the middle of nothing. So for this reason, in the religion where anything goes, and anything is allowed. No

holds barred. There is for that reason precise discipline and order, which is pretty strict. But the spirit of the strictness is different than the spirit of strictness in theistic religions. In Buddhism there's no boss. Ultimate reality is not conceived in the form of off parity. Because from their point of view that's childish. You're your own boss. And you're responsible if you want to believe it belong to a society. It's up to you if you want to conform in other words but one of the interesting things is you can always cease to be a monk without dishonor. In the Christian church, you can't. Because you make life vows to get in. You promise for ever to be obedient, chaste and poor. And this this is irrevocable like Christian marriage. But in the Buddhist Order, you can leave any time you want. And they say all right if you do you've got many other lives ahead of you in which you can be a monk all over again, and if you don't want to do it this round you don't have to. And we're not we're not mad at you. Just please, if you don't want to undergo this discipline go somewhere else. And there's no dishonorable. That at all. I have a friend in Los Angeles who runs a very fancy restaurant. He was a Buddhist monk for ten days. It was quite an experience but that's all right. OK you try it and if you want to stay here we're very happy to have you if you don't want to we just assume you one round because you're not deceiving us you know if you stay and you don't really want to but feel you auto you're a nuisance like a person who feels they ought to be unselfish and is therefore always making promises which they're never going to fulfill. It is much better to be frank and tell people what you honestly feel than pretend so. For this reason then, where there is no religion at all, because everybody's realized that the sky's the limit. There isn't any boss. There's nothing to kowtow to. Because you're it. It follows that you become therefore responsible for creating an order. Instead of there but, you see, instead of submitting to the order, you create it.

Next, you find that you can, having got rid of religion completely. Well now everything becomes religious. That is to say instead of having some kind of hang up on universals, on vast abstract huge area conceptions. You employ instead things that are very particular, very temporal. Because of jijimuge. You remember, the image that I used to illustrate G.G. more gave was the net of jewels. Where in every Crystal reflects all the other crystals every dewdrop on the spider's web reflects all the others OK So then. I just happened to pick up this because it happened to be handy. I don't want you

to think about found in Orient and what sort of thing. With this all Buddhism can be taught. All the universe, all sciences, all philosophy can be demonstrated with this. Because this is one of the jewels. Reflecting only others as when you pick up a link in a chain all the other links come up with it and so with us. And, if you ask me about what is the mystery of life what is God, and I show you this fan. People look at you in a strange way. And say. I wonder what he meant by that. Well truth of the matter is it didn't mean anything at all. Because this doesn't mean anything. Words mean something because they refer. To events and things that are other than the sounds of the words. But the things and events that words refer to don't refer to anything else. Of course that connected with everything else but they don't refer to everything else in the same way as a symbol dots.

So that's why Zen always answers in terms of the completely concrete. What is this? A fan. Must be a noise. Which This isn't. This is. What this? Or alternatively if you don't want to be hung up on it. It's this. Or this. New Thing. There's no fixed thing that this is. So, in just the same way. Let's consider the advance that Zen makes in the world. Of art. With all the world of painting. I showed you a Tibetan painting this morning which was extremely elaborate where every tiny space was filled. And where all of it was obviously religious It was quite clear that this painting was an icon. Now then people don't like that and then. I mean, it isn't that they have a real prejudice against it but they don't usually have it around. Instead, they prefer a style of painting in which there's an enormous amount of untouched paper. And where, a brush has various swiftly and deftly painted some bamboo sort of in one corner. Now, the way the bamboo is put on the paper lives all the rest of the paper, because it turns it into a lake. Without drawing a single line a master can put bamboo on a piece of paper and turn the rest of the paper into a lake. Everybody can see the lake there although nothing has happened empty space or it might be a whole mountain might be there but covered in mist. Because you see, he didn't use the paper as mere paper. You often see around especially motels they have, you know, the kind of Motel where you have flower prints over the bird. It is a bunch of flowers taken out of an old book of etchings or something put in a frame. Some interior decorator remember it was there in one two three four months in a row and always the bunch of flowers is put bang in the middle of the piece of paper now you know what that does that the vitalized is all the rest

of the paper because it means the background has become an important and this is always done by people who don't understand polar thinking who don't feel that figure and ground go together, but all Zen painting where you get this extraordinary relationship of figure to background is done by people who feel and think in a actually a sense in a polar way. They see the space and the solid simultaneously. And that's why the Chinese place things in space the way they do. Even, you can't all see it from where you're sitting. A piece of calligraphy contains in it, an extremely important relationship between the characters and the space. Now it would take me quite a while to go into all the details of that. But they have to be. Just the right size to accord with that space. There isn't only one way of doing it there are several ways of putting the characters in a piece of paper that size. But in each way that you use, you take account of the space. You don't use the paper as a mere neutral background. So when, for example, you will find so often with the Chinese painter takes his area, his rectangular area in which he is painting, and he will paint one corner. And for it say from the bottom left he will strike up a bamboo stalk, and flow leaves in the wind on it. And so leave the rest. This is a trick. You see which. Uses and as I said vitalize is the whole of the rest of the area. And you don't do that. Simply by putting the figure plump in the center.

So, the whole art which has been inspired by zen is based on the polar recognition of the identity of space and solid. Solid in space, see, one implies the other. But this is always so unexpected from the point of view of common sense people. In other words, think space is nothing. And it has no power. And so for this very reason, the architecture inspired by Zen is practically all of it playing with space. Then emphasizes the luxurious richness of poverty. Of rooms with practically nothing in. Furniture lessness. And if it has a luxury That's unbelievable. But the uncluttered life. Although I must say. That somewhere. I went to the house of a very great team out. Where everything was absolutely gorgeous live in order. It was the highest styles then taste Japan and. They call it the Motomusashi. And we went into a little tea room and Jane-O, in a kind of experimental fiddling way pushed aside a screen. And inside was a western style room. Come prickly cluttered with papers and old clothes and everything thrown in there was this thing because everybody needs an unconscious place you can somebody everybody everybody's house has a basement or a closet or

something where they throw everything away. That's just what I call the element of it or reducible rascality is always there. But nevertheless, on the outside, the place where you operate, you know, they have this sense of complete clearness. Which is the coincidence in one artistic expression of freedom and discipline. Anything goes because you've got complete space in which you can do anything and yet the space is disciplined beautifully. Then in the subject matter of painting. Then people of course as I said prefer the secular. Even when they paint St sages, Buddhas, and so on, they give them a secular form has to say they look like just ordinary people. They don't necessarily have hellos or special markings. They prefer that they shouldn't but they should look kind of rustic. And they prefer to put on the altar as it were the. Token Nama of a T.V. room. The alcove in other words, is not almost never adorned with a religious figure. But always with a naturalistic painting rocks. Water, vegetables. Trees, whatever. So in the same way, in poetry, where the haiku is a kind of masterpiece of this way of feeling the universe. The haiku always celebrates a particular finite. In ji type and no ji. as distinct from Ri...instant of life. In the dense mist, what is being shouted between hill and boat? And you from such a poem will remember you know some morning when you were at some goddess or of a story. And you couldn't see anything and of the conversation going on between going to calling down to someone in the boat on the Hill and you can't make out what it's all about anymore than you can make out what's on the other side of the river and yet you know it is God it is. Somehow the very fact that you can't see makes it all the better. This is all there is. The path comes to an end in the parsley. This is called in Japanese Yugen, Y-U-G-E-N.. We have no English word for you again whatsoever. But yugen... ends nowhere but with a certain implication. That is to say, as I was just trying to describe the place up in the mountain, where somehow the trail disappears. And there might be something beyond. But the whole point is that you don't investigate too closely. Because then you are the sort of person who when you get in there would spoil it. Like you say. When you make love to somebody do it delicately. Don't be too inquisitive. Don't be too probing, because that would injure what you love. But the real constant theme of the haiku is that it always incarnates the specific. Finite, temporal, immediate moment. And with this says more than you can say with any amount of abstract generalisations. Only, only, only, only, you always know but that behind this, the people who make up the haiku are not Bourgeois

philistines who say, well isn't the main thing simply to be practical and get on with their work. The point about the haiku is there's something in human life which is very difficult to pin down. But it's when somebody comes on at you. And says something but you know that there's another meaning behind it which doesn't have to be stated between you. And so you get a joke. So you get a tacit understanding about something. And. This looks like it's this but it does that. And I could does this in a very cunning way. It's the simplest possible utterance. Basho said to get haiku well written ask a three foot child to say, the robin's egg is blue. You light the fire. I'll show you something beautiful a great big ball of snow and this is a haiku. But something is conveyed by this, see, but we're not going to talk about to be bad form to begin with. Like gentlemen in England don't talk about religion. Or sex. Well, you don't mention these things it's not quite like that but it's nearly like that. There's something got over to you by this. Where the whole fun of the thing is that you don't mention it. But this is possible only when you know. The jijimuge thing. That every bit of experience takes in everything else so in exactly the same way we have a confraternity among us in our society today, of hipsters. And they can with a flick of an eyelash, make a whole crowd of people laugh or in the know. Because they have seen that one single moment motion of an eye is the whole universe in operation. And the joke is that the people outside don't know this. But when I move an eyelash at you and you're in the know about this, you laugh. It's the very funny game.

Problems in Meditation

As you know the subject of the seminars problems of meditation. But the word meditation in English is usually associated with thinking things over. And what I'm talking about is not that at all. But we use the word to translate Indian words such as tyana, which in Chinese is Chanon in Japanese Zen. And we use it to translate words like yoga. And sadhana which means more or less a spiritual discipline. But, the function of what we call meditation, in the East, is a process for changing consciousness. Changing the quality of consciousness changing the way in which you experience your own existence. And as you know, all over the world, with some exceptions among quite primitive people, we experience our existence in a rather odd way that is to say as being isolated individuals. Highly

disconnected from the external world. We feel that we are almost strangers in the earth, even though we are just as symptomatic of the earth as a tree or a cloud or the oceans or mountain. Only we move around rather more freely. And our behavior is extremely complicated. Also, we are more responsive to the movements of nature than say a mountain is. If you hit a bell, it will just say dong. But if you hit a human being, something much more complicated will happen. But it's quite clear that this way in which we experience our existence as a hallucination. It just doesn't fit the facts it doesn't fit the facts of science. Because when scientists describe the behavior of human beings or the behavior of any other living organism whatsoever. They find they can't do so unless they describe the behavior of the environment at the same time. That is to say, of the external world. And this forces one to the conclusion that what you are describing is not simply the behavior of an individual but the behavior of what we would call a physical field. And so in this sense then, the individual and the field the environment are the same process only it's a highly complex process and the difficulty we have in seeing it as a unity is simply that we suffer from a kind of myopia.

You see if you take... let's put it in a sort of an abstract way. There are a whole series of bodies points and they may be planets they might be cells in tissue or they might be a flock of birds. And as you watch them you see that they're all moving in the same way. Supposing you saw a vast chessboard with innumerable squares covered with Knights. And all the knights were moving through the knights move but in exactly the same pattern. You would then identify this whole performance as a thing. You would say it is one thing. It is a bevy of knights. Or a flock of birds. Or a Ganglion of cells. Now, the performance of this collective, might become a little bit more complicated as one sees a difference between a surface with an even pattern. With a uniform pattern and a surface with a complex pattern on it although with a surface with a complex pattern you might call a picture and a picture is a thing. So let us suppose that on our vast chess board, the Knights still kept the essential pattern of the knights move but certain groups of them did it towards the Far Side of the board, and others that it was the near side some did it towards the left and some did it towards the right then you would see a much more complicated process happening, but you would still call it a process. Well, let's make it a little more complicated

you see. And soon you will see the whole movement of the Knights will assume before your eyes what I would call a wiggly performance. It will look like a let's say a bucket of worms where they're all wiggling in different directions and the only reason you don't call it a thing anymore, is it's too complicated to figure out what is the pattern of the whole thing. There are as we say in it, too many variables. But it still essentially is the same sort of thing it was in the beginning except that it's just become more complicated.

And so, if you want to keep track of it, the only thing to do and that really isn't keeping track of it but it sort of keeping some sort of hold on it is to focus your attention on one of them. And you follow the path of one worm in the bucket. You watch that going around and watch it going around you see you know you get rather fond of it. You begin to take sides with it. And before you know where you are you've identified yourself with that particular worm. You're on its side. And if either one should clobber it you say don't do that because it loses my thread see my worm. I want to keep track of all this and if you Club of my why my I'm at a loss how to pick up another. And you see every individual is exactly in that situation. We have identified ourselves with a particular organism. And we're interested in it we would be very carefully brought up to take that point of view to take one's own side. And it's taken many, many millenia to produce that point of view in us, and therefore it isn't going to be easy to take another point of view altogether. We are myopically, in other words fixated on our what we call our own body.

And a little while ago I don't know if I've told you this story before but I was asked by the weapons research laboratory of the US Air Force to go there and consult with them about moral behavior, of all things. They were they got a panel of four philosophers. All there was at least one theologians and they wanted to know what was our basis for moral conduct. Well I said when it came my turn to tell them, You gentlemen here of course are all very realistic hard boiled people, and I'm not going to mess around with you and give you a lot of mawkish sentimentality. I tell you frankly in my bases for moral behavior is total self-interest. Cos I'm not crude about it I just don't go around and bang people on the head and tell them to give me what I want I do it much more subtly I'm in great shape I tell them I give

the impression that I very fond of them and going to be sociable and well behaved and so by this setting honey to catch flies I'll get what I want. And naturally, we must observe this basis for moral behavior not only on a personal level but also on a national level. And it's your job to conduct the strategy of the United States by such subtle methods as we get what we want and of course you other other hard hitting fellows and it's up more to the secretary of state to put on the counting. Now I said the problem about this is it raises two further questions. The first question it raises is what do I want? And the second question is who am I? And this it becomes an extraordinarily interesting and quite complicated when you really begin to think it through and it is your job as a high strategist to think these things through and not just take shots sighted goals because if you do you can get in tremendous trouble and what will you do with Vietnam when you get it? Any conqueror has a terrible time looking after his victory. Because just more responsibility and is that what you want you want all that responsibility. Do you want to be God? Do you want to rule the world? Well of course, nobody does. We don't in the first place want to rule our own bodies let alone the world and so we've got a marvelous contraption going insiders whereby most of the things that go on are inside our bodies don't even have to be thought about. And so it goes very well the only time we have to think about anything is when it goes wrong. We have this homeostatic process going on inside us which takes care of temperature and all that sort of stuff to digest our food for us without having to think about that. And that's just great and another word for that system is democracy. Because all we've delegated the authority. For regulating our bodies to all the organs and cells and so on and they they manage pretty well another name for it is an icky not in the sense of chaos but in the sense of anarchy as it was taught by Prince creep up in philosophical anarchy which is he would say for example that if you have a bunch of pebbles in a box and you shake it they will eventually arrange themselves in an order.

And, so in the same way he said you can only get human beings to behave themselves properly by trusting them. By letting them bite it was say in a big business you have to delegate authority or you go quite mad a person who tries to govern a large corporation or a political unit of some kind, must delegate off because if he doesn't he'll have to think of everything that's going on all the time and you'll never even get a moment to sleep

because he's the perpetual policeman of the Big Brother and there he'll be sitting in his super office with hundreds of television screens. Peeking at what people are doing because he'll probably have some subordinate peakers but he's got the peak of the beakers and see that they do their jobs and he just didn't In other words he he's tied up he's completely in a trap. So, then you know, we got into this kind of thing and what do you want. And they began to have their minds expanded. Because nobody really knows what he wants. It's perfectly fantastic to talk as I have for many years with young people when I've been in college situations. And the thing that one talks about most in the long run is what is generally called vocational guidance. What do you want to do? Well, some people say they just want to paint. Or write poetry. And others say they'd like to ride horses. Others say they want to make money. And they laugh at the people who want to paint and ride horses, because they say you never make any money that way. But I always said in this kind of counseling. Do what you really want to do and to hell with the money. Because you will find out that if you think that what you want is money that that's not what you want at all. Unless you are merely fascinated in the mathematics of making money, which of course has a certain interest to it, because it's like playing poker. But if you think you want money and that will make you happy it won't do anything of the kind because all the extraordinarily rich people I know, are for the most part miserable and have no idea how to enjoy themselves. They, they are either so absorbed in making and keeping the money and defending it against other people and against the government, that they worry about it their night or if they don't worry about it they worry instead about their health. Or their family relationships. There's always something to worry about it doesn't matter how secure you are how well off you are there's always something to keep you awake at night if you're the worrying type. And the people who think that what they want is money. They say Well I'd like to be rich. Well, I would say Be specific. What sort of wealth you want? You know you can't drive six cars at once You can't live in ten homes at once not eat twelve roast beef that one meal. So in concrete terms, please. Please make it as concrete as possible I say is material possible what do you want under Who do you want to marry? Be specific. Don't just say I want a beautiful and intelligent woman. Because there is no such thing in the abstract there is only this particular beautiful and intelligent woman or that one.

So you have to get very specific in thinking this question through. And soon you discover. And let's just take the question of marriage the sample This may seem to be a little bit off the subject but it really leads directly into a. Let's take the question of marriage. Now, you say yes, I want this I want that I want the other right let's go along now would you like. A woman. Who always does exactly what you wanted to do. And that she fulfilled your wishes even before you've expressed them. That she is completely responsive to [you]. You think that over for a while and some people would jump at it and say Yes, that's exactly what I want. But last said to think about it just a little bit more when you. And they go on thinking a while and they suddenly realize that what they would have would be a plastic doll. Very highly mechanized one, but very complicated one. But that's what it would be because if she would never be able to surprise you. And so when you it would be like where plastic covers when you push a plastic doll it yields and then when you take your figure away it goes back to its ordinary position. Well then you push that and it behaves that way you say that's not alive that's just a doll. But what you like about a real live woman is that if you push it a little bit you don't know what it what she's going to do next. And so she comes back at you, and you realize that she is a center of life, just like you are. See which is another one. And that's interesting now this more all in the in other words applicable to everything if you want to control everything all you will have will be a dull. But we want it to bounce back in an unpredictable way. Not too unpredictable. But there's something else we want to see and we want a relationship with it with that with. With a real living being and that means you've got to let things get out of control. So that you can be surprised. And I notice and we're going to come back to this notice notice notice that's the state of affairs we are in however much we may complain about. We are in this state of affairs where we're always being surprised, and where things are only very vaguely predictable. We can push technology and we can push science maybe in the coming centuries to extraordinary degrees, where we can predict all kinds of things, but I'm quite sure that as we approach that goal there will be an increasing anti-scientific revolution. We can see it already among the hippies that there is a tendency to want to abandon very, very high technology. Because it is as they say, and this is a sort of symbolic expression, covering the earth with concrete. Taking away the thing that we call ...and we really don't know what we mean, we call it nature. It's somehow against nature. And

when we say nature we mean the. Well of the earth we mean the wind in the trees we mean vegetation grass clouds water. All sorts of funky things. And there's something in us you see that yearns for that always. And yet we have a battle inside ourselves when it gets too funky we say it stinks and we want to clean it up. And we're always trying to straighten things out nature is always really all over the place but whenever you see anything straight like a house or a highway or factories you know people have been around because they always make things straight. They they're bothered by weekly things even though we're all very wiggly. So we're always straightening it out. And so yet at the same time when we get it too straight we don't like it. But what do we want? Well, you can always say we want something 'twixt in between. We want a certain amount of control Yes but we also want to certain amount of randomness. We like things to be tidy we like things to be simple we like things to be comprehensible and yet we don't really. Know what we want is a kind of. Orderly randomness and a random orderliness. That's what Buddha called the middle way. And the maintenance of the middle way is very difficult. It's like walking a tightrope. And when you walk a tightrope you're always swaying a little bit from side to side your counterbalancing itself. And so to keep the middle way is a matter of constant counterbalancing, and that's difficult. And so we say well, I know I did want the middle way but it's awfully difficult to keep it and that's rather bored do. It sir. If you really don't know what we want. And yet it away we want what we've got, because profoundly looking at it from the most profound point of view, we wouldn't have what we've got if we didn't want it. That's what the Buddhists and Hindus call karma. The doctrine that what comes to you is a return to you of what goes out of your. Karma, I, when you say it is your karma that this has happened it means very strictly it is your doing that it has happened but as the word karma means doing action. But of course, we, because we are constantly complaining, and say I didn't want this and I didn't want that and somebody else is to blame and you did it, or the universe did it, doesn't thing like that or God did it. We are constantly unaware. Of the fact that we get what we want. And we are unaware of what we want also because. We want a lot of things that we don't admit we want. And we don't admit it to ourselves you know that time and time again where somebody wishes their mother was dead but can't possibly admit that. And, finally they go to psychoanalysis and it comes out they really do wish their mother were out of the way and, you

know, that's a great revelation. So in the same way, you will find we have all kinds of concealed wishes that we won't admit. And if we really went into it I think we would find that we are on the whole living the way we want to live. And that would be embarrassing to find out from the very many reasons not only because we would discover all sorts of villainy within ourselves, but also because we would discover a great deal of power within ourselves. And that's dangerous because. You might begin to think you were God. Then, this is then raises the second problem the moment you get really get into it when you ask what do you want it raises the second problem who are you? What are you? And we haven't thought that over by a long shot.

Because, let's just consider a very simple problem in perception.

You cannot identify visually a figure without a background. You cannot identify a sound unless it can be heard against relative silence. Or in combination with a limited range of other sounds again against silence as in listening say two four part music. Now, if you can have the sound without the silence, if you can't have the figure without the background, doesn't it occur to you if you think about it, that the sound down the silence are all part of the same process. One of the most curious problems of human consciousness is what I will call ignorance or ignore and of space. Of background. Of the field in which any given event happens or in which any so-called thing exists space is ordinarily understood to be nothing. So we ignore space. There are all kinds of space. We can talk about intergalactic space, interstellar space, the space between people, space in a room. Space to stretch in. And only physicists and architects and painters. Really begin to be aware of space as something that they're. And so when astronomers talk about curved space. Or properties of space, the average person says they're talking total nonsense. You can't have curved nothing. You can't have properties of pure emptiness. And so they feel just the same way as people used to feel long ago when it suggested that the earth was spherical. Well they said you can't have a spherical earth, because the people on the opposite side would fall off. Because they thought of gravity. As one directional through space and they couldn't see it as some a force that was centripetal. So, when we say for example we should go on to higher things well who's higher? Because every one of us being, as it were, having our

feet pointing to the center of the Earth must have our heads which are up pointing to regions of space which are vastly differentiated. So which way is up. Your up or my up? That people have a great difficulty you see in getting new ideas of the skyline and this is the difference that is so often brought up by people who discuss oriental philosophy or mysticism. They say I understand. But you say in theory but I don't actually feel that I don't realize it.

So in the same way, somebody hundreds of years ago might have said to a geographer. Yes I understand your theory of the earth being that of all. But I don't feel I feel I'm living on a flat thing. I suppose a lot of people living today feel they're living on a flat thing but if you've done a great deal of travel by air certainly if you've been in orbit as an astronaut you jolly well know it isn't flat. You realized it. So in a similar way, I think that in the course of history we have realized colors. There's evidence to show that only quite recently have people really been able to differentiate blue from Green. In Chinese, there is one word meaning blue and green and it means the color of nature. You know how much there's a reference to the wine dark sea. And we wonder whether those early Greeks were aware of the differentiation of blue from the dark red of wine. See the dark red of wine is beginning to approach purple. You see, that the spectrum is...we always look at it in books when we study physics and in certain physical experiments we see the spectrum of as a band, as when we look at a rainbow we look at a section of the rainbow and we see a band with red at one side and purple at the other what we don't realize is that the spectrum should be drawn as a circle in which the different colors radiate from the center and we would see that when you have gone through red orange yellow etc around the purple you go again to red. Because after all what is purple except the mixture of red with blue.

So, everything goes around like that. Everything in the world, as a matter of fact, is a crisscrossing or interlocking of many Dimensions of spectra. You take the spectrum of sound. If anybody thought to do it they could make up a spectrum of smells. You can make a spectrum of emotions you can make a spectrum of tactile vibrations you could make a spectrum of textures. And when you put all these things together as you say. It is blue and hard. Or that's where you've crossed two spectra. We don't usually think of

something that is blue and noisy. But, it would really be quite easy to conceive something that was. We don't ordinarily hear colors but you can you can take L.S.D. and hear colors and or see the color of sounds and realize that your senses are fundamentally one sense differentiated, is very tender and sensitive in the eyes because it can by being so sensitive respond to the extremely subtle vibrations of light with the ears it's a little less stander but the ears respond to the subtle vibrations of sound. Vibrations in the air. And then the nerves on the epidermis, they are a little cruder. That they respond to the vibrations of the so-called hard objects. Or through vibrations on the same spectrum as light but we call it heat. And then when you begin to think about these spectra. You just begin to feel about them. You find there are some places in this interlocking measure of specter that you have rather be than others. You don't want to be where it's too hot. You don't want to be where the light's too bright. Or where there isn't any light. You don't want to be on the spectrum of touch with the sense of touch is excruciating, sharp, you're always try to move away from that. But you see there are so many spectra interlocking with each other the when you move away from one point that you don't like you're very liable to bump into another that you don't like on a different level. And so eventually you realize, that just as you can have the red and without the purple you can have the pleasure and of the tactile sensation, without there being also the pain end. Because if you weren't responsive to the pain and you couldn't respond to the pleasure end. You must have the whole spectrum to have any of it.

And the longer you go into that, the more you think it over, the more you realize that. You say something that Mystics often say, but which ordinary people just can't understand, when they say that everything is harmonious. It's absolutely absurd but everything. It is really harmonious in the end. And it's all of it is somehow just as it should be. And the ordinary person says Well that's absurd. Let's take the problem say that we're all faced with the atomic age. There's a real possibility we can blow up the planet. And we might do just that. When I mean, I'm involved in the situation if I were going to bet on it and they were somewhere to place my bet which there isn't. I would bet that human beings will blow up the planet. Taking a hard, realistic point of view as I think human beings are going to do the most stupid things they can do like I've never been anywhere anytime I've voted

in an election my candidate never won. So I tend not to vote. But I but I realize at the same time I'm involved in the scene. I can't get out of it. There's nowhere to place my bet therefore I have to do something to make things come out the way I think I want them to come out. But let's suppose they do blow up a planet. Well this is just a fantasy but supposing they turn it into a star. Maybe that's the way all stars started. Maybe there's a sort of a process which works like this that there is a star and it as it blows up it's got hoes all sorts of fragments out and these become planets. And then every so often and some star has a planet that starts generating life. And life gets more and more intelligent, and starts working around and fiddling and then it starts asking questions what is all this you know what is matter? They investigated for they prod it, and they electrify it and do this that and the other finally [explosion].

And so that you could say in this way in the evolution of the universe. All stars mean that there were once people around and. So in this way, then you could construct a vision of things where it was all perfectly all right that you have to have bad people as well as good people just as you have to have. The slugs in the garden and weeds and all sorts of things you don't approve of in order to have something that you can approve of. You see oil is the this is that this is what the mystic feels he suddenly gets it is say that it's all OK. And of course, the average person thinks that's a very dangerous thought and there are several reasons for thinking it's a very dangerous thought one is that. It seems to give justification for any kind of behavior and therefore to overrule all the ordinary reasons for being moral and cooperative. Although, it neglects the fact that the might you might then discover quite other reasons for being moral. And you might be so happy as a result of finding this out that you're happiness would become infectious After all if I'm suddenly going to be given a million dollars I'm not going to suddenly run out of doors and shoot everybody. I'm much more liable as a good Gareth on the road to invite people in for a party. And so, also, people would say if somebody realized that, well that's a that's subversive, that's awful, because that's bringing democracy into the kingdom of heaven, which is a point, which I won't go into right now but it's enormously interesting what that implies. Or other people would say, It's just the opposite of bringing democracy into the kingdom of heaven it's that you feel you're God. And that from your point of view everything's all

right. God's in his heavens, all's right with the world. Or else they say, well it's sentimental. A lot of people say this. I've run into this type, particularly in the academic world. They say the truth of life is fundamentally if you're a realist and if you're really sensitive and aware life is tragedy. And that is a noble set they feel that if they face the fact that the world is basically tragic. That human existence in particular is tragic because it's full of hope and love and joy and so on but it's doomed to come to a bad end that's tragic but to face tragedy and so on is to be very noble. I thought to disagree with this. I say you're just strutting on the stage. And saying how noble you are because that's the only result you've got. And wouldn't it I mean be better wouldn't you really enjoy your life much more if you could see that there was behind it all the possibility that it wasn't tragic and that it was a chronic tremendous celebration only, that on the way to realising that it is there are all kinds of things that go bang and rolls nasty shock from horrible surprises and difficult problems because you would be bored if there weren't. You have to wiggle yourself through all these mazes because that's what there is. That's the way we do it otherwise we get bored. But you know when the wiggling through the mazes of the shocks and the bangs and everything get too much. Some people say well isn't it time to wake up. Isn't it time to stop this myopia of imagining that there is a right place in the spectrum where you could be comfortable, and I'm talking about the multidimensional spectrum of all the different levels on the river. But can't we see that the whole thing is necessary and that as a matter of fact you are the whole thing. Only the whole thing as a very fascinating to pass city which is to be able to concentrate its attention in various places, and we call these places people. And therefore to surprise itself with another person. In the Upanishads, this one a bunch of which says that in the beginning was the self. And it said I am. And thus it is that when anyone is asked Who is there he says it is I and after that gives whatever particular name he may have. And when it realize that it was alone the self was afraid. But then it said of what have I be afraid where I am all that there is and fear can come only from another Keep that in mind then it said but I am alone and experience no joy delight as one who is alone has no delight. And therefore it split itself. And one half was male, and the other half female. So you can have delight without, now we've got another you've got the possibility of fear. And so that he-part copulated with the she part and produced all human beings. But she said how can he have intercourse with me since he is

originally me this is incest and so she turned herself into a cow. He immediately turned himself into a bull and from that population were produced all cattle. But then she turned herself into a mare but he immediately into a stallion and so they made all horses then she turned herself into a you and he became around. And so came all sheep and then all the various beasts down to the very ants and so the world was created as a sort of interesting backwards creation story in which the human beings come first and then all the other creatures. But that's that's the I mean, in a mythological way of talking that's the kind of game we're involved in. And so the process of meditation. Has as its objective. To enable us to have the vision of the mystic. To have what is called I think. Perhaps unfortunately a cosmic consciousness trouble with the word cosmic is that it's so associated with the daft old ladies who Wear Violet and read Madame Blavatsky or something. And always going around telling people that something's very cosmic. I remember I had a friend who became like that she was a very pretty girl when I first knew it and. When she she she always talked about body consciousness and I that said why do you use that word but it why don't you just say Buddhist it's an ordinary word in the dictionary and but it sounds spooky. But she went on talking about but it things and. Eventually. Dressed in pure white and had all things in her robe white and crystal balls on the tables of it you know there was nothing at the left about it she was much too pure.

Anyway, to to realise cosmic consciousness, to say that this universe that there state that what there is is all of a piece doesn't mean that it's like this lady's room all white or without any differentiations in it it sure is full of differentiation look at it but actually these differentiations are all the dancing of a single energy and you are that energy. And the thing that you don't realize in the ordinary way is that all energy goes on and off it's pulsing things so, now you see it, now you don't know. You're alive and now you're dead. See, and we because of our limited vision don't see that no that doesn't matter in the least. The conceit of thinking that when you're dead that will be the end of everything you know is just appalling. Naturally you will come back but you won't remember how it was when you were here before for the simple reason that if you did it would be a bore. You know just like you feel you're here now without remembering ever being here before you can feel you're here again without ever remembering you

were there before which is a definition of simply a definition of what we mean by somebody else. After you're dead you'll be somebody else, who thinks he's you. Because that's what he says he is. He says, I am I, That's your name. So I mean just don't worry about it the only thing is that it's some sense in looking toward the future so that when you come back again the world will be a reasonably decent place to appear in. Only as a matter of fact you simultaneously appear in all worlds. In whatever planets there may be with other people on them each one of them as it comes into the world is you. Those Because that's how you feel they all feel like that air from the point of view of Astrophysics. In a curved space-time continuum, every point in this universe can be regarded as its center. It's like you look out what is the central point on the surface of a sphere. Well any point can be the center. So in the same way, the fact that you feel that you are the center of the world is exactly the truth. You can see equal distantly around you in all ways you see and you feel as when you are out on a ship on the ocean, and that the horizon seems to be a circle Well that's just because you're in the middle. But everybody's in the middle. Wherever you are you're in the middle that's why St Bonaventure referred to God as that circle whose center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere.

So, modern man in the West in particular after he abandoned the Ptolemaic theory of the world and took on the Copernican. And then realized that the solar system is only on the edge of a galaxy has felt awfully put down. It's a terrible shock to find out that. Because he felt again he says if he wasn't in the center and wasn't really mean it didn't really belong. And that's why that having become our common sense we have such hatred of nature and have been fighting against it so hard. But the more you study astronomy the more you realize that that isn't that only a partial look at things I know a psychiatrist who uses astronomy for psychotherapy. He himself has an office where he practices but no home. Lives are not time of pies in a tent. And every night he enjoys the view. People perhaps don't realize that. You don't have to have a beautiful home like this to have a good view or you have to lie on your back. And you're looking straight out into the most incredible view. Goes on and on forever. And to begin to realize that your You're on a spaceship the big spaceship beautifully equipped. And you're going on a long long journey because it's not just the orbit of the earth around the Sun. The Sun's moving and carrying you along, and at a pretty

good clip. It isn't quite fast enough for anyone. And there are the beautiful thing about this existence is. That, in a certain sense, everything moves by falling. But there's nowhere for it to hit and when the something should collide in the COS but we're all in a completely relativistic space. And there's no up there's no down no right direction no wrong direction. Where we are behaving on this, in this galaxy, like a whole bunch of gulls you know when the wind blows the gulls like to get up high and they rock around in the wind and they plunge and they they they dance and this whole cosmos is going to live there in our little swimming around having a ball. Well it's all a lot of balls. Naturally it has a ball.

So, but, it needs an extension it needs an enlargement. Universalization of our consciousness in order to be able to feel it that way and know that that's what it is. And so therefore to do that, there must be some way of overcoming myopia, of overcoming shall I call it, fascinated identification with only a single part of the process. And so meditation, yana, yoga is the art of de-fascination, and that is why it is called. Liberation from Maya. From illusion. From being spellbound and charmed bewitch befuddled and bewildered. The Buddha. Means the one who is awake the wake, as in the man it was called Hara with the wake, in the early English history. So Guatama Wake, would be an excellent translation of go to my brother. Wake up. So meditation then is a process of clarifying your consciousness. Rather as one allows a pull to be clarified. When it's clear you can see what's on the bottom of it and you can see the sky reflected in it. You see both the heights and the depths in a clear pool. But in order for a pool to become clear. Either cleared of mud or cleared of waves, there's only one way to do it, which is to leave it alone. If you try to smooth the ways with your hand over the flat on your to start up more trouble if you try to push the mud down you would just make it all the worse. So you have to leave it alone. It's very difficult however to leave your mind alone without going to sleep. But doing that is the whole art of meditation.

And I say to someone, have you practice the piano today, and I say to another person do you practice medicine, it's obvious that the word practice has a different meaning in both senses. When you say do you practice the piano, it means do you prepare for a concert. Have you practiced as a preparation for your performance. But when you say do you practice medicine it means is medicine the regular thing you do is a way of life. And

so, when one talks about the practice of yoga or of meditation which senses it meant and. Most people take it in the first sense, practicing the piano. Because they tend to look upon meditation as a sort of mental gymnastic. Like doing physical exercises in the morning because it's good for your health. But if you understand the practice of meditation in that way, you're not meditating. Because it's quite erroneous to consider it as a preparatory exercise with an objective. And of course that that. That bugs people because then they say well why do it. I mean aren't you trying to do something for yourself and you're trying to improve aren't you trying to get in lightened. And. You say well no. Because fundamentally, meditation is not anything except a way of being. People of course usually sit when they practice yoga or zazen, they may also walk you can actually carry on meditation while you're doing almost anything except intellectual work. And even that can by someone competent in it be used to. But that's difficult.

Meditation is not really to be considered as something special apart from the rest of life. However, when Zen monks or yogis sit for a long time, they aren't doing anything else, except breathing. And, you might imagine that they were doing this for some purpose. They were trying to become Buddhas. Very far back in the early history of Zen, there was a master by the name of Basho. And he when he was a young man was practicing meditation. And when his teacher came along one day, or the man who became his teacher. The teacher said What are you doing? And he answered I'm sitting to become a Buddha. And the teacher picked up a brick and started to polish it. And Basho said What are you doing with the brick where he said I'm polishing it to make a mirror. And Basho said well however much you polish a brick it will never become a mirror. And the teacher said however much you meditate or sit you won't become a Buddha, because Buddha is in no special state. If you become attached to sitting, your Buddha will only be a static Buddha. Nevertheless, in spite of this, Zen monks still continue to meditate to do Zazen. Japanese simply means sitting sitting Zen as distinct from standing then lying Zen and walking Zen because in fact. There is in Buddhism what are called of the three dignities of man. And they are walking standing sitting and lying. Forces me for dignity as a man. And so that to to to sit in meditation is

simply really to sit the way a Buddha sits. And so they say in Zen, if you want to walk, walk, if you want to sit, sit, but don't wobble.

When Yakojo was asked what is what are all your monks doing in this monastery and he answered we eat when hungry we sleep when tired. The man said Well everybody does that what's special about Yakoojo they don't do anything of the kind. When they are hungry they don't just eat but they talk and think about all sorts of other things when they're tired they don't just sleep but they dream all sorts of dreams. And it's interesting you know that if your supreme profession people in then I. Suppose it's said that they don't have any dreams. The Taoist philosopher Chuang Tzu says that when a wise man sleeps he breathes deeply from his heels and is without dreams. So he sleeps thoroughly The Hindu's distinguish four states of consciousness waking state, the dreaming state, and dreamless sleep and then the fourth state which they don't call anything except the fourth. And they value very much. Long long periods of dreamless sleep in which you go to a very, very deep level. And it's so deep that you can't remember it when you wake up. And that's the non dream or the beyond dream state. However then, you might say that the whole principle therefore of meditation. Is along the lines of when you sit sit or as the Japanese Zen priest Dogen put it, sit just to sit. Not to become a Buddha, but because you are one. And so in the same way how koans song of starts out by saying from the beginning all beings are Buddhas it is like ice and water, apart from water no ice can exist. But ordinary people are like a man swimming in the middle of a lake crying out imploringly in thirst. So here is our initial apparent paradox. That if as we saw this morning, cosmic consciousness involves the recognition. That everything is right. Or harmonious the way it is. That the unit universe is a terrific play of energy. This energy is you. But part of the game is that this energy myopia-sizes itself, if I may invent a word. And it becomes identified with particular individual expressions of the pattern. Individual bits of the pattern. And once that has happened. There is it as it were a taking of sides. And you become identified with one particular wiggle and therefore concerned with that one particular wiggle and therefore eventually anxious about the destiny of that one particular wiggle. And that's the result of your not seeing the whole thing but that very entanglement, that very identification that taking sides is part of the whole system of wiggles in its own turn. I mean imagine the system of

wiggles. It's like a a great vine. And there's a central branch and then other branches come off and then other branches come off that and then other branches come off that and then on the end of those they begin to be twigs and right out on the end of the twigs you know how the vine clings to things that are little a little weakly legals.

Now, we could talk of a vine at various levels. The main trunk is level number one. When any trunk branching off the main trunk is at level two any trunk branching off the subsidiary trances at level three then each branching again we'll assign the numbers four five six until maybe. At about fifteen we get to those little curly things, you see. Now on every level you see, the thing is harmonious. But you might think you might mistake levels. You might think that something that was one of those little very complicated curly things was a level two phenomenon. You say, well that's not the way we should behave on that level. Because level two isn't supposed to be a spiral like that level two goes like this but you've mistaken levels. When you know how often we do this in ordinary human relationships. We mistake the level on which a message is given to us we take for example someone who's kidding as if they were speaking seriously that's a mistake the level. Or so in exactly the same way. When you get involved in the life game and you think you really are a separate ego that itself is part of the life game. That getting involved. But it's way out on the end you see it's very far out, to get so immersed in the illusion of separateness. And so as a result of getting immersed in the illusion of separateness, we play all our complex social games of one upmanship. But they're all in the scheme, they're very far out. So you never really you never get away from the vine. The whole thing is a play and it's perfectly from a fundamental view as say the mystic sees it, from his standpoint. All the people wandering around in ignorance are all perfectly divine. So then there's a basic difficulty arises about this. I can put it in two ways. If the mystic sees this. And says well I see that everyone is Buddha, everyone is God or whatever you want to say. Has he really said anything at all. And if you ask that was that master he would laugh and say no that nothing whatever. Because you see from the standpoint of strict logic, you can't say anything about everything. Because the only meaningful statements you can make are comparative statements which involve some sort of classification.

And there isn't a class of all classes. There isn't you can't classify everything.

And, so very naturally, a person who thinks logically I would say well this mystic is just talking out of the top of his of as talking through his hat. But nevertheless you cannot get away with the fact that the person who is saying this has had a very very moving and profound experience. And this is the way in which he tried to say what he meant. And that's why some of them just shrug their shoulders and give up and say it can't be put into words. You have to realize it, because you see whenever you put it into words you talk nonsense. But it is rather easy to see this. That. The lens of your eye is what we call transparent or colorless. If it were not so we were not be able to differentiate between all the colors we can see it is just possible that the lens of our eye has a color, only we are unaware of it because it's always the background to everything else. It is possible that the windows are colored. There might be some being with a different kind of iron from ours who would see our windows as colored and he would say Good heavens why do people always look at things through colored glass because it distorts your vision. If I have read glass you see, I will not be able to differentiate red in the outside view. So, would be some means then, you might say whereby I could discover the color of the lens of my eye. And if so, then it would be like putting on colored spectacles. And so, if I put on red spectacles I will see that everything is red. But I could only say that having remembered another situation where it wasn't. And I have by in my memory, I could compare the present situation with the former situation so I would know it was red. I can also have spectacles which simply turn everything upside down. And you see the world upside down. And if you wear them for some time, your brain will simply turn the image the right way out. And then you will be perfectly adjusted. Because you see consciousness eliminates all constant stimuli. Because the moment a stimulus is constant it is of no interest, no further interest to ordinary attentive consciousness. It isn't a warning sign it isn't something I have to look out for it's going to be the way it is we were talking about bad smells the only way to get Master a bad smell is to get used to it. If you live in a neighborhood where the tannery or a gas works or a slaughterhouse something you soon think that that's the nothing at all it vanishes. But you see, to talk about this though, it is not entirely to talk about meaningless

things. There is the transparency of the eye, through which everything seen is filtered. There is likewise the speaker in a radio. And on that speaker all the sounds that come from the radio vibrate on it. But you're not normally aware of that, because the speaker makes no difference to what is said on the radio or what music is played but they all go through it just the same. So then assuming that there is this unitary energy or whatever it is that is at the basis of the universe. There is no way of making it a thing that you can 'thing' about. Because if it wasn't there nothing else would be there. It's basic. It's what Paul Tillich called the Ground of Being his decontaminated name for God. So you say, well what difference does it make? If this ground is basic to everything what difference does it make Well it doesn't make any difference that's the whole point in let's you can say all differences that are made are in. It makes. Then again a logician is going to quarrel with that statement because you say all. But by analogy with the function of the speaker in the radio or the lens of the eye you can see that very well might be some completely indefinable continuum at the basis of the multiplicity we call life.

But how to get at it? It seems to be the same sort of problem as discussing color with a congenitally blind man. But apparently this is what the mystic has seen. Has become aware of in some way. And the difference that it makes is this. Having discovered that that's what there is and that's what you are. You then see that there is really no need to cling to life. That you are just what there is what there will be, what there always was. This energy this continuum that's at the basis of consciousness. And having seen that, you get an enormous access of psychic energy. Because in the ordinary way you waste a colossal amount of energy defending yourself worrying. Fighting this, and pushing that. When you don't when you see you don't need to do that anymore all that energy is available for something else. We could say, for creative work. For just wonderful life and goofing off and everything it's all there so it makes a difference in that sense. So then though, that's that's the first public part of the puzzle the second part of the puzzle is this. If it is true that everything that is happening is in accord. It is the expression of this energy down to the very wiggles and if even we can add to that confusing wiggles on one level with wheels on another. That's also in the game. Then wouldn't the best teaching be. To say to people. Why do you have any kind of religious therapeutic meditative practice at

all? Why not just be as you are? Eat when you're hungry, sleep when tired etc. Why is something special? After all we've never seen cats go to church with each other. I've never seen dogs practicing Zazen. They don't have the special thing they do. Why couldn't human beings be just natural like that? Why all this hocus pocus?

Furthermore we could go on to say. It may very well be that this hocus pocus gets in the way of realizing. The basic unity. That because if you are a Buddha, trying to become one is based on the presupposition that you aren't so already. And therefore it becomes like what the Taoists called beating a drum in search of a fugitive. Or as we would put it I'm driving to a police raid with the siren on because when they hear you coming get out of the way. So in this way Bankei describe it as trying to wash off blood with blood. Or we would say, trying to put out fire with fire. And there is an enormous amount of truth is. Because one would be astonished at the extent to which religious people are pretty mixed up. And you find this everywhere. One doesn't know whether they're religious because they're mixed up or mixed up, or because they're religious. And in Zen, this is called Zen stink. So then you see, it's like a very interesting meditation exercise you can employ is to take two knitting needles. And practice fencing with yourself. And really do it and see if you can stick one hand with the other and yet the other hand has got to defend itself. What happens? Well, nothing happens because one hand always for knows what the other one is going to do. There's no means of one hand surprising the other. So you got a stalemate. It's like those baseball games between two equally good sides. [[it's] absolutely boring perfect playing but nothing happens. So there has to be a surprise so then you ask the question how do you surprise yourself. When you can't arrange to do that. Satori, enlightenment is always a surprise. Pickups is a surprise is it difficult to plan things out. Or you know, the old Indian superstition that if you think of a monkey while you're taking medicine the medicine won't work so you must try not to think of the monkey while taking the medicine. See there's the whole hang up. Now, one answer to this is yes that's perfectly true. And therefore the only thing you can do is wait until it happens by itself. And say oh heavens, I might wait all my life for Satori, and it might never happen. It's like one of the kings of Spain went for twenty seven days without a bowel movement. And. Heaven you know what anxiety what

frightful purge it would take. But as George graphic the contemporary of Freud used to say just don't worry about it. There's a hold on at the end it's got to come out something.

So there are things you see it like going to sleep the children have a great day off and have a great deal of difficulty going to sleep because they're so excited. And their mothers tell them to try to go to sleep well that's a ridiculous thing to say you can try to go to sleep as merely a way of staying awake, because you develop anxiety about it. All when they are going back to the matters of the toiletry, children used to be. I don't know what they do today since the age and no spark whatever. But we used as children to be absolutely hounded. To have bowel movements every day regularly after breakfast. And if you didn't work. And they they first of all gave you a California syrup or figs. If that didn't work they gave you Senate Tea if that didn't work they gave you Cascara. If that didn't work they gave you a calomel pill and if that didn't work the final blast was caused their oil. And this developed in so many children a kind of chronic peristaltic anxiety. And they were just always in trouble. Because the mothers and nurses wouldn't let nature take its course they had to have it all on schedule. Well in just the same way, you can't schedule your own enlightened. You can't say you must be enlightened every day at six o'clock. Or when when I want it. You do have to wait. But now, there are two ways of waiting. One way is the way of expectancy. Oh when will it happen? Oh when will it happen? You know and you wait like that. Another way of waiting is to abandon enlightenment altogether. Give it up. When you say how can you do that because I am I can't help being fascinated with the prospect that there is another state of consciousness which is somehow more harmonious than the one I'm in. See, the grass on the other side of the fence is always green. And I want to get that other state of consciousness. Well now, then teachers you see have all kinds of clever gimmicks that they use to get in here. They say such as. You should realize that enlightenment is really the actual state of consciousness you're in now. There's nothing to be attained. And, or it was like one of the monks came to JoShu the other early Chinese and master and said What would you say to someone who comes to you with nothing? Joshu answered throw it away.

It's so...right. In ordinary consciousness. We are normally trying to get into another state of consciousness. We call it say the quest for pleasure or the quest for happiness I would like to be happy all the time. Therefore I I don't like the state of consciousness I'm in I want to get out of it. Now then, if I say somebody says no you can only change your consciousness by accepting it as it is. Then if I do something about that like trying to accept my state of mind as it is why am I doing that obviously that I want to change it so I didn't accept it at all. So then the teacher can say alright look, just leave everything alone. Because it's all there the way it is. See? Now, he may just if he's lucky get you to see something at that point. What he says in that way may surprise you, that what will you be doing then you see, you will be in fact in so far as you're not striving to change your state of consciousness. You're at last meditating. But it's that you see it's that little problem to get over. One thinks in other words, wouldn't it be nice to have cosmic consciousness. She Think of all the problems that would solve they have all the new energy I would get. Well what's wrong with this consciousness? What's wrong with being in this state can't you you know get rid of your troubles anyway. By seeing that you really can't going to think about them. Because you see if you do do anything about your problems in practical life. It's like what you're going to do if you win the war? Supposing you know you've got money troubles and you buy some shrewd business you get some more money you think you've solved your problem for a while. But then you start worrying about something else as I pointed out this morning. You got the same old trouble back only got another form. And we're always doing that we're always doing the same thing over and over again in all kinds of different ways pretending each time that into a new trick or a new situation or a new problem. That's what makes the world go round. It's like a squirrel cage see, this animal going to turn and turn turn turn turn, on the bottom of the cage you always stays in the same place but the Cage goes round and it looks as if it were getting somewhere. But he's not, Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose, mentioned those more it changes the more of the same thing. And so it is likewise with all beings in this universe, whether they be as high as the gods or as low as the demons. They're all on the make. And they all think they have the same problems. You can see this to a certain extent in human life, that very poor people have their problems. Very rich people have their problems and from a subjective standpoint the two can feel equally bad. So

it is somehow isn't it a matter of coming to where you are. What's the difference then between coming to where you are. And going on just as you did before. Isn't there some little itty bitty difference? Well if I say no there isn't. There is none whatever, some people will simply dismiss the subject out of hand. Other people will be very deeply affected by it, because that understanding. Will lift away their anxiety. They'll become come inside they will not be struggling with their own state of consciousness as it is and that will be exactly like leaving the pool of water alone, so that the waves die down and the mud sinks to the bottom. Now when that starts to happen, and you've learned, somehow or other to leave your mind alone. You can begin to practice meditation. Which is that you make the discovery, that to sit quietly in this present state of consciousness. Letting whatever happens happen. In this way your mind pacifies itself and the activity becomes extraordinarily pleasant. So that those people are proficiency in meditation just plain like to meditate. They're not doing it for any Alterian reason but just that they like to be in that state. But the question is, you see, how get to that little jumping point between the two? And as you examine it and go back behind the motivation you see why do you want to jump from one to the other. Because I'd feel happier. How do you know you would if you haven't already been then. When all those mystics who come back with reports of it say they're happy that the little girl wrote to me the other day that Dear Mr. Watts, are you enlightened? I would be like to be enlightened too will you please tell me how I can be enlightened age fifteen. I have announced the letter yet. And. I think I'll send a hula hoop or something, I don't know but what would be a nice present for a fifteen year old girl... [audience murmurs] Oh that's right, yes, that's right. Kangaroo Balloon

So, this is then, let me try first of all and put it in this way. Generally speaking, the simplest way to learn to meditate is yes, by all means sit down. In Lotus posture or any posture that is reasonably comfortable. And let your mind alone. You could say to that your thoughts OK OK OK, go ahead. Think anything you want to. Say to your feelings all right feel. Your body yes by all means it. Fidget or whatever. As Li-Tzu put it, I let my mind think whatever it liked. I let my mouth say whatever it wanted I let my eyes see what ever they wanted to see and my ears whatever they wanted to hear. That is in a way you see in the direction of the democracy of the body others don't. Give free speech to your mouth. Free hearing to

your ears. And you can free vision your eyes then he said he let his legs go wherever they wanted to take him and then he discovered he was had the sensation of walking on the wind. And he says I didn't know whether I was riding on the wind of the wind was riding on me. In other words, he was describing the tremendous liberative effect of trusting your own organism to do its own thing. Of course, we feel that that's dangerous because we think that the human organism is really a kind of the naked ape. And that if left to itself and not in the ordinary sense of discipline that is to say not disciplined by violence, everybody will be like the monk of Siberia. Fasting grew weary and weary and the last of the yell he burst from the cell devour the fathers of period and that there's is what will happen well yes to some extent it would. With Westerners I think that if this became. A sort of popular religious attitude. All sorts of people would break loose. And do things they never would have dreamed of doing before this has happened to some extent in the hippie revolution. Because when people go and get a lot of mystical experiences from using L.S.D. or marijuana or something and they somehow get an insight into this thing. They are very liable through the karma or backlog of resentment they have for their off already figures teachers parents and so on they will do something calculated, to shock those parents completely. They will wear the kind of clothes that would be quite outrageous. See, responsible Americans always appear in a certain way. You can turn through the pages of photographs of important people. And by Jove, it's amazing how much alike they look, especially in dress. And short hair and so on. And so naturally, the hippie having realised this experience grows is how long. Whereas womanish be. And, generally it does all sorts of petty thievery and rights fall out of words all over the place and. You know the whole pitch. Well that's a swing you see that's one of the dangers that's the thing that's always liable to work. When you stop moving in one direction you tend to be shoved in the opposite even though your intention was to come to the middle way. Now but on the other hand if you persevered. Now that sounds like a practice word in the sense of practicing piano. Therefore persevere isn't quite the right word to use for meditation. Not persevered but. Simply go on doing it for no purpose at all. You know, when you've got the hot water faucet on and cold water is coming out and you leave it along. And it keeps coming cold water cold water you may have with your things on the tap be impatient and say oh, it's never going to come. Sometimes it comes quickly. But this is the idea of meditation is

putting your fingers under the cosmic hot water tap. And then you have to wait for it to happen. Now there's a difference between the experience in the state. If I say you wait for it to happen. And there is the thought Oh, I shouldn't be just lazy like that. Surely there's something I can do. Just some little bit of a thing I can do to hasten it along. But if the teacher says nothing. You see. What he's saying on one level and this again is a question of levels as I numerated them in the analogy of the vine will have a different sort of effect on another level. It's as if for example Calvinists who are fatalists, and believe in absolute predestination. How come that people who can believe that get so spiritually energetic. It's a paradox. But that's true for all the same. The person who sees In other words that any forced meditation can't solve anything, thereby leaves his mind alone. There's a Tibetan poem. For the verse [Tibetan phrase] which means don't. Think. Don't meditate don't concentrate. Don't. Practice contemplation but keep your mind in its natural state. From the precepts of Tilopa. Well you can't do it. There's no way of keeping your mind in its natural state. But. If I say to you, but you don't need to you always are. If, you, then and there. Get what I'm saying. So you just simply believe me. Then you will by doing that stop doing the things that are preventing you from being in the natural state. Only you mustn't say so. Otherwise it gives the show rights I've given the show away to you. So you can't do this anymore, 'cause you know about it. So what will you do next. Let me put it in another way. You can say. Whether you like it or not, you're a Buddha already. And nothing you can do will get rid of it. Not even trying to get it will get rid of it. So you have gone to another level now. I haven't said, by not trying you will get it. I have said you can't get away from it even if you do try. Now you see the psychological effect of that, you feel perfectly free to try i.e. to be as you are. And in this state then you are no longer wrestling with yourself. But the point is we always do wrestle with ourselves even people who we would consider, oh I don't know, spiritual bums and total failures and eve of positively vicious people they're wrestling with themselves like anything well let's take the people who was a special kind of cheating the income tax. And what you do is you go all over the country filing false returns. And then claiming something on them so the government will send you a check and you keep a place in ever so many different cities and you go around collecting the checks but you could earn far more money at an honest job. And this is one of the great fallacies of the criminal life that it becomes very

complicated. Because you have to tell lies to cover up lies you have to commit murders to cover up murders and you get so involved.

So in that sense you see it is more work, to be neurotic, to be a slob, than it is to actually meditate. That's in a way the easiest thing to do but the trouble is when you are used to a life of criminality. When you're used to anxiety. You can't give it up because you think it's good to be anxious. In all this talk by existentialist like Rollo May about authentic humanity. How a person who is not anxious. [laughter] Surprise The person is that anxious is not really human. And therefore it sort of becomes your duty to be anxious. Well a lot of people are like that. They think if I don't worry the thing I'm worried about is going to happen. That if we don't get excited about something see, well then we won't do anything to correct it because you want it but the point is if you do get excited about it if you do you know liar awake nights thinking about your sins and what specially your sins of omission. You [won't] wake up in the morning with any energy to do anything about it at all all your psychic energy will be will be dissipated in trying to steam up motivation. Now you don't need to do that. Because if you need to alter some situation in life and actually do something about anything you will do it not from worry. But from an overpass of psychic energy. It's like the industrial revolution everybody always worried about what to do with the poor people and the sick, but until the Industrial Revolution came along, there was no energy for it. And it's only as we harnessed electricity and steam and things like that that we could produce effectively to feed everybody in the world.

So in the same way when you have let go, then you've got all this energy to do things with. You don't ask where. We're going to get the energy from like asking where are we going to get the money from. Money doesn't come from anywhere. It's an invention and so where are you going to get the energy from where the answer is you are imaging you are nothing but and your whole being is a pattern consisting of nothing whatsoever except energy. There isn't any. Kind of lump of body that you are carrying around that's a koan and then who is it that carries this corpse around. Now, there is a very curious relationship between great energy and activity and stillness. These two like each other very much. Take a guy like Joe Louis the boxer. He would spend a great deal of time just lounging around. He was like a

great big cat. And it went and study cats. Because they're just like this cats will relax like this completely open. They'll curl up. They'll sit for a long time quite still but wide awake, watching. And then Zingo, the minute a cat needs to do anything it's all they're just full of energy. So in exactly the same way anybody who is. Has realized energy. He will very much enjoy being like a cat, and spending time just sitting. And that's meditation practice. And that's real meditation practice as distinct from something which is self-conscious, cultish, phony.. Well one of the most offensive things about. Certain people in Japan who go over there are studies and they're always bragging. About the difficult times they had how long they sat how much their needs ached. How difficult it all was, but by Jove have we suffered. You know this is the good old Protestant conscience suddenly coming along in a Buddhist rope.

This morning I'm going to talk about the various different methods of meditation. The yoga sutra Patanjali starts out with the phrase yoga citta naroga, which is a definition of yoga and roughly translated into English it means yoga is the cessation of mind waves. The word citta means roughly consciousness except that we don't have the same richness of words in English for aspects of the mind which they have in Sanskrit. They see that the word big neon which is also translated consciousness' chitter it's a different word which we just call consciousness and the manner. In which we translate mind, and so it goes. Now citta i analogous to the water in the pool that I was talking about the reflecting pool. And vriti is a word which means basically a turning that is to say a sort of a churning motion naroda means cessation, roughly. So the sensation of the turnings of the mind has quite an elaborate meaning. And different schools of thought interpreted in different ways. For example, when you get this pull completely still. It is another Sanskrit word is used for it which is NirviKalpa. Now, one school of thought will interpret this as the mind in such total stillness that nothing at all is registering it. In other words that there are not only no thoughts but also no feelings and no sensory input, quite blank. Perhaps not so extremely as to say quite blank. It is also held that this kind of blankness is also called satcitananda, which means reality consciousness bliss it is in a state of bliss of a kind of formless blissful luminosity. But if you look into the word nirvikalpa and see exactly what it means, the same word nir as in naroda, again means cessation about the caliper means concept. As distinct from percept. So, my own interpretation of the word because nearly Kalpa is the

mind operating without concepts. That is to say, thoughts are not being formulated and by thoughts I mean symbolic tools such as words such as numbers such as abstract symbols by which we represent the physical world. In other words, in a state of nirvikalpa, you would be perfectly aware of everything going on in this room. Only you wouldn't be talking to yourself about it, you wouldn't be naming things. And you would therefore be reflecting your sensory input. Very very clearly. Also you can say. Say that cittavriti, the mind waving or mind turning is a state like worrying. Where you're going around and around and around in a sort of vicious circle that's turning you can also interpret the same phrase to mean the mind attempting to turn back on itself like a dog chasing its tail. So there are at least four meanings of this phrase. But I simply take the one that means. The attainment of Nirvikalpa samadhi some of the meaning. Difficult word again to translate it referring to a state of consciousness the root of the word some is related to our word some. Which means therefore complete an idea of totality in integrity. Some of these sometimes translated trance but that isn't very good. Somebody is often understood to mean the disappearance of any distinction between subject and object, the knower and the known. And probably that does rather well because as I explained yesterday when after some time you have simply allowed. The art mind to think whatever it wants and to feel whatever it wants and to perceive whatever it wants. You will become aware of yourself not as a sort of separate observer, but simply as the flow of experience, so that there is no experience facing an experience or of vice versa but simply a process of experiencing which is unitary. Even though it is differentiated as we speak of sensory differentiations only you don't call it differentiated that's a concept. You can't point to the difference between somebodies fingers, because the difference between them is conceptual. The idea of difference is purely conceptual.

So, in this state then of Samadhi, it means it is a state of quietness because there is no further agitation going on between the process of experience the panorama of experience on the one hand and the experience of on the other who is either accepting or rejecting or commenting upon the constant flow of nature. Now, how then, or what are the various methods of getting to this state? We might begin with ananpranasmiti, which means watching over the breath. This is done it is basic to almost all techniques of meditation.

And it may take the form of simply allowing breath to go on, however it feels like going on, that say counting the breaths. There are two reasons for this. Number one, by watching breathing you concentrate your mind. On something which absorbs your attention but which isn't a concept. Also number two, breathing is a very curious faculty because you can experience it as happening either voluntarily or involuntarily. You can say I breathe. That's normal in our speech. Even though you don't say I circulate my blood. Because you don't experience that as a voluntary action. But so you can consciously control the rhythm of your breath but within limits if you stop thinking about it it goes on by itself and happens in voluntarily. And therefore through becoming aware of the breath in this way you see that the division between voluntary action and involuntary action is arbitrary. When you do something voluntarily, like opening and closing your hand, which is not something labile to go on automatically all the time or the are thinking about it or not then you say I do it and it does seem to be voluntarily voluntary it seems to be under your control and yet you don't know how you do it you are not in voluntary control of the processes which enable you to do something voluntarily. You don't know how you managed to be conscious. You don't know how you exert will. And so again the border line is quite arbitrary.

And so, as you simply become aware of breathing and sit for a while and do nothing but breathe. You begin to get into that state of mind. Where what you do and what happens to you become the same. And also the easy unrestricted flow of breath works on the rest of your consciousness like a pacifier. And everything becomes still and quiet. After a while the breathing the comes so gentle. That you could say, almost, that you have stopped breathing. You haven't of course actually stopped. Although some expert has a yogi can hold their breath for an unbelievably long time and will even roll back their tongues in a certain way and literally stop breathing and be buried underground for seven hours and then be brought out and immediately resuscitated. That's a sort of a musical trick. There's no point in it. But actually, what is called the cessation of breath. Simply means that it's become extremely quiet and very very smooth. On the other hand breathing exercises are practiced are quite a complex nature. Whereby for example you take your fingers and you breathe in at the left nostril and then out through the right nostril and then in through the right nostril, and out

through the left and in through the left and up through the right and then through the right and out through the left and through the left and out through the right and so on, and then as you do this, you imagine that the current that you're breathing in goes in when you breathe in through the left nostril so it goes down a passage in the spine which is called the sushumna. And it has two channels and one is called the ida on the left and the other is called the pingala on the right. So that when you breathe in through the left you imagine the current is going down through the ida. And it goes all the way down to the bottom of your spine and strikes on a center called a muladhara chakra. Chakra and of the word literally means a wheel. And there are sometimes equated with. Neural plaques or ganglia. Base the longest. Final column but I think one should take these in a more symbolic way and not really in a literal way. The muladhara chakra is always represented as being an inverted triangle that of course represents the feminine sex dog. Inside the triangle or dark chakra when it is drawn on yoga maps of the body there is an erect phallus, around which is entwined a serpent who is asleep and this gentleman is known as the kundalini. The crown chakra represents the divine essence. And it was said therefore that in ordinary people the divine essence is asleep. And needs to be awakened. And the process of yoga or what is strictly called Raja Yoga the royal yoga. Or many kinds of yoga Raja Yoga consists in awakening the kundalini and drawing it up the spinal cord up the sushumna and as it goes up it energizes all the different chakras on the way in there in all seven of them. I'm not going into the geography of all the chakras except to say that the top chakra is called the sahasra chakra, which means the thousand-petaled Lotus. And that is as it were, the cortex. Now all this has a very very deep symbolism in it. It is this. That the skull represents the vault of heaven. And in the top of the skull that is supposed to be an aperture out of which your life departs when you die but it's also represents the sun. Because the sun has been considered as a dog in the firmament of heaven through which you see into heaven. So the sun dog is at the top of the load of all that have. There is a great tree called the actual tree of the world and that is the spine. And the Sahasra chakra the thousand-petaled lotus as it were the great flowering top of the tree. And it goes down and it has roots and the muladhara chakra is the root place and the sleeping serpent at the bottom will find a complete parallel to this in Norse mythology where the world tree is called a Yggdrasil and at the bottom of it there is the world serpent who is always knowing the roots.

And about you see. Also you will see the medieval representation of the crucifixion. Where there is likewise a serpent at the base of the cross. Sometimes you will see crucifixes on which there is a serpent instead of the Body of Christ. And that is called in a hushed UN in Hebrew the serpent which Moses lifted up in the wilderness made of bronze so the two ever looked upon it was cured from the plague of snakes. Why is it also that doctors represent their profession staff with serpents intertwined around it why does Hermes carry such a staff it, a Caduceus, what is this business of serpents on rods. Well, to get the simplest answer to that question you look at the constellation of Pisces an astrological symbolism, where you will see that one fish is going up and the other fish is going down, or you take the in young symbol of the Taoists and you will see two fish like comers interlocked with each other, one black and one white. One is the Yang who is white one is the yin who is black. And each one has an eye of the opposite color. These are respectively going up and going down going in and going out going away and coming back they represent the fundamental vibration of nature. Or you could call it involution and evolution. So the when you take the the this breathing process that you see of the breast going down the eater up the pingala down the Beguiler and up the eater and getting the can do the can really need to wake up and come up again you are starting the process of evolution. So this relates to the Hindu idea that the universe is from on the Supreme of the star going to Brahman that is to say the. To be active aspect of Brahman. Playing hide and seek with itself. Now you see me, now you don't. Now I know who I am, now I get lost. And as Brahman imagines that it's all of us that is the serpent going down and hiding in the roots they also have the image of going down the tubes inside a Lotus stem. And you know when you eat Lotus roots they're for they they've got holes through them because the tubes through the stem and goes down and hides in the depth of the Lotus root under the surface of the water in the sea in the mud. And then when it comes up again why that's why you always see Buddha sitting on top of the Lotus he's come out so naturally he sits on the top of the Lotus. Thank you.

So, likewise also, Buddhas are born at midnight why at midnight because that's the time when the sun is right underneath you and that's the lotus on which you're sitting. All these images and figures from all over the world that fit together in a funny way. So then, as you go on practicing this

pranayama It's called, the breathing technique. And you energized the kundalini. And as it creeps up the spine and energizes each chakra you get all sorts of strange changes in your consciousness. You may start by hearing all sorts of bell like sounds, smelling the most beautiful perfumes. Seeing things that you just never saw before. And you must be very careful as you do this not to get sidetracked, because you may think oh these sounds are gas and I'm going to really absorb and explore all that you see but if you do that you're apt to get sidetracked because that's not the main issue. Then when it gets higher, you begin to get very strange experiences of reading other people's minds or of knowing. The past in strange ways and of foretelling the future and again you mustn't get sidetracked. These are not important. The thing is to go right on and get that going to Leni right up to the Sahara chakra. And then you are enlightened but you are what is called Mokhta which means liberated in the in life. As distinct from the day how Mokhta, which means liberated at death.

Now, and then of course the yogi as he's drawn on this map that I'm describing is shown sitting in the lotus basket and always above his head there is a flame. And that is the final liberation of the kundalini force escaping through the sundog at the top. And this is the death of the fundamental design of what is called in India a stupa. S.T. U.P.A. where you see a go to like structure with a dome and a spike on the to. Out of it so that dome on the stupa is the skull and the spike is the flame. That is modified in the far east as the pagoda it is also called the Dagobah you see the word pagoda is Dagobah it is also the fundamental design of the New England church spire. And the pattern, the architectural pattern of that though chutzpah is really the same as that of a stupor or The Globe. In Tibet it's called a chart and. So here is this wonderful sort of map of man's. In a lifeless psychic Constitution. And the process going on so finally see if you avoid all the traps if you avoid being beguiled by city which means supernormal powers. You are eventually liberated, because you see through the whole cosmic game. And naturally when people use pharmacological agents like L.S.D. and many of these chakras this is least what an Indian would say are touched off. And in life and as a result of that you hear all those sounds you see all the strange sights you smell the marvelous perfumes you become aware that the whole world is a throbbing electronic vibrating thing. [It's] is diaphanous and. But you will you see when when

people do this and they get fascinated with what I would call the by products of L.S.D.. They may get on a very wrong track and that's what leads people to take L.S.D. over and over again so that they can have a marvelous time. You know listening to Bach turned on and seeing the way they can the music evokes color, because you see as this process works you get to the point where you experience the unity of the senses. But you see to do that is in a way, to get lost in all the ramifications of the psychic world. So if you use things of this kind you must be very careful indeed because they are really nothing more than starters to get a person who is absolutely cannot understand what all this is about, to take a peek into paradise as it were. And see that there are more things in heaven and earth than I dreamed of in your philosophy. And it is of course often the occasion for a person who was really very boring. To become quite interested in life to see that there really is something going on in this world that is extremely exciting.

But, it, it's strongly to be advised, that once you have seen the point where. You understand quite clearly. That this whole world is in fact the play of a single energy. And that it has this harmonious property. Whatever may be said about things on another level conflicts, wars cruelties, diseases what have you. Then it's time for you to stop. Employing anything so powerful as L.S.D.. and to switch instead to meditation. Because at that point you had it you got the message. And no point going back and back about. Because when you come down out of a state of consciousness like that, there's a very critical moment as you come down which is seeing that the real insight doesn't consist in some exotic experience, it consists in the realisation that ordinary everyday consciousness is it. That in other words, if I may put it in the crudest possible terms, that you see quite plainly, that what is going on now is what God is doing. And you are that. And just this is so simple a matter of picking up the pipe and chewing it is a completely divine act. I don't even know why I use the word divine but I do it in order somehow to call attention to something that people don't ordinarily seem to see. So then, in yoga, when you've gone through all this. And all that jazz, was the way that kundalini was going up you get to a state which is beyond Nirvikalpa samadhi. And that is called Sahaja. S.A.H. A.J. A. And that means the natural state. And so a great master Great One might almost call him an avatar like Sri Ramana. Who lived in fear of animal law and in my dress died about oh I suppose twenty years ago. He spent a certain time sitting in

meditation but on the whole he sat back and read the new. Paper and. Write in his account in a compound. And hundreds of pilgrims would come from all over. And they would sit around in practice meditation they would occasionally ask him questions and he gave that what he was doing was called giving Darshan. Darshan meaning view he's on view and he's as and he's just as much an object of veneration as a put image. But he returned back on his couch and read the Hindustan Times and ate meals and carried on an everyday life because he was in the state so harder which means that he lives that can live the life of a perfectly ordinary person. And there so that in the same way many people who have undertaken Zen training. And gone through the whole thing they don't become Zen masters they just disappear. And they might be scientists or shoemakers or what have you in the formal way most of them being priests sons which is not to get an idea go go on to be priests take over their father's temples but many people who have completed Zen training just disappear. And indeed that's considered a very good thing to do, because you don't leave a track. The Buddha once in the dumb a part or likened the way of an enlightened person to the path of a bird through the sky it leaves no trace and as an poem says, entering the forest, he does not disturb the blade of grass entering the water he does not make a ripple. And there was one Zen Master very it was very much respected Bankei, who was a contemporary of Hakuin. Now, Hakuin dominates the Rinzai Zen to this day seventeenth century. His method. Bankei was a contemporary go in left eighty successors Bankei left none. And Bankei is that a little bit admired for this city he didn't as this and saying he didn't raise waves when no wind is blowing. So that kind of trace listeners. They would say you know it takes one to know one and if. The maybe a pope or someone who everybody else thinks is just ordinary like themselves but then man would perceive that he was was and like and. So, that roughly describes the cost. Of Raja Yoga meditation. And. It's not always easy to know just in what sense this is to be taken whether the thing is how far it's symbolic how far it's literal young always took it in history in a very symbolic sense of not referring to anything that had actually a connection with the spinal cord or the brain. I feel the truth is somewhere in between. And that this is a way of doing things. My own experiments especially with psychedelics that lead me to believe that there's really something in it. But that it's like all these things. When you study medieval European medicine., you find out all these there's a doctrine of signatures.

Say somebody has got as of a sour disposition wells and suddenly he needs sugar. Or because a sudden flower has that bloom or a leaf that corresponds to him by resemblance to certain parts of the human body then that's a medicine for those parts when they're affected one of the funniest things is that one of the very few really effective drugs we have is aspirin and the way aspirin was discovered. Was that. It was reason that in swampy land where people would contract that humors you would find the appropriate drugs for curing those that humor. Cause it was always said that next to the poison you found the healing. There's of course again the two supplements sitting on the could uses one of the poisonings up and one of the legs up. So they dug around in marshy land and of course willows grow in marshy land and from willows you get salicylic acid which is Aspen. And it was that was how it was found out and it was for reasons which today we would consider absurd.

So, the modern scientist looks at these old mumbo jumbo those, not entirely with disrespect. But chairs. There must be something in it. What in for example in some frightful stew that one is advised to make up with a rope from the gallows and boiled knew. What was the active ingredient what was essential and so I look at these things over these ancient methods of meditation and I asked whether they really doing. What is the essential ingredient? Because now we can we have that many many ways of looking at all this physiological neurological psychological pharmacological. And perhaps derive from all this, a yoga that is appropriate for Western man in the twentieth century. And perhaps very much more efficient this like a technology is a very efficient technology. So, what one sees then going on is a process of a person becoming aware of a world, which is far far richer. Than the world as he ordinarily knows it. Why is this? Because the world as ordinarily known is being screened. And the major screening activity. Results from the fact that throughout our lives we are taught what to experience. And we are not altogether too aware. That what is experience depends on certain social regulations. There are experiences which are taboo. There are experiences which really aren't allowed. And as we are brought up. In the same way that we are taught about gestures. There are certain gestures which are considered uncouth. Vulgar, hostile you don't do that see so in exactly the same way experiences is regulated. So, it's like the old joke about the psychiatrist saying to a person well do you ever have

strange thoughts. Do you ever have weird feelings. You know everybody had strange thoughts and weird feelings. Because, the input from exteroceptive and proprioceptive sense organs is colossal. And now we ordinarily say and people commonly put it like this. You can't deal with all that input because there's too much of it and it's too complicated. Now that's not true. It is only too much and too complicated when you try to analyze it and translate it into words. See, let's take a flower. How many things other in a flower? Well it depends how many you want to count. It depends how long you want to spend splitting it up. And analyzing it under a microscope and giving names to all the Wiggles. From another point of view, there aren't any things in a flower. It's all perfectly simple, but that doesn't mean it's not wiggly. Yes, it wiggles very much. But that doesn't make it complicated so when you try to understand it that is to say translated into words of figures then the flower becomes complicated the flower isn't complicated the process of translating it is complicated. So in the same way, how many things you are aware of when you're aware of this room? Well it depends on how you want to count the things now you play that game where you put a lot of objects spalls of thread of found in a bottle of medicine, saucer and a thimble on a plate and so on you expose it for a moment person looks at it then you cover it how many can they write down. That's not the same thing as awareness. That's simply a kind of intellectual dexterity. But this awareness is quite different from that it isn't counting things at all. But it comes up you see, when the mind is quiet and when the process of 'thing-king' which is the way we manufacture things is suspended. Then of course if you're not thinking about the world the difference between the no or in the known simply disappears because that's conceptual in the nirvikalpa our non-conceptual staid there is no difference also in a way there's no unity because unity is also a concept. That's what is meant by the Zen word mu. It doesn't mean nothing. It means. No thing. Neither one thing nor many things there's another call on saying when the many are reduced to the one to watch of the one be reduced. It's also called the state of things is called. In Sanskrit Tathata, which means proximately, vastness, that-ness or such ness. And that's something that comes out very powerfully in these states of consciousness. Now I have to explain it if I can. It's very easy to understand and very difficult to explain. When a baby is first born, the first sound it makes is 'ta'. And males and fathers and their vanity I think it's saying that it. That it is not saying that it's saying that.

Look at something. So the word tathata in Sanskrit is really that. Like we have the other in Western art I was some kind of feeling after this. Now what is such an it's. Well you can say it's just the way things are. But it's a little more than that and let me try and illustrate it. When you talk to someone, they understand the meaning of what you say. And it to change takes place. And I am going to ask the question. The process of talking. Making sounds that have a meaning conveys information to someone else. Or to yourself. The question is, what does it mean that we do that. Well it doesn't mean anything. Why should it? Words have a meaning but that doesn't that cause it that of the whole process including words but the process itself wasn't a word. It was a dance. So you look at nature! Why, you know, you hear all these trees reaching out and leaves absolving things and all the little creatures running around and breeding their family and then they eventually disappear just as a breath has to go out in order to come back in and so they disappear into the soil and then the new little generations of the same things which is the this is kind of a dozen. All over again it comes out and they wiggle around and they eat and they breed their families and so little of a little bit of it all is going on and when you look at it in that way you are seeing it from the standpoint of such ness that's just, it's the jazz. And you see everything is just like that. And. When you do anything happens you sort of stop panicking about it. And so you say well it it just does the whole thing doesn't have any meaning. In the West, that sounds like a put down because we say everything has that meaning you must do something meaningful. Why of course we say that because we're completely hypnotized with words. And so, if you do something that has no meaning people say you're crazy It means you're not acting in accordance with the order of concepts. But lots of people love it they get a little get away with doing things that are completely meaningless but they but they managed to give the impression that they're very important. Take music for example. Music from a practical point of view is a total waste of time. It doesn't do anyone it you know doesn't feed anyone unless you make money by playing music but music as such you see has. Absolutely that it you make the sum and it disappears it's not like a product that you can bring out and slap it on the counter and there it is you know. And that's the best music has no meaning. It doesn't represent anything it doesn't convey any particular message the medium is the message in music. And so were all these people blowing through to certain complicatedly lucky little patterns

of. Pulling strings and and hitting on drums and making blasts through trumpets. And why, everybody can say anybody who is anybody has to go to the symphony and contribute to its maintenance for all these weird people. Blowing through tubes. And this gentleman and greater power all gets up in front of them all you know and the conductor is a great orchestra leader and he comes out of a very ritualistic way and waves it that hung and sort of leads all these people and keeps them together and makes this fantastic blast. Of us all out of the. Well, it's culture. You could describe music as an addiction. To a very very hallucinatory state of consciousness called Cord-itis. And even worse what this is going to Logic's. And but you see that the whole world is like that. So then, there's another form of meditation I'm going to go into that's related to music and it's called mantra yoga. Actually you see, in India the principle yoga is the first Raja Yoga the royal yoga. Then this come on yoga, karma, action. Yoga being practiced through all the pursuit of one's professional vocation. Whether it's position housewife University professor shoemaker whatever. Next comes between you and I yoga which is a kind of intellectual yoga. It doesn't go through all those chakra things it's a very direct yoga. Represented by the Vedanta by the doctrines of Sankar. Then there's bakti yoga, which is usually a vice Navarra thing in others or the worshippers of Vishnu and they like to concentrate on devotion so back to means the yoga of devotion of love. Christianity is bakti yoga. The devotion to Christ. The beloved with the divine is always called the beloved and buck to yoga. Dennis Hopper yoga which is not so much a way of liberation as a very elaborate system of physical exercises passed years ago. All the complexities of breathing and so on then there is Mantra Yoga. Mantra yoga then is the use of sound as the method of. Arriving at the near a week out of thoughtlessness. And this is a for many people a very good way indeed. Because for some reason or other. Sound will concentrate you more than vision. It's much easier to give your whole attention into a hum. Than it is to stare at or to keep your eyes fixed on a certain point. Or even than to just watch your breath. Because sound has a little more activity in it it is a stronger vibration than just breath. And so, the the mantra means, a single syllable or a seek shot sequence of syllables, which are chanted in a certain way. Even out loud or subvocally in your imagination. Usually gurus of who you work with mantras will give each individual his own Mundra. Yes he does he says in mantra yogi. Are in the same way that as an teacher will give each person his own special can't

and you're not supposed to tell anyone else what your column is or what your mantra is. Now I vaguely suspect a little bit of hocus pocus that if I do know the point in the in the car on which is that. If the students start discussing their cars together well it lends to a little bit of cheating. But I don't see how that would be so with the mantra perhaps the idea is that when you've got a secret. You've got something sacred sacred secrets. And, that may be it. But anyway, you have to say the basic mantra is the word aum. And that is used because. Fully spelled in Sanskrit, it is A U M. And that starts you see are is right at the back of the throat the little comes up and is with the lips so you got the whole range of sound in that word and therefore it represents the universe the whole energy of the universe. And so if you hum own. It sets out of but beautiful thing is great to do it in a circle of people. By staggering it. It goes on all the time. You can get it on a tape and listen to it that way.

Now, the Buddhists extend that into the mantra. Um Mani Padme Hum. And that means very little. Um means everything, mani means jewel, padme means Lotus, om means it's sort of an explanation. And, they will hum this very very slowly. Taking a full breath on every syllable. And keep keep doing this. They'll often ring gongs and things along with it. And you can get well like that. Is just great. Then they have the Hindu is often used polish the last big amount try like that Howdy Krishna How do you Don but I'm a Christian I read on. Die die die. Die die die I'm. Howdy how he how do you how do you things like that and I and. This in the fella call Harry if it. Means one of the names of God. Now, he has to say the trouble for Americans is the pope's a man of the world you can't slap on the back and called Barry. But anyway, doing that is mantric. Now in exactly the same way, the Christians have used mantra look in the Eastern Orthodox Church there is a way of meditation which is called hesychasm. And is used by the say the monks of Mount Athos and of Russiam and it simply consists of what is called The Jesus prayer. And it is simply the endless repetition of the name of Jesus. And they describe all the cycle physical symptoms that will follow for this the change of temperature the warm feeling in the heart all sorts of things like that but that's what it is is the effect of going on and on and on and on and on and on like this then in the in the western church there are mantras to. Say why does a priest say as your penance say five Hail Mary's Well you know how I'll marry a set. Now that I guess about it I don't know

if I was of and I don't know if it was about that. And. If that is the slightest attention to the meaning of the words. In the same way with it with. For centuries and centuries the mass was always on my side in Latin which was a very good idea because nobody paid any attention to what it means. It's meaning that gets in the way. And this awful translation of the mass into English is ruining the whole Catholic Church. Because everybody discovers what it means and it's just terrible. So then they worked out the Gregorian chant which is a very powerfully monophonic chant. Even though unlike the eastern chant it has a much more melodic structure. Whereas, the eastern chant keeps up a pretty steady beat. All the syllables. Pretty much the same sound you know it but done. As an on the down be so. On and on. Be. Me that be. That I me be as out on. And so on. In the West you know your get. It moves along in a small little ting way but. You will see that as the difference between the traditional Western chant and say a mass by Bach or Beethoven's Missa Solemnis. Because there is no doubt when you hear the the mass in B. minor that it was written by Bach. The style is right there ,and Beethoven of course. Well now, mantrians say no, well that's not good. Because it's still much attached to a particular personal style. And the role of the of the chant is to depersonalize. It has likened to this that when you chant you become a flute. And the Holy Spirit blows through you. So it's the God of himself that's blown. When you sing the chant. And therefore an impersonal form is given to it. And so you will hear when monks chant the Psalms. They keep up an absolutely I'm very in its At first you think it's monotonous but it will go I mean in any in any in the the. Meaning you need any meaning the you need anything any meaning the I got here Part three and spirit is tall so you could add in principio sampled upper arm you know sake it was less Thank you a lot and you know just on and on and on like that I'm not very good singing this morning.

But, yeah you'll keep that up you go say to the the Holy Week service of Tenebrae in a monastic church. When they have a service that goes on for about three hours. And it slowly gets darker and darker as they put out all the lights but this rhythm is keeping up all the time until it gets completely black Well you ask Stoned by the end of that. Those monks are not thinking about what it all means. They're practicing contemplation if they know anything about it there. And they are slowly coming to what is the Christians call the divine darkness or, the Cloud of Unknowing. And that is

the same thing as need of a cult personality. It is the adoration of God without any concept or image of God in your mind. And really nobody has ever been able to explain it because the moment you open your mouth you bring in words and the state itself doesn't have any words. Now, because beyond that the mantra go get take me in an electronic age can be vastly souped up. You can get a continuous electrical note. And work on that. You can get a stroboscopic light. And work on that one. You can get revolving moray patterns. And look at those. You can get fascinated with an oscilloscope. There are endless things that can be done to facilitate meditation by technological means. A few warnings. Don't, don't push it too hard ever. Take it easy. Stop If you anything you do gives you a headache or seems to strain your eyes or if you start getting buzzing in the ears. Don't over do any breathing exercises never strain your breath. There is an exercise called kumbhaka. Kumbhaka is simply...retention of the breath. People do when it's moving part that practicing. But actually it don't ever keep up kumbhaka too long. You'll start reeling because you'll get sort of hyper oxygenation. And then people when they do breathing they tend to exit emphasize the out breath. And maybe that's a little bit better for us because when you relax you sort of give a sigh of relief. When you're frightened you suck your breath in and the breath the in breath is more tense of the outbreath more relaxing, and what they would say in Zen is do the out-breath and don't pay any attention to the in-breath, it will come back by itself. And so I would say in general don't overstrain anything in the meditation process now you see that the object of all these gimmicks. Is that they are like a clever teacher catching people's attention. In order to get them make it easy to understand the subject. So they are all of them crutches or spectacles or gadgets to help still the mind. There are those like Krishnamurti the won't have anything to do with them because he says if you make your mind still it is of if fake it's not natural stillness and he says natural stillness can come only by observing, being aware of all the job mind is doing without judgement without criticism without interference until in the course it will just give up and then it's naturalist ill. And of course there's a good deal to be said for that but I'm rather open minded about all these things and I say each man to his own way.

Thusness

Now, the title of the seminar is a very strange word translatable into English as thusness or suchness, in Sanskrit, tathata. This is based on the Sanskrit word tat which is Etymologically the root of our word that. And its supposed in India you see, that this is the first word that a baby says. We all know babies say da da da, and in our highly paternalistic culture it's assumed that the baby is addressing its father and so does our means father. But in India which is, where the cultures anciently were matriarchal, it didn't even mean mother but da which was the fundamental word of all words it is the baby pointing to it and saying that. Because when the baby wakes up and the... as I said last night and aperture through which the all looks at everything the great and proper exclamation is when it sees it is to say duck and so. Is that about. And it means just exactly that. In the same way as there was a dot a school of painting in the West because they wanted to go beyond words and names because they died I would argue when you call a dog a dog doesn't sound anything like a dog Psalms or shot in French sounds nothing like a dog but if you called a dog one that would be a proper name for a dog.

So, this is a fundamental word. And we have great difficulty in translating it because in a way it's a meaningless word. Now then, in order to understand the subject properly I must not take too much for granted. I have to give you some introduction to Buddhism because this is all part of Buddhist philosophy, and Buddhism finds its context in the philosophy of India. And we have to go first of all very thoroughly into what Buddhism is about. And the first thing I want you to understand about Buddhism that very few people do understand is that Buddhism does not have a doctrine in the same sense that Christianity has a doctrine. There could be no such thing as a Buddhist creed. The word dharma D H A R M A in Sanskrit, which describes what Buddhism is Buddhism is called the Buddha dharma. Dharma means method. Not doctrine, not law it's often translated law that won't do it all. Dharma sometimes means function. The function of somebody his svadharma, means roughly what we would call his vocation. The hallmark can also mean. In a peculiar way a thing, a basic portion of the world, a thing or event. But its primary meaning as used in the phrase Buddha dharma, is method. And so Buddhism is a method for something or other.

And so, for this reason, all Buddhism is a dialectic. A discussion, an interchange between a preceptor or guru or teacher. And his student between the Buddha and his disciples. Now what is it about first of all the word Buddha comes from a Sanskrit root budh, B U D H. And budh means to be awake. So it is a person who is awake. It is therefore a title, it's not a proper name. And it's not the name of a divinity. There are many many gods recognised angels we might rather call them in Buddhism. But they are regarded as being inferior to a Buddha the gods are not yet fully awakened. Buddhism divides the world into six divisions. And this is very important for understanding what's it about. You don't have to take these six divisions literally because they may equally well refer to states of human consciousness. But the six divisions are like this you see you draw the circle of the wheel of life. And in the top section of the circle you have the Deva world. And Deva from which we get our word devil, actually means the angels. In that the reason is this that when the the Iranians had battles with the Aryans, the Northern Indians, the Northern Indians called their gods Deva. So the Persians insulted them by using that word for devils. And then they had here Asura, who are in this division and these are spirits of wrath, and so opposite in passion are who are our mother is a lot of light. Because they were enemies but so here are the Devas on top and next to them on this side are the the powers of Divine. Wrath in the sense of energy vigor. And below opposite the devas are the NACA and those are the purgatory that's where everybody is as unhappy as they can possibly be. Here are animals in this section. Here are men and women. And here are things called pretas. Pretas are frustrated spirits with very large stomachs and very small mouths. Now this is the rat race of existence of all the Samsara, in Sanskrit, Samsara, the round of birth and death. And this is the nadir, I mean this is the zenith, and this is the nadir. This is as high as you can get that's as low as you can get and that's always going to happen to you while you work on the principle of a squirrel cage. That is to say so long as you are trying to make progress you will go up. But up always implies down. So while you are trying to get better and better and better that means that when you get to the best you can only go on to the worst. And so you go round and round and round ever chasing the illusion that there is something outside yourself, outside your here and now, to be attained that will make things better. And the thing is to recover from that illusion so a Buddha would mean somebody who has woken up and discovered that

running around this thing. Maybe fun and it may be good to run around but if you think you're going to get something out of it you're under illusion because you're forever the donkey with a carrot suspended from his own halter.

Now then, it goes on to say that there's only one place one point in this wheel, from which you can become a Buddha, and that's here. The devas are too happy to become Buddhas, or to worry about becoming a Buddha. The pretas are too miserable. The Asuras are too angry, the animals are too dumb and the predators too frustrated only in the middle position the position of man which is you could say the equal position the position of sufficient equanimity to begin to think about getting off this rat race only from there you see it can you become a Buddha. So the position of a Buddha may be represented either as not on the wheel at all or is right in the middle of it. It makes no difference. And so he is just as in a way the axle point, The Still Point of the turning world as to use T.S. Eliot's phrase is the unmoved center of the Unmoved Mover the primo mobile, the axletree of the world all thought the navel that's why yogis are said to contemplate their navel the navel isn't on their tummy it's this place. The navel of the world. So that's the scheme of cosmology. Of Ancient Indian cosmology in which Buddhism arises. So you see that for a Buddha is one who awakens from the illusion of some sorrow. That is, from the thought that there is something to get out of life. That tomorrow will bring it to you that in the course of time it will be all right. And therefore, one is set pursuing time, as if you were trying to quench your thirst by drinking salt water. Now I can exemplify this a little more strongly by relating Buddhism to the social system in which it arose. A Buddhist Monk is sometimes called a Sramana. This is closely allied to the word Shaman. And a shaman is the Holy Man in a culture that is still hunting it isn't settled it isn't agrarian. There is a very strong and important difference between a shaman and a priest. A priest receives his audience nation from his superiors. He receives something from a tradition which is handed down. A shaman doesn't. He receives his in lightened by going off into the forest by himself. To be completely alone. A shaman is a man in other words, who has undergone solitariness. He's gone away into the forest to find out who he really is, because it's very difficult to find that out while you're with other people. And the reason is that other people are busy all the time telling you who you are. In many

many ways, by the laws they impose on you by the behavior ruts they set on you, by the things they tell you by the fact that they always call you by your name and by the fact that when you live among people you have to be in a state of ceaseless chatter. But if you want to find out who you are before your father and mother conceived you, who you really are, you almost have to go off by yourself. And go into the forest and stop talking even stop thinking words. And be absolutely alone. And listen to the great silences. And then if you're lucky, you recover from the illusion that you're just a little me the so and so, and you attain the state of nirvana, which means the blown-out state. The relieved state the sigh of relief. Nirvana may be translated into English as phew. I've at last discovered that I don't have to survive. I can survive of course but I don't really have to. Because you discover you see that what you really are doesn't have to survive because it's what there is. The real you is it, or that, tat tvam asi, the Hindu say. So then. In the normal life of India. Which is not a hunting culture but a settled culture. There are priests. But there is something beyond the priest. That is to say when a man or woman has fulfilled his or her life in the world of society. It's the normal thing to do for a person to quit their status in society and become what's called a forest dweller. That is almost, you see, to go back to the hunting culture. Bait it would divide people into two classes agree hostile which means householder and Vanna Prosper which means forest dweller. And the older people will hand over their occupations. And positions to their children and into the state of Vannaprasta at their whim or become a trauma and go outside the stockade I'm speaking metaphorically they sometimes do actually they sometimes don't and become a nobody. They give up their name. That is to say, the label which designates who they are in terms of caste or class. They become unclassified people. That's why, strictly speaking, you see, Hinduism and Buddhism are not religions you can classify the religions you can say what's your denomination that does Methodist Catholic Presbyterian Episcopalian Quaker cetera et cetera et cetera you see. But strictly speaking a van a prostitute a shaman A has no label he is a labeled bottle.

So, in the time when the Buddha lived about six hundred B.C., the Hindu system had become somewhat decadent. It isn't altogether clear what had happened to it, but it was certain that it did seem in some way to be in need of reform. And so, there were many reasons for this. And the Buddha as a

young man, being basically troubled by the great problems that we are all troubled with. The problem of suffering. And the problem of what all this universe is about he endeavored to follow the methods that were then being used by people who were prominent as. Vanna prospers far as well as and at that time it's very apparent that the main method that these people were using was an ascetic discipline. Starvation, very arduous meditation practices. Probably self flagellation and things of that kind. And it said that for seven years he practiced these austerity is. But he found out that they didn't lead to liberation and all the people who were practicing them knew they didn't either but they felt that that was only because they weren't doing it hard enough. And so he propounded instead the middle way. The way that led to liberation from the rat race that I've drawn, neither through austerities, nor through pleasure seeking. So these are the two ways the two paths the people who say. The whole point of life is to enjoy it to get the most out. It you see and the other people who tried that and then they found it was sour grapes or something you know or they burned their fingers in the pursuit of pleasure. The girl that was so beautiful eventually fell apart [was] turned into a shrew and whatever it was. So they said instead let us torment ourselves. A lot of people enjoy this or get something special out of it I was in Mexico this summer and what I went there for was to study Mexican Catholicism, where they make a great cult of suffering. And I was very puzzled about this and wanted to understand it and everywhere you know they have these ghastly tormented Christs, all drooling with blood hanging on the crosses in very contorted positions. And I realized certain people who find that the sitting on the tip of a spike is the realest place in the world. Because when you're on the tip of a spike, you know you're there. There's no doubt about it and also you know that your expiating for everything this somehow by sitting on that's on the spike you are paying for your guilt and so long as you hurt you're all right. So these sramanas were doing something of the same kind. And the Buddha became enlightened, became a Buddha he woke up at the moment when he gave up that kind of quest the moment he gave up as we should say trying to take the kingdom of heaven by storm. Now what does this mean? It means, that in his time, the way of liberation had become competitive, which meant it was on the wrong track. There are a lot of people who we call it the holier than thou attitude but we find it today with some objectionable Westerners who go over to Japan to studies Zen Buddhism and then come home and brag about

the great disciplines they've undergone. And say I sat with my legs crossed in one position for ten hours as distinct from somebody else who only sat for five. And always, there's this tendency you know, to have a marathon and be in a competition with others or with oneself about these things. But the moment you do that you're back on the wheel. The best thing you can get by asceticism is to get up to the Deva world you can't get anywhere else by it. You may get down to the narakaworld by asceticism too. Read the story of Thais by Anatole France.

So he found you see that the real path. The middle way. The meaning of the middle way is that it's the path that can't be followed. Because to get you on to the middle way I have to get into a dialogue with you you see and you say to me because after all it's always the student that raises the problem not the teacher. You say, Well now what's the right thing to do. I say back to you why are you looking for the right thing to do. And then you have to consider your situation where you are. And you say, well I'm looking for the right thing to do because I feel that I'm in the wrong situation I don't have peace of mind. Why do you want peace of mind? Because my mind is disturbed. That in other words you as a disturbed mind are trying to find peace of mind your quest for peace of mind is the same thing as having a disturbed mind. Now, if you don't have a disturbed mind, you won't ask for peace of mind. Well, how can I quote my mind why are you asking to quiet your mind because it's disturbing you see where you are. So in this way by this dialogue the guru the teacher brings a person back to center. So then, this is the point all Buddhist teaching is a dialogue. Really and truly, the man who goes out and leaves society and becomes a monk is it a little bit too much. Buddhism involves this act as a preliminary gesture, but what it comes to in the end is the position of what's called a bodhisattva. A bodhisattva means somebody who went out of society. Or we should say gave up the world in some way took on the the robe took on the discipline. He found what he was looking for but his finding it was absolutely simultaneous with his coming back into society. And he's called a bodhisattva. As distinct from a Pratyeka Buddha, which means a private buddha, one who goes out and doesn't come back. And the Bodhisattva is considered as having is superior payment. Superior insight.

So the important thing to remember then is Buddhism is a dialogue. And its teaching is a method, and not a doctrine. Now the teaching of Buddhism is summed up in what are called the Four Noble Truths. The truth of suffering. The truth about the origin of suffering. The truth about the ceasing of suffering. And the truth about the way to the ceasing of suffering. DUKHA is in the Sanskrit word we translate suffering. Discord, frustration something like that that's always the problem you see and this because of suffering is the reason why human beings seek out teachers and saviors. I hurt, and I don't want to hurt. So that's the the universal problem you see that everybody brings. So then, the teacher replies to this problem. Programme that by saying my problem. You suffer because you crave things. T R I S H N A We from which we get our word first thrishna, craving or desire, is the cause of suffering that claim I'm going to die are you. Now the Buddhist analyze is this that. The world is Dukha that all of us ration and it's also characterized by in the prominence Anita. And by. I. Non-entity in this. That means that no thing exists independently. Everything is a thing only in relation to everything else therefore there are no separate things no real selves or souls or egos. And trying to cling to the world, which is necessarily changing, trying to have a separate self and to protect it. All these things are thrishna. They are the cause of dukha. So the teachers having said this then the student comes back and says Well how do I get rid of Trishna. If Trish not desire is the cause of suffering couldn't I get rid of desire so as not to suffer. And the teacher says well you try. And this then is the first part of the discipline to try and not to desire. To calm your mind. To practice centering to practice getting rid of all what they call Klesha K L E S A, disturbing thoughts distractions evil passions, immoderate appetites, and come to a picture or it can imitate of mind. And so the student practices that. And this is a very difficult an arduous discipline and all the time he sees the teacher watching him of the slightly sour expression on his face. And he knows of course, or thinks he knows that the teacher is fully aware of his inmost thoughts because you know it's the Indian way they go to meeting with the teacher and the teacher says. It's under a tree and smokes a cigarette or a pipe or something and all the students sit around a cross legged and they they meditate and sometimes the teacher meditates and they can see him occasionally looking at them like this you know. And they think uh-oh, the teacher knows what I'm thinking. Because he has the power of infinite vision you see and all seeing this and

this bugs them completely. Because you see you remember how it was in school when you were trying to do something the teacher walked around and looked over your shoulder. It puts you off completely. And so, the Hindu teacher, or the Buddhist teacher, deliberately puts his students off. And finally he raises in their minds an insoluble problem. That if you are trying to stop desire so that you will not suffer, aren't you still desiring to stop desire? All the students may very well find that out for themselves and they say to the teacher but how are we to stop desire when we're desiring to stop desire. So then the teacher can engage them in [an] extremely marvelous trap. Which is to say. He can he can play it in a number of different directions one direction is to say well, don't try to stop all desire. But try to stop as much desire as you can stop. You see where this is going to go. Then they're going to say well, I'm a little excessive about desiring to stop desire. Well, if you're naturally excessive about it he says try to be as us. Likely excessive as you can see. Now do you see what's leading here? If you follow that course, you are being brought to center. In the same way as I demonstrated before. You are being brought to yourself, to accept yourself as you are here and now totally. But you can't do that directly. Because if you try to accept yourself you will always find that in yourself there is a spirit of the non acceptance of things and you have to accept that. So the teacher would say, don't try to accept yourself more than you can accept yourself except yourself as much as you can accept yourself. Because then you see, you are also accepting the part of you that doesn't accept. Or, he may try on another tack he may say. All right now if you've seen that it's, that desiring not to desire is simply another form of desire. You're trying for example, to get rid of your sensuous appetites. You are going to give up booze and women and. Or whatever it may be. And you then think well now, yes this I must do. And eventually. You find that you are becoming proud of your success in mastering your appetites. And you're beginning to depend on that. So the teacher says, Do you see you're in the same trap as you always were. Formally you sought spiritual security in booze and women and so on now you are seeking it in holiness. Formerly, you bound yourself with chains of iron now you are bound with chains of gold. Formerly, you boasted to all the boys how many sins you committed. Now, your boasting before the lot of how many virtues you have same trap. Why do you do it. So, the student eventually finds there's no way at all. To not desire. Even desiring not to desire is desiring. Even

trying to accept oneself is a way of trying to escape from one's self because one hopes psychotherapeutic clear that by accepting yourself you will get rid of your nasty symptoms. So you're not accepting them you're not accepting them by the gimmick by the pretense of trying to accept them. So this is the way, in which the dialogue of Buddhism begins to work. And as it progresses step-by-step. Let me try and show you a little bit more how it works because I'm shortening it enormously, in order to give you an outline of the whole thing what is going on between the teacher and the student the Buddha and his disciples is not merely a dialogue. There is the verbal dialogue else that goes on but there are also it spread over a long period of time. And in the intervals the students are practicing meditations. They are making efforts to control their minds and emotions, and practicing those things which are the Buddhist equivalents of yoga.

So that, in parallel to the intellectual discussion that is going on, there is a total devotion of one's whole being to a quest. Morning, noon and night. And so you see this works up to a very considerable. Psychic alertness it makes the student put a very considerable psychic investment in the task. And as he goes on you see he becomes more and more frustrated. Because as the trap closes. And he finds that it's impossible to do the right thing because the right thing is always done for the wrong reason. When the wrong man uses the right means the right means work in the wrong way. You see. There is something you could do to attain liberation or as the Christian would say union with God. If you could do it. But the Christian would say by reason of original sin you can't because through Original Sin everybody is basically selfish and you can't be unselfish for a selfish reason but you have only selfish reasons. So to him that hath shall be given. But of course he doesn't need it. From him that hath not be taken away even that which you have. Poor fellow what is he to do. So you see in this way, the teacher closes a trap on the student where he finds himself completely impotent. Not only can he not do anything that will bring about his salvation, he is also unable not to do anything. One might say, you must do nothing. You must be completely passive, but you can't do that because the moment you try to be passive you are doing something. So you get into the state which they call in Zen Buddhism a mosquito biting and iron bull. Or as we would say, in our Western idiom the state when the irresistible force meets the immovable object. Where something must be done but simply

cannot be done. And in this state of maximum frustration. There is an opportunity. To understand the situation. To understand. That I. The meaning of the state I cannot do I cannot not do. The meaning of this state is that the separate I thought yourself to be is an illusion that's why it cannot do and why it cannot not do. You see, what is are I, our ego? Sometime in the development of man, maybe three four or five thousand years ago. We developed self consciousness in a peculiar way. We began to realize that by directed thought, we could control our environment. And then it was, you see, that we had a sense of responsibility let's just assume for the sake of argument that there was a time when nobody deliberated they did exactly what they felt like. When you were hungry, you ate. When you were thirsty, you drank. When you were angry, you hit something. When you were happy, you downs but you never stopped to think what was the right thing to do. You just trusted your intuition your instincts your unconscious or whatever it might be called. Well that was great because nobody wanted. Nobody had any problems when it was like that. See a baby is in the same situation today. Now maybe you were unsuccessful maybe the thing you did spontaneously was absolutely the wrong thing and the tiger ate you up well that was all right because it really doesn't matter if the tiger eats you up so long as you want spending a previous time worrying about it see everybody dies and if you die clunk like that that's that you don't spend all your life before you die worrying about death you don't spend all your time before you get sick worrying about getting sick. And when you see you move on that level of unpremeditated spontaneous behavior that's the golden age. And the reason people look back with nostalgia for the golden age is because that was the time of irresponsibility. That when people began to see that they could provide for the future, and that they could look after things and take care of and direct everything, immediately anxiety came into the world. So that was the fall of man.

Because then the moment you start doing that you begin to think now having thought this question through and decided that such and such is the right thing to do have I thought it over carefully enough. Now that's a real bugaboo of a question. You know you go out of the house and you wonder did I turn off the gas stove. I think counted but on the other hand I'm not quite sure that's go back and see so having gone about five blocks to work back yes you did turn it off so you go out again. And you wonder again,

now I wonder if I really looked, or whether I was so keen on finding out that I did turn it off that some sort of wishful thinking about it diverted my consciousness and whether I hadn't better check that I really did look properly or see well this way you never get away you're trapped. So this you see is the problem of all self-conscious beings. They are they feel responsibility and then they feel responsible for being responsible and responsible for being with sponsible for being responsible and there's no end to it. So when in this obscure way everybody wants to get back to the Golden Age. But they say, if I just acted as I felt and was completely spontaneous, goodness only knows what would happen. Jesus you see, said to do that. He did, and everybody reads it in the King James Bible where it means nothing. Take no thought for the morrow, watch you should eat, what you should drink and wherewithal you should be clothed. Consider the lives of the field how they grow toil not neither the days. But I say unto you that Solomon in all his glory was not a raid like one of these I have God so the grass of the field which today is and tomorrow is cast into the oven shall he not much more close you oh ye of little faith or I mean it sounds lovely read in church. But what it says. Her bosses know that's that's the summit on the mountain that's not practical nobody can do that maybe for a few saints but after all in our practical life was of practicing Christians in the modern world we can't do that kind of thing. Well. Isn't that funny. Why can't you do it I mean that's the real reason for saying it in the first place Jesus said many very strange things. For example, in the parable of the Pharisee in the publican, how the Pharisee goes up into the front row. And says how good he is and that he has fulfilled all his obligations and pay the ties and then there's this this publican who goes into the back and sits there and beats his breast and says God be merciful to me of sin and Jesus says now that man, was the Right man, he was justified, but the moment he's told that story everybody creeps into the back row and says God be merciful to me a sinner and they're all in the front row again but I'm nobody can do it, you see that's why the story is told in the same way he says Take no thought for the morrow, stop being anxious like going to a psychiatrist he said you don't want any stopping novus. Can you see nobody can. And also they find out to see that really in the end nobody can be God. Nobody can make life any better by being responsible about it. Because whatever you gain in that direction you lose at the same time. By being responsible, we've created civilization medicine care of the poor, everything, but what a headache the

thing is becoming. As we solve all our problems we make more problems every problem you solve gives you ten new problems I'm not saying don't do that but don't think you're going to get anywhere by doing that. That's one way of arranging it, that's one kind of dance you can have is to improve everything and have technology but it doesn't really solve anything. And it's only in the moment you see, when you fully understand that your situation as a human being is completely insoluble. [That] there is no answer. And that you give up looking for the answer that's, that's Nirvana and that's how Buddhism works.

In the first session last night, I was making two principle points about the nature of Buddhism. Number one, that it's a dharma, or method. And it's method is a dialogue or what is sometimes called dialectic. It is basically a conversation. A dialogue. The beginning of which is not necessarily at all the same thing as the end. The reason is that the discovery which constitutes the foundation of Buddhism the experience of awakening can't be stated. Or at least, if it can be stated it can't be stated in such a way that the mere statement will communicate the experience to somebody else. The experience itself is the culmination of an adventure. And one has to go through that adventure in order to come to it. I've sometimes tried to describe this adventure as a *reductio ad absurdum* of one's own false views, through a process wherein the teacher makes you act consistently upon your false views so that you come to find out experimentally that they are false. And indeed one might say, Buddhism has nothing to teach. Nothing whatever. All it has to do is to get rid of illusions. And then the content of the experience happens when the illusions are gone just like the sun comes out when the clouds go away. But if you try to manufacture the Sun before the clouds have gone away you see what I mean? And you paint the sun on the side of the clouds it's not the real fun so in this way the speculation as such ideation as such, does not lead to the awakening experience.

So then, that this is this was the first point then that it's a dialogue and from the statements about Buddhism that you can read in books. You will discover only the opening phases of the dialogue. One of the methods that's used in this respect... People say, now Buddhism teaches that all things are subject to change nothing is permanent. Now that isn't exactly what Buddhism teaches. A more subtle scholar will tell you that the Buddha taught that the world is impermanent. In order to counteract. The wrong

view that it's permanent. And Buddhist teachers always work in oppositions. If a person asks you a question about philosophical matters, you should reply in terms of everyday matters. What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism? I have just finished washing the saucepans. Or the other way around, if a person asks you a worldly question you answer with a philosophical one. Please will you pass me the knife. And so the teacher passes it blade first. Please I want the other end. And what would you do with the other end. You see here, the metaphysics comes in in answer to the practical question. And so if once when our RH Blythe was a great Zen student was asked by some students do you believe in God He replied If you do I don't if you don't I do. So. When anything then is taught it's taught in order to counteract something muesli the Buddha taught that there was no self. And scholars have debated eternally whether he meant there was no ego. In the sense of the superficial. I centered on consciousness alone. Or whether he taught that there is no self in the more classical Hindu sense of the Atman. That is to say, the ultimate self, the divine final reality which is in everybody, which is the root and ground of all consciousness everywhere. And some people who see of thought that he denied that well he may very well have done so. But with the idea you see of correcting something. If you see a person believes that his basic self is divine and eternal and beyond all vices to. He may be leaving that for the very he may be believing that the very wrong reason. He may be believing in it as something to cling to. To give him a sense of security but so long as you have a sense of security and you feel safe you haven't got the point because it means you are still relying on something. And a Buddha is a man who doesn't depend on anything not because he's so tough and he's so strong. When you get a tough guy who says I'm not afraid of anything you try him out and you'll soon find he has limits. Everybody has his price. If you try hard enough. It doesn't you see a question of being strong. In the sense of tough. It's a question of knowing very clearly that there isn't anything to depend on. So you don't depend on things anymore. The only thing to depend on is what you really are but that's not something you can hang onto you see you can't catch hold of that you don't need to. The sun doesn't need to shine a light on the sun. So, by the exploration of the dialectic, the teacher, by talking this way, and talking that way, completely undermines you. That is to say, he digs out all the dirt from underneath you. And you drop or think you do, because you're used to having your out there but

when you are in fully in empty space there's nowhere to drop. That's why people get such a marvelous feeling when they go skin-diving and they get down below thirty feet or so and start to lose all sense of weight. Or when astronauts go out and start to lose weight in the middle of the space bubbles. You know what's going to happen? All those boys are going to get out there and then I want to come back. This is just great that's what happens to skin divers You see they don't have automatic controls on those things they're not too certain of getting the man back because when people go down skin diving and they stay down too long so you have to have a watch with you and or someone with a string on your foot something to know exactly when you've got to make the trip back you may have oxygen to last you a long time but you're going to go out of your mind because you will suddenly realize that nothing matters that everything is OK. I mean so what, supposing I do die, and the people take off their oxygen masks and presented to a fish. They have a drag. And they're so happy.

So you know the famous story when Suzuki was asked what is it like to have Satori, he said well it's just like ordinary everyday experience except about two inches off the ground. So. There is this peculiar thing a sense of you might say weightlessness, but you mustn't interpret that too literally. Some people interpret it so literally that they believe great mystics levitate. I remember when I was a little boy there was a famous Dean in England his name was Ralph W. Inge ING I think it's pronounced. And he wrote many books on Plotinus and mysticism, and one day he came to kind of preconceived rule and was sitting in the choir stall and I was sitting right near him and I noticed that all the time he was doing this. Other stick you know. But people said it was because he was always Bach to live it. To keep you stuck down. So, that levitation you see, just as if something in mystical experience. Like a sense of luminosity. Or a sense of transparency. It's very common there are two visions of the world to see that painters have had in history is the vision of let's say in our own western history the vision of JATO of Jericho and the vision of Rembrandt, but you see Rembrandt is full of shadows. Whereas the other painters are full of luminosity. And then you can get some painters who are not only full of shadows. But their paintings look as if they were all. Drawn just outside of Foster's freeze you know what a Foster freeze is? I don't know if you have them on the East Coast but you probably have the equivalent of the places where they sell ice

cream custard. And they sell them from a from a glass box which is all it inside with fluorescent light it's absolutely blue and coat and the customers all stand outside the glass box and on a chilly night we have there you see them all under this ghastly blue light, eating ice cream cones, and the men serve it to them through little windows like a theater ticket box and how people can go that's the idea of one of the cold Hells. But they do, and so what are some paintings some visions of the world that look as if they're seen under that light so that there is no light within things. Now, when you see the other painter who sees light in everything. Even shadows are full of color you notice with you because those work how full of light it is. And that's because the vision of the world, of the mystic, is always full of light. Only it isn't quite literal light it isn't as if. Everything was blazing or you may say that everything is transparent and it doesn't mean that he can see through your body or to the wall of the other person behind. It means that things are transparent because they're clear it has become clear a problem has disappeared that I thought was a real problem and now it is clear I can't tell you how it's clear but it is and that's what we're going to get to in finding out what vastness is when things are seen in the state of vastness all such that they are clear there is no further problem about them they are what they are and they do what they do. And if you can really penetrate that as we should go into it you will see the mystery cleared up. The mystery clears up when you get to the point that you don't know what questions to ask him all. The questions of vanished the problem has vanished. Now aside from the fact that Buddhism is a method, is a dialogue. I explain to you that it's a transformation of one state of consciousness. That's what awakening means. That is to say, it is a transformation of the way you see things. Almost I could say, the way you sense them. And in this respect I've often thought that the process of Buddhism is much more like ophthalmology than it's like religion. An ophthalmologist as a person who corrects field. Vision so that you see clearly. And so in exactly the same way awakening is to see clearly. A transformation of consciousness. Be careful of the implications that that word may have. Because it doesn't mean necessarily an ecstatic state of affairs, and it doesn't mean an unnatural or even strange state of affairs. I mean, you could imagine that if you put on blue glasses, you would for a while see everything looking blue. It isn't something like that at all. Or it isn't as if you saw everything in a different way like you suddenly put on the eyes of a fly you see, and

suddenly everything became multiple .You saw all this room of the people in it hundreds of times all at once it isn't something like that.

It's just that everything is the way it always was except it has a completely different meaning. And there is a curious connection between the experience of this and the understanding of it. First of all, there are really three steps in this kind of understanding. You might say there is in the first place, an intellectual comprehension of the getting of an idea. And what sort of idea do I mean? Let's take for example, the idea of a third dimension. To be aware of depth. If you look at things with one eye only, you see, you don't see depth. But if you look with two eyes then the dimension of depth appears. And once you, though have understood depth though you can see depths for example I don't look at things with two eyes at once I look either with my left eye or with my right eye and I don't have binocular vision, but I still see depth, because I understand it to be there and as a result of understanding it to be that I see it. If I understand clearly. I couldn't understand the nature of depth if I was just told looking at things that they have two dimensions but if I make an exploration and I handle the thing, and I understand what the third dimension is then I understand it more thoroughly I'm quite clear about it, and then as a result of being clear about it I see it. Now in the same way, people did at one time actually see believe it or not the crystal spheres in which the planets were supported. We would say, How did they see it if it was transparent? Well they saw it they knew it was up there. And it was there for all to see because naturally you can always see through crystal clear. To see people really think like that. And they see things if they're hypnotized into seeing them. Now then if you take the suggestion away. Then they won't. Or conversely, if you have the idea of a number system which is only one two three many. Nobody can see four things. They will see something that other people call fall but they won't see far they want to see many and four will be as many as five. They might begin then to have a concept of a little many in a big many. And a middle many. That's three again. They won't be able to get a little many. Not so little many, rather large many, very big Many You see they won't be able to do that so long as their number system is one two three many. So then it can never be a fact for such a person that a room has four corners. It has many corners are all three. But once you've got the idea of four then you can see that it has four corners. When I see the sun rising I know that

the sun isn't moving but the earth is turning. One has traveled enough in airplanes to see that for oneself and the the question then now is this if someone believes that the sun is rising and the earth is still when he looks at the sunrise is he seeing the same thing I'm seeing. I don't think he is. Because my seeing, has an entirely different interpretation on it than his seeing.

So, what you understand also determines what you see. So that's what's meant by a yana in yoga in India method of awakening through intellectual mind, through intellectual understanding. People say you can't get it intellectually that's partly true but only partly true. That means first of all. Well for example, the old Hindu saying that you cannot get wisdom through books is as I explained because. It's a dialogue but also it's because the books that exist are only notes. In other words all the sacred books are nothing more than memoranda just like the notation of Hindu music or it is only a memorandum it's not something you follow it's a reminder of a certain rock graph or theme and then you play it and improvise on it. So in the same way, all the aphorisms in the yoga sutras or the verses of the of the gate and so on, they're notes. Little jottings, and then the teacher will explain them. So when the something is understood, very subtly by the thinking mind it will eventually become a sensation because you really understand it you see. So that, I'm saying all this as a basis for seeing. That when Buddhism in visage is the character and the consciousness of the highest form of man, which it calls Bodhisattva. It is not somebody who's out of this world. It's not somebody who is in a state of some weird ecstasy, or somebody who sees. Everything kind of full of angels as we might expect in the ordinary way or things like that. Real Angels, Gods and so on are very different from what you might suppose in the imagery. You can find out for example that the dust is full of gods. If you really look at dust. And that the paws of your skin contain many universes. And that's marvelous, you see. That's to see that things are full of gods but you're still not seeing anything different. From the ordinary things you see but you got a different understanding. So having a different understanding you was never the less the same world same everyday life same everything going on that everybody else has. The understanding in other words is not away from this everyday kind of experience we're having now so there's the bodhisattva. And this is an extraordinarily important vision for the whole of

Asia. Why? Because there was always a tendency in Asian spirituality to want to go away. That's very understandable, because when life is rough and there are terrible plagues and wars and hunger and diseases, a lot of people would think oh enough is enough is enough and if this is going to go on and on if we're going to be reincarnated back and back into this mess, isn't there some way of getting out? So in that way you can lose all interest in everyday life. For example, supposing you are a drunk. A really serious dedicated drunk and lots of people are they want out. And they couldn't care less whether they have no money whether they're going to die or whether they're dead just so long as they can stay out. Now you might say as we look at people like that well that's very sad. It's terrible. Well, look at them, they're wasting their lives but from their point of view they're not. They're living the real life, they want to live. Or a person may be an opium addict you see and he would be in his special paradise. And you say Well isn't that terrible. Or he wants out. And from his point of view as he looks at it it's perfectly all right because he thinks that people who are pursuing those ends which are considered virtuous. And practical he thinks they're out of their minds. Why do all that? Why do you have to go on struggling and struggling and struggling to keep alive? What do you think that that's going to give you to see so he feels it doesn't matter if it ends soon or if it ends later time is an illusion. In his state of consciousness he can make a tiny little bit of time into a long long time. He can experience one hundred years in an afternoon or longer. And some people think you see, that you might have immortality through the fact that in the moment of your death. Your sense of time gets longer and longer and longer and longer and longer and longer. So that although from the standpoint of an outside observer who is not in your state of consciousness, it looks as if you are having your head cut off in a hurry. From your standpoint that lasts forever. Because of the alteration of your time rhythm. See how slippery philosophy can be. And so people can think all these things and they can get lost and there was always a tendency in Oriental culture to do that and from our point of view, that's a bad thing.

Well from a say the Chinese point of view also, it was a bad thing the Chinese are very practical and like they believed in in the family and in having children and husbands and wives and in industriousness and in the building and in arts and in cultivating the soil by very ingenious methods.

And so, it was a special appeal to them in the idea of the bodhisattva. Bodhisattva you see it doesn't is not like the extremely contemplative. Private Buddha. You won't find a bodhisattva sitting all day under a tree in a state of rapt absorption. So that anybody who comes up and knocks on him won't get an answer. He'll be like everybody else or he will look like everybody else because he will see that this everyday world too is it. This no special, nothing special world. Misty rain on Mount Lu, waves surging on River Che. Waves, when you have not been there no rest from the pain of longing but you go there and come back it was nothing special misty rain on Mt Lu, surging waves Che-Chiang. This isn't meant to see to debunk it and say well after all. You know that it was a nasty baby any. Now, I don't know who died this but it is it isn't does it doesn't. It doesn't the kind of thing it was nothing like that. In the idea of nothing special or boogy. There is a way of saying. But look at ordinariness. Look, what you miss every moment. And you see that sort of attitude underlies tea ceremony well. Very. Great appreciation exists all of the very simplest kinds of utensils rooms architecture and so on. There was a very great sage who lived far off in the mountains behind Kyoto. And an American student had a great desire to see him. And he made all sorts of inquiries to find this man at last found the way to the Hermitage but then it was very difficult to get up. And but he did finally find the old man out and came and said How do you do? And they talked and the old man was delighted that the foreign student should have taken all that trouble and should show such [a] good understanding of these things, that he served him tea ceremony with nothing but hot water. No tea. And the American student was delighted he realized that this man had paid him a real compliment. So. That's buji you see that's nothing special. Now then. Generally speaking as we look at the whole field of Buddhism. The idea of the bodhisattva that is to say the idea of realising the enlightened state in terms of everyday life is characteristic of the Mahayana School of the North. North Asia. Whereas, the Theravada are sometimes when a young a school of South Asia still has its emphasis on the idea of getting away. Still very much concentrates on the ideal of the monkish life, which is celibate and away from every dayness all attachment, all kinds of worldly responsibility. And so those monks their yellow robes are very much a people apart. In the Marianna on the other hand. Although there are monks. They aren't monks quite in the sense of the Southern school I mean

it's like a Roman Catholic priest is not supposed to marry but in a piece of paper and priest may.

So in that sense the southern monks are like Roman Catholic monks and the Northern monks are like Anglican clergy or something like that except that they have a rule that if they do live in a monastery they mayn't take wives in there and likewise the nuns mayn't have husbands in their. But if they live apart into a temple a priest may have a wife. Because they see no fundamental inconsistency between the state of deeply illuminated consciousness and living in some kind of affectionate human community and society. So therefore, for that reason, through Mahayana through the idea of the bodhisattva Buddhism was able to exercise an enormous influence upon the everyday life of the Far East. To express itself through art forms that were by no means Styria typed. Not merely iconographic and stylized. Buddhism in the Far East expressed itself through naturalistic art forms. And so, it's an extraordinary thing but you see, the religious painting of China in so far as it is influenced by Zen Buddhism very rarely has a religious subject. When you would say, What is Christian art? Well, you wouldn't recognise that certain great schools and styles you would say you would associate Romanesque architecture with Christianity certainly Gothic architecture you would associate early Italian painting or a great deal of Russian painting with Christianity peculiar. But Christian art you see always seems to have for its subject matter. The the Christ the saints the angels the incidents in the lives of the saints that martyrdoms, and so on and so forth. But it's inconceivable, to get the idea isn't it, that a still life. Which might have been painted by a Christian is a form of Christian art. When all it is in it is a few apples on the table. That a case could be made for that idea but it hasn't been made it's never really occurred to someone to express Christianity through that sort of method Oh it's true that there has been a symbolism of the grapes and the wheat represent the sacrament the mass, that limb is represent something and so on and so forth but this is purely symbolic. It wouldn't occur for Christian art that. If the fine painting of a used ashtray, with a piece of tong paper beside it could possibly be Christian art. Unless it was propaganda against being dirty or something like that. But, for the Far East, a painting of an old rock with some grass growing beside it. Can most definitely be Buddhist art. Because that painting of the rock is concerned with such ness. And just as much so as

any painting of borders and their halos and golden. Duras and flowers and lotuses and all like kind of thing. So likewise, when this cool of painting paints Buddhas and bodhisattvas it makes them look like ordinary people. Even a little bit to get the point a little bit more than ordinary that is to say tramps, bums, clowns. You know, this fellow. This it Hotai, in Chinese and he is a fat slob. But he goes around with an enormous bag, patched and so on and he collects trash. He collects everything that nobody wants to see there are all new people are always up for precious things but put tires up for rubbish. And he collects all this rubbish and he gives it away to children who love it. Well this is the way you see this is true this man is sometimes called the Fat or laughing buddha and he has a fat Buddha. But, the only clue that he is a Buddha is a big ears. Because that means he can hear. Right through everything see. He can hear the ultimate sound in everybody's voice. Now that's a very important trick. If you listen to me talking, you may try to make sense of the words. But actually, in the sense of the words that I'm saying isn't the content of what I'm trying to explain. The content of what I'm trying to explain can be heard in the sound of my voice. And in order to listen to that properly you have to go beyond its meaning. For example, if you say the word yes, and then say it again yes yes yes yes yes, it becomes a very funny word. And you think why did we use that funny noise yes to mean yes. Or are you might see somebody sitting like this you know say I imagine this is on a movie. And the man just sitting there for a while and suddenly goes. He shrugs his shoulders. That's a normal enough gesture and I mean it was puzzled. But as he's going on saying that he does. And you want to know what's the matter to go to Dick. Suddenly you see the gesture begins to lose meaning you come upon something. Well, that's what you have to have big ears to get that you see. So it through that you know he he hears all sounds as being just songs. Of course, [he] can hear meaning in them too. When they have meaning but fundamentally underlying the meaning he hears just the sound. And this is something you get to if you go to a foreign country and you don't understand the language and you see all the people talking and you notice things that they don't notice about themselves because they get absorbed in the meaning of what they're saying. And so they don't notice. The fascinating aspect of the perfectly meaningless side of their behavior. But at any rate, the, a whole approach of the whole result of the bodhisattva doctrine in the art of the Far East is to create what the Spiegelberg has called the religion of non-

religion. Where the religion became so perfect that it left no trace. It's like when you build a house you erect scaffolding when you finish you take the scaffolding away. And you wonder if you had never seen a house being built how on earth the builders got up so high.

So in the same way, the ancient idea of Buddhism is that the Buddhism is a ferryboat. And it's designed to take you across the stream from this shore, which is Samsara, the Rat Race, to the other shore which is nirvana when you get on the other side you get off the ferry see a ferry boat goes back to bring the next party over. But if you stay on the ferry boat, that means you see you're in love with the ferry boat. And you're in danger of becoming a religious maniac. And, you people do that you see you know how it is you've probably had that experience people who join a church and then become fascinated with all the things that go with church they like Bibles not just for what's in them but the smell of a Bible, the appearance of the Bible has something something holy and numinous about it and they like crucifixes. Now, a crucifix is a pretty grisly object. A corpse nailed on beams, but they get jeweled crucifix it's beautiful works of art in natural gorgeous things and people with a great. Religious feeling love to think of those things easy and Buddhists to do that they like their rosaries and there. Are images and the smell of incense and they get a kind of church if occasion. The French have a wonderful word for those goods they call the bon years early. I know and it's a little difficult to translate. Literally, good God guttery. That lived long here you know everybody's on this sentimental because all of the born year though lady is always talking about the bond years and so people say you know people who've got church on the brain the born the year it's all these stores sell bronze years only.

Now while this you see is this just in its own way understandable. The whole point is that the in the Supremes state of understanding you get rid of volunteers or the altogether that's the religion of no religion see you don't even have any beliefs. The whole creed everything is utterly. Past surpassed that man's You left the ferryboat and you've gone on on the other shore you don't carry the ferryboat with you. And so, this religion of no religion, is very pure are very transparent it's called like the salt in water like the glue in color or in ink and you see it sticking that the Chinese make has glue in it to hold it together but you can't see the glue. It's all solid black all the way

through and the glue isn't observable. So the salt isn't observable in water. In this way you see religion is being used as a medicine and not as a diet the Dharma is, to use a Zen expression it's like picking up a brick to knock at somebody's door. And when the door opens, you don't carry the brick into the house. So a person who see who has much religion has what is called In Zen is instinct. And that's considered rather bad. Or rather special a bad smell and one of the Zen poem says to know your original mind your essential nature that is the great disease of our religion of our school see so people who have this thing who have zen and you can say well that fellow's a Buddhist. And he has this special thing he has you know it's like. Those of us who have the disadvantage of our eyes not being quite good we have to wear spectacles look new since we've got around with you all over the place gadgets you have to fix on you. Or people who belong like clergy to a religious order have to go around in funny clothes and at the rabbi who has a beautiful beard but he will wear a beastly black homburg at which is so unnatural. And, so, they have to separate us in a way that people with artificial legs crutches and so on so it isn't something that's worked it isn't working like a medicine because if the medicine works you get rid of it if a doctor successful, he gets rid of his patients.

And so in exactly this way, suchness is an attempt to say something which can't be said. It is trying to say. There is the world that just as it is you see that that's what we're trying to show you to look at we're not trying to drag in some fancy operators from about. Some special system which has got to be imposed on you some all kinds of gods and complicated people you've got to believe in. We're not going to fill your brains with a lot of new stuff. But instead come to the clarity of seeing things just the way they are. The trouble is, when when somebody said to a Zen master, the lines of the hills and the clouds are not all the is the body of Buddha he said yes but it's a pity to say so. And so even to have to say, look, that, see, it's just a little bit too much. Just a little bit too much. It would be more admirable if I didn't have to say anything didn't have to point out a thing, but after all, one does have to make some concessions to follow.

Psychedelics

Turning the Head or Turning On

I wonder how many of you have ever read a romantic Victorian novel called Zan Ngoni. It was written by Beau Willimon. And it's the story of an alchemist, an aristocratic, very good looking man called Zan Ngoni, who was several hundred years old, living in Naples shortly before the French Revolution. And he was several hundred years old because he had discovered the elixir of life. Which was, of course, supposed to be the quest of all alchemists all over the world, not simply something that would turn led into gold and give one indefinite riches about the secret of immortality. And this was the quest of alchemy both in the West and in the Far East. And many of the great emperors of China died because the Dow as priests gave them mysterious concoctions purporting to be the elixir of life. I only had an apprentice, and one day while the master was out, The Apprentice could not resist taking a very close look at some certain crystal bottles hidden in the depths of his cupboards. And this was the elixir. And he removed the stopper and took just a slight sniff.

And then suddenly there appeared before him an absolutely monstrous being.

And trembling, he put the stopper back into the bottle. And face this appalling apparition, which is called the dweller on the threshold. The something or other one has to come to terms with before crossing the border into immortality. Now, today, we are living in an age which is quite peculiar because in the world of science, there are no longer any secrets.

Because the method of science. Requires that all scientists be in communication with each other and therefore that every scientist, as soon as he has discovered something or got a good idea, he rushes into print.

And it's important for him to do so because some other scientists somewhere else in the world might be thinking about something on the

same lines and would be stimulated in his work by this man's speculations, even if not by discoverers.

And so the whole scientific world tries to remain in communication. And for this reason, it was an absolutely impossible to keep atomic energy a secret. In former ages, that might have been managed because there were many secrets once upon a time. And people were not admitted to these secrets unless they were in some way tested and found capable of handling them without running amuck. We live in such a dangerous age because all the secrets are out in the open and anybody can run amuck with them.

And that's just the situation we have to face and that is just the situation we have to handle. It is too late to stop it because that would be, as they say. Locking the door after the horse has bolted. And there is a certain reason why such a thing as a sudden chemical. Which is capable of opening people's minds in a certain way should be something extremely disturbing.

Because this particular chemical in common with a number of others that have been known for centuries. But I've been rather played cool through those centuries.

Is capable of doing something which simply cannot be tolerated.

That is to say, capable of letting properly prepared individuals or sometimes improperly prepared individuals in on a secret which is very closely guarded. And which is, as a matter of fact, the deepest and most fundamental of all our social taboos. I have just finished writing a book, which I've had with a sort of tongue in cheek attitude, had the temerity to call the book, and it is subtitled the book you see on the Taboo against knowing who you are. Because that is really the thing that cannot be let out. Sex is not really a serious taboo in our culture.

If you are initiating a young person into life and you realize that your son or daughter is going to college and that you ought therefore to have a serious talk with them, they'll laugh at you and say all this thing you're telling us about sex we knew years ago and we know more about it than you do. So that is not a subject for a serious initiation. Talk to a young person. So we have to think again and try and find out. Think deeply what is

fundamentally taboo in this culture and perhaps in other cultures as well. What would what information? In other words, would really let out let the cat out of the bag and give away the show?

Now quest around a bit.

Ask yourself this for what reason would a person be considered hopelessly insane? What sort of claims? Must a person simply not make it? Well, there is one, and that is if anybody claims that he is God. That simply isn't done. Certainly not in our culture, although it's very frequent in India, but in our culture, that is simply not allowed because we most of us from a Christian background and if not that from a Jewish background, and there's a great deal in common because both Christians and Jews are deeply concerned about somebody called Jesus Christ.

Both Christians and Jews are, in a way, followers of Jesus Christ in different ways. He is a problem to both because he was the man who came out and discovered he was God. And that simply is impermissible. The Jews handled it in one way. The Christians handled it quite as effectively. In another way, the Christians handled Jesus perfectly, even more tactfully than the Jews by putting him on a pedestal and saying this was the only man who ever was God, and nobody else was really so before.

And certainly nobody can be so afterwards. Stop right there. Put him on the altar, bow down to him, worship him so that everything he had to say will be null and void. And it worked beautifully, but you see, the trouble about deep secrets is they can't be repressed indefinitely.

As a certain president of the United States, one for once remarked, you can fool some of the people some of the time. But you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

And we human beings have been systematically fooled by ourselves.

It isn't as if there were some deep, dark conspiracy with somebody else to blame for quite a number of centuries into the notion that we are strangers in the universe.

That the world that lies beyond the border of our skins is not ourselves and is some quite alien mechanical contraption into which we arrived. And from which we will disappear.

And we really have nothing very much to do with it. It's something about which we can take an objective point of view. We can look at it. We can measure it. We can calculate it. But it all turns out in the end to be some sort of stupid, stupid mechanism in which we are involved, because as bodies, we are part of it.

But it is. Common sense. For most individuals.

That they themselves. Aren't even their bodies. They are alienated spooks which have bodies like people have cars and in which they go around. And confront. The external world. As if it was something in which you were trapped. And children can say to their parents.

I didn't ask to be born. Just because of your funny love affairs and all that. I got mixed up in this world and you are responsible to.

And we don't even think that we had anything personally to do with the fact that our fathers once had an evil gleam in their eyes. But that evil gleam was you coming off.

Only U.S. by this idea of our own identity that we have, we are able to disclaim responsibility for all kinds of things. And say, no, it was my parents see if as a fellow taken in juvenile delinquency and he knows a little Freud, he can say, well, I couldn't help it because I was psycho analytically fouled up when I was a baby. Even before perhaps I was born. My mother had all sorts of complexes. And then if he gets away with that, the people in the press say for juvenile delinquents that the kids should not be punished. But the parents and the parents say, hey, wait a minute, we got fouled up by our parents. And we are we are pretty bad parents, we admit. But our parents before us brought us up in a certain way that we are hopelessly neurotic and we can't really raise children, but we have to. So every kid, everyone can pass the buck all the way down the line.

The woman that Dow gave us me. She tempted me and I did eat.

And then when God wagged his finger at the serpent. Subban didn't say anything because a serpent knew the answers.

He knew the thing which must not be admitted that the left hand goes with the right hand. That black goes with white and that you wouldn't know what white was unless you knew what black was.

And that, you know, wouldn't know what is was unless you knew what isn't is and you wouldn't know what here is unless you knew what that is. And you wouldn't know what you meant by self unless you knew what was meant by other.

And that is so simple.

But everybody contrived to ignore it.

Now, here's the problem, you see that there are certain processes, some of which are. What you might call spiritual exercises. Others are simply chemicals. Others are just horse sense. Whereby one comes to see very clearly indeed that black goes with white and self goes with other. And as this becomes clear to you, it's rather shaking. Because, look, if what you define as you. Is inseparable from everything, what you define as not you. Just as front is inseparable from back. Then you realize that deep down between self and other. There is some sort of conspiracy.

If these things always occur in combination. And look very different from each other and feel quite different. Nevertheless, the feeling of difference between them.

Allows each one to exist.

And so underneath the opposition or the polarity between self and other or between any other pair of opposites you can think of. There is something in common as there is, for example, between figure and background.

You can't see a figure without a background. You can't have an organism without an environment. Equally, you can't have a background without a figure or an environment without organisms in it or without things in it. You

can't have space which is unoccupied by any solid. You cannot cannot have solids not occupying some space. This is absolutely elementary. And yet we don't realize it. Because, for example, the average person thinks that space is nothing. But is this just sort of not fairness in which there are things?

And we are slightly afraid that not the fairness, that nothingness, that darkness, that the negative polls of all these oppositions will win.

That they will eventually swallow up every kind of being and every kind of Venice. But when you catch on to the game, you realize that that won't happen. Because what is called not existing is quite incapable of being there without the contrast of something called existing. It's like the crest and the trough of a wave. You can't have a wave that is all trough and no crest, just as you can't have a wave which is all crest and no trough. Such a thing has never been manifested in the physical universe.

They go together.

And that is the secret, there really is no other secret than that.

But it is thoroughly repressed.

And therefore, we are all educated to feel. That we've got to fight for the white. Because the black might with.

We've got to survive.

You must survive.

That's the great thing we're all working on now and pounding it out day after day and anxiety because this is a description of anxiety. Anxiety is the fear that one of a pair of opposites might cancel the other.

And if by any chance, by any means, you'll find out that that is not so.

You have an entirely new attitude to what human beings are doing.

Which may be very creative, but which also may be very dangerous. You see through the game. The game called White Must Win.

Because you know that neither black nor white are going to win because they belong to each other.

So one of the problems of the various chemicals which can change the human mind in certain ways so that it becomes apparent that inside and outside go together, is that they do rather give the show away. And people who take these chemicals and see through the human game.

Cannot be trusted.

They may decide to be good sports and go back into the game and play it as if it were for real. Or they may not. And if they don't know what's going to happen. If you wanted some sort of appropriate illustration for a Life magazine article on the effects of LSD, you would have one very simple solution.

You would publish the most gorgeous color reproductions of Persian miniatures. And of Moorish Arab Basques and of the illuminations of Celtic manuscripts that would give you the story. So far as changes in human sensation are concerned.

But there would be one thing very difficult to put across in pictures because the people who looked at them, if they didn't get the point of view, wouldn't see it. And that is what I will call the sensation, as well as the intellectual understanding of polarity. That is to say that the inside and the outside, the subjective and the objective, the self and the other go together.

In other words, what? There is a harmony, an unbreakable harmony. I'm when I'm using the word harmony, I don't necessarily mean something sweet. I mean, absolute Concorde relationship between what goes on inside your skin and what goes on outside your skin. It isn't that what goes on outside is so powerful that it pushes around and controls what goes on inside. Equally so it isn't that what goes on inside is so strong that it often succeeds in pushing around what goes on outside. It is very simply that the two processes, the two behaviors are one.

What you do is what the universe starts. And what the universe does is also what you do. Not EU in the sense of your superficial ego.

Which is a very small, little, tiny area of your conscious sensitivity, but you in the sense of your total psycho physical organism conscious as well as unconscious.

This is not something that arrived in the world from somewhere else altogether that confronts an alien reality. What you are.

Is the universe in that, in fact, the works? What there is and always has been and always will be forever and ever. Performing an act called John Doe.

And this is such a subversion of common sense. But is that fact, matter of fact something if you stop to think about it, that is completely obvious.

Only everything conspires to prevent you from seeing that obvious thing.

Because when you were babies, practically all your parents and your teachers and your aunts and uncles and your older brothers and sisters got together and they told you who you were. They defined you as Johnny.

Was just Johnny. No. And don't you come on too strong, Johnny. Because we've got elders and betters around here.

But you're responsible.

You're a free agent. You'd better be.

And so when you are told from childhood that you are expected and commanded to behave in a way that will be acceptable only if you do it voluntarily.

You remain permanently mixed up that if anything is permanent brain damage.

But that's the idea you see, because that's the game we're playing. You started it. I didn't say that's the game we're playing. We can make all kinds of complexities out of that and really in a way, have enormous fun. But once anybody sees through that.

Well, we are frightened.

Once you get this sense of polarity of your inside being the same process as your outside and your ego being one and the same process as the whole universe going on.

Then we are afraid that people may say. Well, good equals bad. And we can do anything we like and we didn't in any way be further subject to the ordinary rules of human conduct. And we can wear what clothes we like or no clothes at all. We can have what sexual life we like. We can do anything. And we are going to generally because the world is being rather oppressive towards us, challenged the whole thing and run amuck. And a lot of people are doing just exactly that.

So I want to introduce into this whole problem some ancient wisdom. I have really two things to talk about how cultures which always did know in some way or among whom a large number of people always did know this secret handled it. And then I want to make some observations about how we are trying to handle it and how it's not going to work.

Among the Hindus and among the Buddhists. This view of the real identity of a human being has always been known. At least by a very influential minority.

The central doctrine of the Hindu way of life. I call it that rather than a religion is in Sanskrit. Tad Devine Marcy, you're it. Put it in a kind of colloquial way, you're it and it is the which then which there is no which are which they call the Brahman or the Ottoman with a capital, a meaning the self. You are only just kidding that you're just poor little me. See the function of a guru. That is to say, a spiritual teacher in India is to look give you a funny look in the eye, because you come to him and say, Mr. Guru, I have problems.

I suffer. And it's the mess. And I can't control my mind. And I am miserable and depressed. So on. And he gives you a funny look.

And you feel a bit nervous about the way he looks at you. Because he you know, he is reading your thoughts.

And this man is a great magician. He can read everything that's in you. He knows right down into your unconscious and you know, all the dreadful things you thought and all that awful desires you have. And you are rather embarrassed that this man looks right through you and sees them all. That's not what he's looking at. He's giving you a funny look for quite another reason altogether, because he sees in you the drama, the Godhead, just claiming it's poor little me. And he's going to eventually buy all sorts of subtle techniques that are called in Sanskrit empire that in politics means chicanery and in spiritual education means skillful pedagogy. He is going to try and kid you back into realizing who you really are.

That's why he gives you a funny look. Why seems to see right through you. As if to say Shiva, oh, boy, don't kid me.

I know who you are, but you're coming on beautifully in this act. You're somebody else altogether. And I congratulate you.

You're doing a wonderful job playing this part, which you call the person. My person, you know, a person is a fake. It with the word means a mask. So if you read books on how to be a real person, you're reading books on how to be a genuine fake.

The word persona, as you know, means a mask worn in Greek or Roman drama.

So if you are this, come on to the guru and say, well, he asked you who you are, Sri Romana Maharishi, when anybody came to him and they said to him, as people do. Who was I and my last incarnation? Or will I be reincarnated again? He always replied. Who's asking the question? And everybody was irritated because he wouldn't give them answers about what they were in their former lives. But I said, Who are you?

And he looked at you if you looked at photographs of this man. I keep a photograph of him close by because of the humor in his eyes. They're looking at you with a dancing twinkle saying, come off it.

Now they're in these Asiatic traditions. It is well recognized. That people who get the knowledge that you're at.

May very well run amuck. And therefore, they always couple any method of gaining this, whether it is yoga, whether it is smoking something or drinking something or whatever, is the method, they always couple it with a discipline. Now, I know the word discipline isn't very popular these days. And I would like to have a new word for it, because most people who teach discipline don't teach them very well. They teach it with a kind of violence. As if a discipline was something that is going to be extremely unpleasant and you're going to have to put up with. But that's not the real secret of discipline. I would prefer to use the word skill.

Discipline is a way.

Expression. Say you want to express your feelings in stone now, stone doesn't give way very easily. It's tough stuff.

And so you have to learn the skill or the discipline of the sculptor in order to express yourself in stone. So in every other way, whatever you do, you require a skill. And it's enormously important, especially for American people to understand that there is absolutely no possibility of having any pleasure in life at all without skill.

Money doesn't buy pleasure.

Ever look if you want to get stoned drunk? And go out and get a bottle of bourbon and done it. You can't do that except for people who have practiced the distillers art. You can't even make love without art. Where I live in Sausalito, we have our harbor full of ever so many pleasure craft, motor cruisers, sailing boats, all kinds of things, and they never leave the dock.

All that happens with them is their owners have cocktail parties there on Saturdays and Sundays because they discovered having bought these things that the discipline of sailing is difficult to learn and takes a lot of time. And they didn't have time for it. So they just bought the thing is a status symbol. So in other words, you can't have pleasure in life without skill. But it isn't a unpleasant task to learn a skill. If the teacher in the first place gets you fascinated with it.

There is immense pleasure in learning how to do anything skillfully. To make carpentry things to cook to right. To calculate anything you want can be immensely pleasurable to learn the discipline. And it is completely indispensable. Because, look, you may be a very inspired musician.

I am not a musical technologist. You see. And I regret it, but I am a world work technologist. But I can hear in my head all kinds of symphonies and all kinds of marvelous compositions. But I do not have the technique to write them down on paper and share them with somebody else.

Too bad. Maybe next time around.

But you see, so far as words are concerned, I can express ideas because I have studied language and I work very hard, not that I didn't like it. I intensely enjoy the work of writing a book, although it is difficult, but it's fascinating to say what can never possibly be said.

So we do see what's happening, what you have to do. You have inspiration, but then you have to have technique to incarnate to express your inspiration.

That is to say, to bring heaven down to earth. And to express heaven in terms of earth. Of course, they are really one behind the scenes, but there's no way of pointing it out unless you do something skillful. You see, we are all at the moment absolutely in the midst of the beatific vision.

We are all one with the divine or some.

I don't like that sort of wishy washy language, but we are all there, but we are so much there that we like fish and water. They don't know they're in water like the birds don't know they're in the air because it's all around them. And in the same way, we don't know what the color of our eyes is. I don't mean whether you got blue or brown eyes, but the color of the lens of your eye. You call that transparent? No color.

See, because you can't see it. But it's basic to being able to see anything. So in order to find out where you are, there has to be some way of drawing attention to it and that involves skill who pay out in Sanskrit skillful means.

So it's all very well. Anybody can have ecstasy.

Anybody, as a matter of fact, can become aware that he is one with the eternal ground of the universe. But since that what's what you are?

Anyway, I am going to ask, so what, when a hero goes on an adventure and he leaves his people and is going to a strange land. He can go away and just hide himself around the corner in an obscure house and then appear a year later and say, I've been on a heroic journey until all sorts of tales. And they say, prove it.

Because they expect him to bring back something, something which nobody has seen before. Then they believe you've been on the journey. So in the same way. Exactly. Anybody who goes on a spiritual journey must bring something back. Because if you just say, oh, man, it was a gas.

Anyone can say that.

Now, this is why in the doctrines of Buddhism, there is a differentiation between two kinds of enlightened beings. They are both forms of Buddha. Which is to say the word Buddha means somebody who has awakened, who has discovered the secret behind all this. In other words, all this thing we call life with its frantic concerns is a big act.

Would you in your unconscious depths are deliberately setting up?

So you can do one of two things when you discover this. You can become what's called a practical Buddha.

That means a private Buddha who doesn't tell anything or you can become a Buddhist advert.

Protect a Buddha goes off into his ecstasy. And never seen again. Bodie Sava is come one who comes back and appears in the everyday world and plays the game of the everyday world by the rules of the everyday world. But he brings with him up higher. He brings with him some way of showing that he's been on the journey, that he's come back and he's going to let you in on the secret to.

If you if if if you will play it cool and also come back. To join in the everyday life of everyday people, because this is the rule.

If the world is dramatic. If the world, as the Hindu say, is a big act put on by the divine self. One of the rules of coming onstage is that you don't come on as yourself. You come on as the part that you're going to play.

It's very bad form if an actor always acts the same way.

That's what's called a star as distinct from an actor, a real actor can become anything.

And so but in private life. Well, he's just Mr. Jones.

And but he doesn't come on the stage that way. So in the same way, if you know that behind the scenes, in the depth, fundamentally, you are it, you don't come on that way. It always comes on as something else.

That's the rule of the stage. Because without that, there wouldn't be a play. It would only be reality, no illusion.

And the whole point of life is illusion. From the word Latin lottery to play.

Show biz, the show must go on. So don't give it away.

But the truth has a way of leaking. It gets out. But then the important thing is you see when the truth gets out.

Those who catch hold of it.

Must find a way of staying in contact with what society calls reality.

That is to say, if you have a radio, you don't only need an antenna. You also need a ground. So what happens in the world of mysticism, of psychedelic visions and so on needs to be grounded?

So then there are always two directions in which such a discipline works. One preparatory. In other words, those who taught disciplines for

awakening in the Orient were always careful to screen, first of all, to screen those who applied.

And then after screening them to make them sensible so that they knew how to handle the game and of ordinary human existence and play it by the ordinary human rules.

In other words, that they had strength of character and were not the sort of people who would be wiped out because they had no strength of character. By an overwhelming experience. Then they let them in. But there are certain disciplines such as Zen, where you get into the essential secret very early on in the discipline. And after that, they are concerned with much more training in showing you how to use it, how to use the power, to use the vision which you have acquired.

But when these people, you know, really feel threatened by this thing, they start sending around messages and public utterances, which sound exactly as if they had taken LSD, had had a bad trip with it and were coming on paranoid. And so they are spreading subtle rumors that this substance causes permanent brain damage and utter destruction of the super ego. There is a there are people in New York, likewise, who are spreading around the idea that you see once this thing has touched you, you as if you've had a prefrontal lobotomy.

You are somebody who ought to be put in a concentration camp because you've lost your conscience. You're out of order. Nothing more can be done about it. Now, do you see how alarming that could be in our day and age?

I think that your brother, your aunt has got permanent brain damage. You took some LSD.

You see what the situation is exactly. Power. You know, the thing that we learn from history is nobody ever learns from history. Consider just go back a few hundred years.

To the days of the Inquisition.

And realize that the theologians of the church were in those days accorded the same kind of respect that we now accord to the professor of pathology at the University of California Medical School.

Or to the professor of physics at Caltech.

We think those people are real authorities. They know it works. They've experiment. They have knowledge. They're the wisest people in our society. All right. Few hundred years ago, so were the theologians and they had the same sense of responsibility. It was the community that are great scientists and physicians have today. And they knew there was a thing called heresy going around.

That was not only capable once you caught heresy of making you damned to hell forever and ever and ever to the most unimaginable tortures that would go on without end, but that it was infectious.

And one heretic would soon make other heretics. So those are entirely humanitarian and merciful. Church fathers got together, said, what are we going to do to stop this? Well, are they new? There is an eternal life beyond the grave.

And so perhaps just in the same way as if you've got a cancer and that's something terrible because it might spread and destroy the whole body. Cut it out, even burn it out. If you have to add a little pain on the part of the patient in the several months on the end of tubes, won't be too bad for if you get rid of it. So they said we've got to torture these people because they might in the middle of this this extreme experience recount. And if they won't recount, we'll burn them because there's just the chance that in the agony of burning at the stake, they will say at the end, oh, God, forgive me for my sins and it'll be all right. Now realize the absolutely merciful intent behind the inquisitors. Perfectly responsible, acting on the best knowledge that they had in their day. Don't you see how that can happen again? Anytime.

So this scared talk is simply without foundation. But nevertheless, there are certain reasons to be cautious. And for those who understand the operation of these chemicals, to issue certain clear warnings.

And this I want to talk about quite seriously.

Now, this class of psychotropic chemicals, which includes LSD, mescaline and its original form, peyote, psilocybin, cannabis and so on, which is a very mild psychotropic.

These do not.

In moderation and proper use in any way harm the physical organism nor form such habits that you can't get rid of them without unpleasant withdrawal symptoms. But if you take them an absurdly large doses. You are in for trouble. I knew a Methodist minister who was a very violent totalitarian and became extremely sick from drinking too much milk. So after all, if you sit down and you buy a bottle of whiskey, which you can get at any store anywhere.

Perfectly legit and you consumed one quarter whiskey in one hour. You can expect trouble. So in the same way, if you've got LSD or something of that kind and you take a thousand micrograms because some friend of yours took 500 and you want to one up him, watch out. You're being just stupid. Furthermore, you're being rather stupid if you buy the kind of LSD that is currently being circulated in the black market.

Because for two reasons, you don't know what else is in it. You don't know how much is in it.

There are two sorts of producers of LSD on the black market. One is the enthusiastic graduate student in chemistry who wants to turn the whole world on.

And his product is apt to be pretty good but excessive in dosage, and what says 100 micrograms may well be 300?

There is another kind of producer who wants to make a good thing out of it. Oh, well, who wants to give you a big jazz, but you mix it with amphetamines. There's another more sinister kind of producer who'll either cut the amount or mix it with heroin. Are anything any other substance? Maybe. Again, amphetamines or whatever to get you hooked on it?

So you. There is no control of the quality of what is being circulated. None, whatever. And you just don't know what you're getting.

Now, this situation is the result of the fact that the United States never learns from history.

It is the same old story of prohibition to think the naive notion that you can control something that might turn into a social evil by handing it over to the police.

Now, after all, who pays the police, you?

And if you can't control yourself, if the police won't control you either, but in lieu of controlling you, they can suppress you.

Now, I all conscience the police have enough to do.

Not only to control the traffic, which is getting worse every day by virtue of Parkinson's law, but also all the possibilities of robbery, violence, murder and so on and so forth, which is a full time job. But to ask the police.

To go and look for people who have LSD or marijuana or heroin or opium or whatever, or who are living irregular sex lives or who have a gambling joint or a whorehouse.

This is to ask the police to act as officers of the state in service of the church. Uniformed ministers. And that's not their job. And when the police are asked to do that, they are put by lawmakers into a position which brings them into public disrespect, as it did in the days of prohibition. It is not fair to the police.

The only way to handle a thing of this kind is to bring it all out into the open. Nothing can be controlled when it's driven underground. It ought to be controlled. Just in the same way as we have learned how to control automobiles, we license people to drive them. So in the same way, we don't sell liquor to minors. We expect them to have some kind of education and grown up responsibility before they go boozing around. So in exactly the same way, society has got to face the fact that it's going to have to license

people for certain spiritual adventures or perhaps just plain pleasures, if that's what you want to call it. After all, you can't even join some churches without can't join the Catholic Church without taking a course of instruction that takes a few weeks and then they put you through an initiation and you may say when you get through that, well, what was all that preparation for?

I didn't feel anything.

But so in exactly the same way with this, it is completely urgent. In other words, that we.

Prevent the occurrence of a very serious, socially destructive criminal situation. Created by law. You've heard of the Trojan diseases. That means diseases caused by physicians. There are no majestic diseases or shall we say, no majestic crimes. Like somebody said, the only serious side effect of marijuana is that you may go to jail. This is a no majestic crime. In other words, it is a ritual crime in exactly the same way that when the early Christians refused to burn incense in front of the Roman gods in whom the Romans themselves didn't believe they were guilty of a crime.

It was a ritual crime and they refused. A reasonable man like the Emperor, Marcus Aurelius, said to the Christians, Now come off it. Really? Do you have to refuse to burn incense?

Said, yes, we're serious about it.

So there's a ritual crimes. And so in the same way various ritual crimes exist and are police poor devils are supposed to enforce it. And if they don't, they're going to get it from the politicians.

So I would say in general, to sum up. Substances like LSD, which give away a secret. About. The nature of the social game, the human game and what underlies it.

Are potentially dangerous.

Of course, like any good thing is electricity is dangerous. Fire is dangerous. Cars are dangerous. Planes are dangerous, but not so dangerous as driving on the freeway.

The only way to handle danger is to face it. If you start getting frightened of it.

Then you make it worse because you project onto it. All kinds of bogies and threats which don't exist in it at all.

The rule about all terrors going back to where I started from the dweller on the threshold. The rule for all terrors is head straight into them. When you are sailing in a storm, you do not let a wave hit your boat on the side, you go bow into the wave and ride it.

So in the same way old folklore says this is an old wives tale with a lot of truth in it.

Whenever you meet a ghost, don't run away because the ghost will capture the substance of your fear and materialize itself out of your own substance.

And will kill you eventually because it will take over all your own vitality. So then whenever confronted with a ghost, walk straight into it and it will disappear.

And so in the same way, when people stir up the depths of the unconscious and are confronted with their own monsters or with the terrors of discovering that they're in a relativistic world where black implies white and white implies black.

So who's in charge? You know, grandfather's dead, father's dead, too. This leaves me who's the authority?

See, when you get that that sense of terror, go right at it.

Don't run away. Explore, feel, fear as completely as you can feel it, head straight into it and just it so happens that these things give you the property and the opportunity. Let me put it that way.

The opportunity to go into some of your very, very most closely kept skeletons.

The Psychedelic Explosion

The psychedelic explosion is a subject on which we need a great deal more careful thought and a great deal less emotion because it's a very touchy subject. I'm going to talk this morning about the general background of this explosion so as to put it in some sort of perspective in time and space. And I have here a letter little card that I received. It says, Dear Mr. Watts, are you enlightened? If you are, would you please help me? I want to be enlightened also. Yours truly Miss So-and-so. Age 15. And as we know, the psychedelic explosion is something which is highly prevalent among young people and is a quest very largely on the part of young people for something which civilization as we know it in the West seems to have failed to supply. Now, what's the matter? The matter is fundamentally one of religion. It is that standard brand religion in the Western world is a very dreary affair. That in effect, what one gets from a church of whatever denomination, be it Catholic to the right or Southern Baptist to the left, is almost entirely preoccupied with moralizing. And when you study the subjects of sermons that are preached Sunday after Sunday, you read the newspapers and see what they're talking about.

You generally form the impression that what the churches in fact are are sexual and family regulation societies. That's what they're actually doing.

Because if you say someone is living in sin, it doesn't usually mean that he is following the profession of a bookie or that he is conducting a business which is profoundly dishonest and selling things that are just frauds. It means a person living in sin is living in an improper or unconventional sexual relationship. And when we speak of a morality, it really doesn't refer much to cheating. Your customers are being intensely cruel to someone or running a factory which is fouling the rivers. Immorality is generally taken to mean sexual irregularity.

I remember when I was a boy in school that every year we had a particular preacher who came to us to preach the same sermon every year, and the

subject was drink gambling and M.R. out and the immorality of gods meant sexual irregularity.

Well, in one way or another, with certain exceptions, the official churches of the West are saying to their congregations, Sunday after Sunday, Dear people, you ought to be good with a rather limited meaning.

What good is it? And I often wonder what my devout Episcopalian brethren mean when they say the general confession before the Holy Communion and say that we have sinned most grievously, and that the remembrance of these sins is grievous unto us and the burden of them is intolerable. I wonder what they think of. I used to be an Episcopalian priest. I suppose I still am. And as a result of that, I often used to hear confessions. And I know the sort of things people confessed and I know them very well what their idea of sin was.

And in all this history of not only Western Christianity, but to a very large extent, Judaism as well.

There has been an extraordinary and curious failure to emphasize the value of what we could call spiritual or religious experience. The Jewish people are very largely occupied with manners and morals out of the ritual of obeying the Mosaic Law. The Christians are preoccupied with other things besides, the Christians are very much preoccupied with what you believe in, whether, for example, you believe that Jesus Christ was in fact God. Whether you believe that Jesus Christ was the only unique incarnation of God. Whether you believe that the Godhead is a trinity.

Whether you believe that the sacrament of the altar, the bread and wine consecrated at the mass are in fact the body and blood of Christ are only represented. And they have fought with each other. They have cut each other's throats. They have waged crusades. The Thirty Years War, all these things were tremendous fights about doctrinal questions that the mayor have, course, have been some other motivations behind it. But at any rate, this was the subject matter that stirred people to fighting anger.

And in all this history, the Catholic Church in particular and other churches in lesser ways have ignored, excluded or actively persecuted people that we

call mystics. That is to say, those who have had a change of consciousness, which in effect induces the realization that you yourself are not a weird little creature that is a subject and nothing more than that of the heavenly king.

But the experience that you yourself are a direct manifestation of the ultimate reality, or what politics is called the ground of being, which was it is particular, I would say decontaminated praise for the word God, because the word God in our culture has all sorts of extremely unfortunate associations. When clergymen talk about our heavenly father, anybody under the age of 30 squirms. Have you made Jesus Christ your personal savior? All these questions you see have a kind of a creepy connotation to them. The churches endeavor to attract young people by all sorts of devices, by having dances and parties and any kind of goings on, even happenings in the more advanced churches today. But young people know very well that the object of these happenings or socials or whatever it is to attract young people is honey to catch flies. And that finally the minister is going to take you aside for a serious talk. And that serious talk is going to be about your morals and about what is your relationship to your heavenly father. You say your prayers. Do you read your Bible? You know, your prayers. And your Bible is a ghastly phrases.

So the thing that is signally missing and it doesn't matter whether it's Catholic or whether it's Protestant is the central function of religion in changing consciousness, because it's quite apparent to everyone that something is wrong with ordinary consciousness. And what is wrong with ordinary consciousness is reflected in ever so many casual phrases that we are accustomed to use, such as I like to forget myself. I want to get away from myself. I want to feel that my life has some meaning. And I find that meaning.

For example, in joining a movement, whether it be political, religious or whatever. Something then is apparently wrong with oneself as oneself is something that you need to forget. If you feel when you're alone, hopelessly anxious and bored, what's wrong with you?

Why is yourself so intolerable to.

You can't really well love your neighbor as yourself unless you have some love for yourself. If you don't have any love for yourself, you don't have any star or a fountain of love in you to give to your neighbors. And all this preaching of be good, be good, be good and love everybody. Everybody recognizes, yes, it would be wonderful if we could love our neighbors. Great. But how do you do it when you hate yourself? And the church is never explained, except, as I say, with some very rare ministers and special rather far out types of church.

So there is in the history of Christianity in particular, an exclusion and there has been from the very earliest times an exclusion of what is called God knows this.

And this has a complex history, which I'll go into a little because it's quite important to our whole subject. There were in the early history of Christianity, some subsets that were called Gnostics.

And they emphasized that the important thing was not belief, not so much even action, but knowledge. It had you. Could you attain to the actual knowledge of God, of the ultimate reality of the universe?

And many of the Gnostic sects offered this knowledge.

The problem with many of these sects was that they felt that the knowledge of God was contingent upon the renunciation of the world. That is to say, upon asceticism, upon celibacy, upon trying to separate one spirit from involvement in body and in matter, and therefore of agnostics classified three types of human being who were respectively called high like h y l I see from the Greek L.A., which means wood the wooden people.

Next there were the psychic people from the Greek sea, meaning the soul. And then finally there was a pneumatic people from the Greek plasma, meaning the spirit, the breath. And only pneumatic people could really expect to attain salvation because the lowest people were absorbed in their bodies.

The middle people were absorbed in their egos, the psyche and but the superior people were absorbed in the spirit, and they were aloof from all

material concerns. And there were two kinds of pneumatic people, according to the sect of Gnosticism, to which you belonged. On the one hand, there were, as I have said, the very, very spiritual people who tried to divorce their attention from all matters of the flesh. But there were the other people who said that the flesh is real and therefore what you do in the flesh. That simply doesn't matter. And they will. Libertines and the official church disapproved of both of them, and rightly in a way, because they said of the people who were the aesthetes that they had missed the central point of Christianity, which is the doctrine of the incarnation that in the person of Jesus Christ, God had become man, and the spirit had adopted the flesh, and therefore a reasonable, fleshly existence was quite proper. And that remains to this day, a tenet not only of Judaism, which holds it very strongly, but of Orthodox Catholicism, however much Catholicism may deny this in practice. It has to adhere to it in theory. And Jews especially believe that the material world is the positive creation of God and therefore is good and is to be enjoyed thoroughly.

And that is why Jewish food is, on the whole, very good in this country and better than Christian for a good Jewish delicatessen has a kind of lip smacking, robust attitude to eating. And, you know, is it kosher?

Jews will even go so far as to admit that God created the principle of evil because it says in the book of the Prophet Isaiah in the seventh verse, in the forty fifth chapter, I am the Lord, and there is none else.

I found the light and create the darkness. I make peace and create evil. Either Lord do all these things. And so Hebrews believe that God put into the heart of Adam something called the Yeti Sahara, which is the spirit of way witness, which I translate as the element of irreducible rascality that is involved in every human being. But it isn't. It's only a little bit. It's like a touch of salt in a stew. And you don't, of course, put salt through the holes, do you? Just put a pinch and God put a pinch of whey witness, of disobedience, of unpredictability and therefore evil in the heart of Adam. And that is the reason why Jews have a very subtle, itchy sense of humor is that they recognize this. Christianity, on the whole, with certain exceptions, is devoid of humor. A man like G.K. Chesterton is a humorous Christian.

But they're very rare. Whereas a Jew can talk to God with a certain kind of banter and you see that in a play like the Fiddler on the Roof.

Well, and you see it throughout the literature of. Which is full of very funny stories about spiritual things. And you can talk back to God in a kind of a friendly way. But a Christian finds that difficult. Christian is too impressed. And it's very strange how Jews have escaped from this since they are in a way responsible for the part of the trouble about religion in the West, which is that they they foisted upon themselves and upon all of us a model of God which is patterned after the great tyrant kings of the ancient Near East.

After David, after pharaoh, the Pharaohs of Egypt.

After the great law givers us like Hammurabi, of the ancient world of the Tigris Euphrates civilizations, and particularly even the second Isaiah, who wrote the book of the Prophet Isaiah from chapter forty onwards, he was very beholden to the then Cyrus of Persia, who invaded the Babylonian Empire and set the Jews free. And so this word, Cyrus, is the Greek kurios, which means the Lord, the King, as in the prayer curia it lays on. Lord Have Mercy Upon US. And the title of the. The Emperor of Persia. In those days was the King of Kings. And this title was adopted through Isaiah as the title of The God of the Hebrews.

The King of Kings and the Lord of Lords.

And so the model, the conception of God under which all these religions have operated is one that is essentially monarchical and political.

And so the human being is taught to view himself as the subject of this independent, extraterrestrial spiritual prince who is definitely authoritarian, definitely paternalistic. You were, therefore, according to both Jewish and Christian theology, brought into being by a fiat of the divine will out of pure nothingness.

And you'd better watch your step, because if you don't accord with the divine will, if you displease this ruler, you can be not only instantly annihilated, but the much more fearsome possibility. You can be condemned to the celestial dungeons forever and ever and ever. And so you

must cultivate spiritual obedience and humility by considering yourself a miserable worm, a nothing whose entire existence is contingent upon the divine pleasure.

And you must never, by any means, commit the final ultimate blasphemy of, say, I am God in Arabic and I'll hug.

The word of the Sufis, the Islamic mystics in Persia, which spread right through the Islamic world.

And they were always being persecuted and put to death and tortured because of unknown heart. I am Allah.

Jesus.

You see, while such a heretic from the standpoint of Judaism, when Jesus claimed as an end that he was one with God, I am the father are one before Abraham was, I am. I am the way, the truth and the life. I am the resurrection and the life. This was the reason why he was crucified. Really? He outraged Jewish piety. And you can see that Jesus is the case of an individual who had a very profound mystical experience and was hard put to it as to how to express that experience in the terms of contemporary Jewish theology. He more or less concentrated.

I mean, apparently if you examine that and study the gospels very closely, he admitted that he really was one was a father to a select circle of disciples. What he said in public was that he was the son of man. And this title meant the the supreme prophet. The expression son of in Hebrew means of the nature of when you call in modern slang, you call someone a son of a bitch. That means they behave like a bridge. And so in Hebrew or in Arabic, you have such expressions as a body called which means son of a dog. Anyhow, Hamar, being the son of a donkey means you are. You're a dog, you're a donkey. But son of means like. And so Jesus calling himself either the son of God or the son of man. Use both expressions means the one who is of divine nature.

Son of God and son of man means the essentially human the man. The second. Adam, the regenerate. Adam. But he had a terrible time. Is he

expressing these ideas? Because if you are brought up. In a culture where the prevailing cosmology is monarchical and you have the mystical experience, you are very liable to make claims as being divine that you imagine are peculiar to yourself.

You have had this experience, and because God is conceived as a commander and a ruler, you are apt to think that you in some sense yourself are now the commander and the ruler of people and of the whole domain of nature.

And you are not apt, as would be the case in India. You are not apt to see that everybody else is in the same situation, whether they know it or whether they don't.

So because then of the definitely imperialistic and royal and monarchical nature of the conception of God, which has come to us through Judaism and Christianity, mysticism has always been suspect for the simple reason that it sounds as if it was going to create democracy in the kingdom of heaven. And that, of course, is treachery, insubordination, subversion, democracy in the kingdom of heaven cannot be tolerated. And this presents for people living in the United States a very peculiar problem because this country is politically a republic.

And as a loyal American citizen, you have to curse and swear and say that you believe the republic to be the best form of government.

And yet an enormous number of Americans have believed and still do believe and half believe that the universe is a monarchy. And if the court of heaven is a monarchy, then obviously it's the best form of government.

And how can you then be a member of a republic without serious inner contradictions?

And this lies at the root of the reason why in the United States there is a very serious conflict between church and state.

Or rather, I would say not so much a conflict as a mix up so that we have our laws and our law enforcement officers enforcing commandments which

are essentially ecclesiastical. And herein lies one of the great roots of the psychedelic problem.

Consider some other laws which throw a great deal of light on this.

Let's take the situation of a conscientious objector now until not so long ago. It was a necessity to qualify as a conscientious objector. That you stated that you believed in a supreme being and therefore implied that you had received from the supreme being a commandment that you were not to fight in war or to kill. And this was taken as an absolute. You had to qualify as a conscientious objector to say that the commandment thou shalt not kill means you must not under any circumstances kill another person. And so they always ask you, what if a German soldier raped your mother and cut her throat saying, would you kill under those circumstances or wouldn't you? Now, the significance of this law. It's been altered recently, but the significance of it is this that you are saying that you have a conscience against killing or fighting in a war because you have received a you have received orders from a higher echelon of command than the president of the United States, namely from the Lord God.

And this was always the test until quite recently when because there have been a lot of Buddhists around and people like that who don't believe in a monarchical God and that do believe in conscientious objection, they could not say that they believed in a supreme being, although it's highly possible that the phrase that the intention of the law in implying the words supreme being was to be vague.

The people who wrote this law. They didn't know what to say. And so they just used the Vegas phrase they could think of instead of saying God or something like that. They said supreme being a supreme being.

There's a subtle difference between supreme being and a supreme being like between religion and a religion, God and a God. Is there a God? Is there God? These are two really fundamentally different questions, but that's the situation.

And therefore, because in the laws of the United States and England and many other Western countries and in the fundamental attitudes of Western

religion, there is this sense of God as the monarch. There has been going on for centuries and insidious and perpetual persecution of the rival religions, even though we say that everybody in this country has given religious liberty, that is not true. You do not really have religious liberty if you subscribe to the heretical doctrine that the universe is not a political state, but instead an organism, a living organism in which, just as are all the extremities and differentiated features of the physical body, are expressions of the whole body. A finger, you see, isn't just part of the body because it's not like an automotive part. If you lose a finger, kind of screw on a new one, although they're trying to do that, that they're trying to put in hearths and the grafting on this, that and the other, that's terribly difficult to do. Obviously, the the the the organism rejects alien parts. And so you have to give it drugs so that it won't reject those alien parts. But at the same time, those drugs make it unable to reject all sorts of bacteria that it normally would reject. Therefore, you have to keep a person with a heart graft in an absolutely sterile environment because he won't be able to resist infection. So but it is a fallacy to see that the human being has parts like a car, because a human being is not a mechanism. A human being is an organism. And an organism functions quite differently from a mechanism. An organism functions in such a way that every part is a complete expression of the whole.

And this, of course, is what Jesus was trying to say when he said to his disciples, I am the vine and you are the branches.

When he put forward the idea of that, you all belong to my body.

The image of the body and the image of the vine is an organic image. Distinct from a political image.

So our problem is that throughout the history of the West, all those who belong to the organic religion or who felt the organic religion have been persecuted.

You see, let's take the case of the mystical revolution that began with roughly Meister Eckhart in Germany. In that it began in the 13th century, but achieved its maximum force in the early 15th century and eventually became the philosophy of nature as exemplified, say, by gutter. But that are

started out in Germany, a movement that included people like Eckhart Taylor, Rice Brook, the brothers of the Free Spirit, Angeles's laziness. All these people writing from a mystical point of view, and they were very heavily persecuted. Some got by rise, broke up by tallow, barely got by. But Eckhart was condemned, and all for the reason that they experienced oneness or identity with God. Eckhart said The eye with which I see God is the same eye as with which God sees me. The love with which I love God is the love with which God loves me. And Angela Salacious went much further than that. He said If I were to die, God would no longer live, because my eye and God's eye are one eye. Just as the Sufis in Islam said, as there is no deity but Allah. So there is no pity but Allah.

That is to say, no selfishness. So all selfishness or anus is the anus of Allah. It's the same as the punish addict saying Touch them. I see you're at that thou art.

So this mystical movement in Germany flowered into various types of religiousness that spread to England and from England to the United States. Let's take George Fox and the Quakers.

The Quakers were regarded in their early days as the most dangerous subversives. They, for example, refused to remove their hats in church or in court. They refused to use titles.

And so in Quaker speech, I would always be just Alan Watts. No, Mr. No Doctor, no nothing. Just Alan Watts. And it's curious, incidentally, how this form of address has become prevalent today, that very many people write letters now. Not dear Mr. Watts, but dear Alan Watts and or whoever it may be. It's not just if you're a celebrity.

It's a very common form of address. Now, the Quakers also, of course, refused to take oaths because of Jesus saying do not swear by anything. Just let your communication be. Yes, yes or no? No. What is more than this comment of evil?

They wouldn't fight. They wouldn't try. And armies and they even felt that scripture was not as holy as the Bible is usually held out to be. As they said that there is something else that has a higher authority in scripture, which is

the inner light as the gospel of St. John describes it. The true light which enlightens every man that comes into the world.

And if you just put your mind back into the 17th century.

And consider that in those days, the theology of the Christian churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, had four people living in that time the same kind of authority and the same kind of respectability that is today enjoyed by great scientists.

Let's say you ask a question to the professor of pharmacology at the University of California, the professor of pathology. This is the last word. And on the advice of the professors of medicine, laws will be made preventing you from ingesting certain substances or from refusing to be cured in certain ways, from having certain operations or injection dates on the scientists today as priest and his vestments, instead of being the old fashioned chargeable around color. He wears a white coat and a stethoscope around his neck. Why is that a symbol of this? And so those people, those scientists do see we take very seriously. In exactly the same way people living in the 17th century took the theologians very seriously indeed, because the theologians knew what the answers were. They knew how the world was constructed and what was the proper way to behave.

And so when people like the Quakers and the other people who came out of German mysticism along with them, the Anna Baptists who were against baptism because they felt that salvation didn't depend on a silly ritual of pouring water on someone and muttering a mumbo jumbo. There were the levels all sorts of sects flourished in the 17th century and were regarded just as today. Hippies and freaks of that kind are regarded as extremely dangerous, subversive people upsetting the morals of society.

Now look what happened. Look what the Quakers have become.

Nothing is more respectable than the Pennsylvania Quaker, a veritable pillar of society that the laws in the United States about religious freedom were designed for just such people as Quakers.

They were individualists. They were far out.

And yet today, when you claim in court that you object conscientiously to war or that you have some peculiar religion with very odd sacraments, they say to you, what church do you belong to that authorizes this? How well established is it? How many members does it have? Can you prove that you were brought up by your parents in this way of life? Because these are the tests of whether your grounds for claiming that you are doing this thing as a matter of religious conscience. This is the test for whether you are valid and thus you are in a frightful double bind, because if you are accused in court of what is generally regarded to be a heinous felony, you know, your chances of getting a light sentence are much better.

If you take a guilty attitude, you plead guilty.

You say, I'm so sorry. It was a grievous mistake. I didn't mean to do it. Please forgive me. Dear God. You know, your chances are better, but if you say I insist that I did this as a religious act, it is in accord with my conscience and I am not guilty. The judge will say your attitude is truculent. And he won't like you and you're liable to get the most severe sentence. But this story is as old as the hills. It's been going on and on. And we never learn from history.

We do the same things over and over again. For example. We all have the horrors about the Spanish Inquisition and how they took Protestants and put them on the rack and with some screw and finally burn them at the stake. And we said, well, we don't do things like that anymore or we don't. I invite you to consider mental hospitals.

The new heresy is not of all religious opinions because nobody takes that seriously anymore. The new heresy is oddball states of consciousness.

And if you have an odd state of consciousness and you try to express it to your family, they start looking at you in a funny way and say, are you feeling all right?

And that's a terrible thing to say to anyone. You know, if you want to put I shouldn't really tell anyone this, but if you want us to really bug someone and put a hex on them, all you do is you look at them in a funny way and say, are you feeling well today?

And this is yes, I'm feeling fine. Now, I just thought you were a bit pale and so personable and feeling all kinds of squeamishness. And it's much worse when you question a person's state of mind because it's very easy to test.

But in this state, you can take a temperature pulse, have a urinalysis or something. And the doctor says there's nothing the matter with you. Sounds it does stethoscope on your lungs. Right.

But when it comes to your mind, everything is very vague.

You can get into the most weird Kafka esque situations, not whether you're sane on the moment you're challenged to prove that you're saying you're on your guard.

And immediately the psychiatrist says why you're so defensive. Psychiatry is completely diabolical. There's almost the more I see of it, the less I think there's any good to be said, for it is a way of bugging people if you arrive for your appointment early. You are defined as anxious. If you arrive late, you're defined as hostile. If you're happy, you're euphoric. If you're not happy, you're melancholic. If you're afraid of something, you're paranoid. Every conceivable way is devised of putting the patient down.

And when you are admitted to a mental hospital, you you may know all this, but you ought to know the law about these things, how it stands. You can be so easily put in a mental hospital, although the only salvation is that the mental hospitals in California today are so crowded and so understaffed that they're not wishing to admit anyone. And you really have to be in a state of the screaming meanies to get in, or somebody has to dislike you very much. But you are deprived of all civil rights. You are no longer considered as a person.

You are d personified in a negative sense.

See, there's a higher D personification when you attain the mystical realization and become one with the absolute and that there is, on the other hand, a lower de personification where you are simply an outcast. This has been true always in India. There were the higher outcasts called the sunny Athens, the holy man who renounced caste and lived a life of poverty and

freedom. But they were the untouchables on the other end. Who are the Aborigines? The like, the ETA in Japan.

And so if you go to a mental hospital, you become a lower outcast. You are no longer human. And you get frightened. You get scared out of your wits because you suddenly begin to realise that you cannot communicate with people because they look at you in a funny way about everything you say.

So I wondered what he meant by that and you get real scared.

And so you start to act in a funny way. Which is it? The whole thing. You know, the diagnosis of schizophrenia is a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy because anybody puts you in that position and makes you the patsy.

You can't help acting in an odd way. You say, now, look, everybody, you're putting a thing over on me.

I'm perfectly sane and say why you so were insisting on it. The thing that is protesting the death, it's a very difficult situation to be in. Never send anyone to an insane asylum to do anything with them anyway, because that's the trap.

They get it. And then, of course, because they're understaffed, you're ignored. They don't they really don't have time to get around to. I know what the problems are. And even very conscientious psychiatrists and insane asylums just can't get the work done.

So how do you get attention?

Well, you start at being difficult and in the expectation that this will draw attention to you and you'll get some therapy.

And that doesn't really work. I'll tell you how to get out of an insane asylum in a minute. But the.

The thing is that you try to get a. Tension until they they construe all the things you do to get attention as being further signs of insanity, of lack of cooperation. Finally, they throw you in a cell where there's nothing left to

you but take shit and throw it at the walls in order to get some kind of attention. And they see see how far gone.

Now, the way to get out of an insane asylum is very suddenly to flatter one other psychiatrist and cooperate with him to the utmost, not to quickly, but in a sort of gradual way, so as to give him the impression that his method of treatment is working.

In your case, as he wants to write a paper published in the psychiatric journal that showed a certain method, a certain technique is really good, and you will cooperate with that idea and you'll do everything he tells you. But just in the right with a sudden little subtle resistance to the don't don't you, he'll immediately spot you someone who is playing funny business. If you cooperate completely and don't do that, but just gently let it be understood that his therapy is working and they'll release.

Unless, of course you want to go to an insane asylum just so as to have no responsibility and just get out of the whole mess. I think there are some people who do that. But you see, what we've got here in this situation is that having a different state of consciousness or because you experience differently from other people.

That's heresy. And that makes everybody else terribly uncomfortable. And so in you go and then you say, now this is all they say. Well, this is pretty desperate guy. What are we going to do to help us person, you know, in all the kindness of their hearts? What are we going to do?

Well, you can see the inquisitors thinking this problem over to this heretic.

You realize that he is going to be tortured for ever and ever and ever because of his beliefs. And they're infectious. They spread. They go to other people who will be tortured in hell forever and ever and ever because of what they believe.

What are we going to do? We have reason with them and they don't respond to reason. Well, let's apply a thumb screw or something, you know, and see if that will just make the difference. Now is very stubborn. Patient.

Well.

It's a last resort, but we could burn them because they might. Under the torture of being burned, repent and therefore escape everlasting damnation.

And they did it with a kindness motivation, burned up the heretics.

So in the same way in a modern mental hospital, they say, well, we'll try shock treatment.

You know, nothing is more unbelievably clumsy. It works occasionally because the patient realizes that he had better get out at all costs. But by and large, it doesn't. And all it is, it is a form of torture.

And if that doesn't work well, as say, the only thing is to scrape out the front part of his brain.

And, you know, they put an ice pick through the lung, side the eyeball and get it into the front part of the brain and they stir it up. It's called a prefrontal lobotomy.

And then the person is a happy moron for the rest of his life.

But it's the same situation all over again. And we have, above all, to watch out in this country for this kind of psychiatric fascism.

Very, very dangerous. And the problem about the political problem today is that the right wing in this country is very mixed up.

They have that they are very opposed to official mental health, mental health programs and all that kind of thing.

And there have some good reasons for it. There are also some very bad reasons because they would send them to jail pronto. The right wing there also have a lot of opposition to taxation and centralized government, which is a kind of beginning of anarchism.

But they don't mean that.

They mean let's have centralized government against the people we don't like. Leave us alone. Tax everybody else, but not us. The wisdom of insecurity for others. So. And here is then a situation in which a for the reasons that I've outlined.

Western religion definitely ignores or positively excludes the mystical experience and be a religion plus law, persecute those who are uncool about having mystical experience.

So this double situation.

Has created, in the course of history, an alarming practical situation. Which is that Western man in charge of his tremendous technology. Is using it against life because he doesn't feel that he belongs in the universe by being identified as an ego, called into being out of nothing and feeling therefore that he comes into this world instead of flowering out of it. He is basically against the world, especially since the death of God in the 19th century, where the new doctrine that follows the authoritarian God, the father.

Is that the universe is a mindless mechanism, and therefore we have to fight it.

And therefore, in any war, the war against nature is naturally commander in chief. Chain of command drawn and the whole monarchical situation starts over again. So as a result of that, then we are using our technology. In an absolutely weird way, this goes, of course, into economic problems as well. You see, since the industrial revolution, it has been possible, increasingly possible with greater and greater rapidity to feed and clothe and adequately house every single person on earth. There is no technical obstacle to that whatsoever.

And but you've got to do it by automation to do enough of it. But when you automate things, you put people out of work. So if they're out of work, they don't have any money.

And so they can't buy what the machines produce. So you have huge surpluses begin to pile up. Well, you can't give them away. What would

happen, you say, if you said, well, let us pay the people for the work the machines do?

We said that would be going into debt. Where's the money going to come from?

Well, the money is originally based on gold.

And this is this is real hocus pocus, because supposing that gold is rather rare and you can't always find a new gold mine, but yet you are producing millions of tons of butter, milk, wheat, iron, wood, everything you could possibly need. We've got to wait to find a gold mine to get all this stuff into circulation. So the only thing they can do is this. People only go into debt in an emergency. So we increase the national debt and therefore circulate more and more purchasing power to keep the economy running by having was the perpetual state of emergency. We must the government has to go into debt because we are threatened by the communists, by the whatever Chinese veto means, anything, anybody. Just as long as we can say there is an emergency, therefore we can go into debt. But actually going into debt is gobbledygook semantically. All you're doing is you're issuing credit based on the actual productive wealth of the nation or whatever community is the unit.

But people don't understand that just as a several hundred years ago, they couldn't possibly understand that the earth was round and that if you lived in the antipodes you wouldn't fall off. And so there's the similar mumbo jumbo and hocus pocus about money. Money is it is a measure of wealth like inches or pounds or grams. And when you discover a load of iron ore, you don't have to go and borrow a thousand tons from someone before you can do anything with it. So.

In this way that.

The culture is so absorbed with verbiage, with doctrines and religion, with money in economics, with status in politics and with all kinds of manipulation of symbols, that we are not in contact in an aware way with the physical world. We are alienated from the physical world. We are fighting. We are fighting our own bodies. And so therefore, imaginative

young people become aware of this and see the disaster all around them. A terrifying depredations of nature. They see it growing and growing. They see the final achievement of great Western physics as the hydrogen bomb. And they say it's high time for us to get back to reality.

And therefore, naturally, they are accused of peddling hallucinations. But who is under a hallucination?

Look at recently, Congress passed very strict laws against burning the American flag and they did it with great further and all sorts of patriotic speeches and this, that and the other.

While they are by acts of commission or omission.

They are burning up the country for which the flag stands. Allowing continued pollution of the atmosphere, of the water ravaging of the forests. Destruction of wildlife on a fantastic scale.

Only if that doesn't matter.

You can tear the physical territory to pieces so long as you don't burn the flag.

And it's this. This is the hallucination. This is the divorce from reality.

And so I'm not reserving the question for the moment as to whether LSD and marijuana and mescaline and psilocybin and so on and so on. As to whether they are good things or bad things. We'll put that for the moment aside. But one thing seems to me to be in no doubt at all that something has to happen and happen fast.

If we are to again get people to be aware of physical reality, get in touch with the natural universe with their own bodies, and feel that they are one with all that, because if you feel obviously if you feel that you really belong, that Mark Hamill pies is as much part of you as your own hand, and that these waters around here, that everything is something in terms of which in and in the context to which you exist, then you can take a friendly attitude towards it and you'll want to use technology in a cooperative way

with all that and do on the mountain what the mountain would be like. Now you can look out of this window and you can see right across here.

Strawberry.

When I first came here in the summer of 1961. That was a reasonable, beautiful hill. But an idiot called Eichler went in with bulldozers and made it flat terraces. He took the top right off the hill and dumped it down in the bay so that could get extra land. And instead of cooperating with the hill, he treated it as one would treat a flat area so as to build houses on it when it's perfectly simple to build an adequate house on a hill without altering the hill at all.

Preserve the trees, preserve the topsoil, and you can build it. This is why this happened and that's happening all over because these people are quite mad. It's like San Francisco, which is a mass of hills on which they just dropped a grid on pattern and streets that would be suitable for Kansas City. Pay no attention to. They also get streaks that go like this and the cars get lost. They run runaway and cable cars and everything always troubles. You see this as a symbol of man's lack of relationship with nature. He doesn't know how to cook. He doesn't know how to clothe himself. He doesn't know how to make love. None, because it's all concepts. It's all ideas which are the true hallucinations, bugging our brains.

Those are the real bats in the belfry, not because ideas are not good things to have. The ones they shouldn't have concept shouldn't use words. But because one should realize that ideas and concepts and words are purely instrumental. There are things to use, but when you get used by them, then the machines have run away from you, and I suppose they will soon have computers that are breeding and making decisions about their own future.

And we'll say finally, let's get rid of human beings that are a nuisance. Having described a sort of historical and cultural background, the psychedelic explosion. I want to go on next to the subject of the actual relationship between the use of psychedelic chemicals and mystical experience.

And here we get again into an extremely tricky problem.

The problem raised by all those people who question whether anything in the way of profound understanding of life changing experience can simply come out of a bottle.

And this is not altogether an easy problem to deal with because one of the eternal questions about any kind of spiritual initiation, by one means or another, is simply that it seems from time to time there are so many cases in which it just doesn't take.

In the early history of Christianity, there was a long, long argument about people who were called Lapsley, that is to say those who had been baptized and had been initiated into the church but somehow fell away either in allegiance or in morals.

And it was a great puzzle how a person who could have undergone the sacrament of baptism, this great union with Christ conferred upon it, how how they could lapse and what to do about them. Supposing they wanted to come back.

And there were people who took a very rigorous line on this and said, no, once you've been baptized and you fell away, you were absolutely more than ever sold to the devil.

And there was no hope for you at all. But after all, because human beings are really creatures who muddle through life, a compromise was arranged and it was possible to follow them through some form of penance to come back in.

And I am amazed at the way in which the psychedelic movement shows so many parallels to the history of religious movements. At other times, it's simply fascinating.

First of all, let's take not so much the sacrament of baptism, but the sacrament of the Holy Communion, the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ as a sort of parallel to this. Because here, after all, was a religion saying that you didn't really get the salvation unless you partook of a particular material substance, which had been formulas in a certain way.

See, the whole idea of transubstantiation was that the priest took the bread and wine and he had to say a certain formula over the. He kissed and in corpus mail. This is my body which is given for you.

And this is my blood of the New and Eternal Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins. Actually, all he has to say is this is my body and this is my blood.

And if you are an ordained priest in the apostolic succession, it is how that just saying those words actually changes the bread and wine into a spiritual instrument, which will be equivalent to eating the body and blood of Christ.

And since on the principle that you are what you eat on the day you become what you eat, you are converted by the sacrament into a member of the body of Christ and therefore united with God.

Now just look at that.

For a moment and ask the question, how does that differ from a chemical operation?

C In chemistry there are involved the same sort of thing. There's the formula, the form of words through which one constitutes the chemical. There is the material bread and wine or wheat ergot. There is also the problem of authorization. And this is a very, very tricky question because the early Christians quarreled among themselves a great deal as to who had the true sacraments, just as psychoanalysts quarrel among themselves as to argue really in the line of Freud.

Well, you analyzed by someone who was analyzed by someone who was ultimately analyzed by Freud. And then in psychoanalysis, there is a huge apostolic succession.

So in the same way now with LSD. Take one example. There is a great deal of controversy going on as to whether Owsley is LSD is as pure as Sanders LSD. And certainly anybody with less genius than me put LSD on the market. That is just crowd and is stacked with amphetamines and heroin and belladonna and goodness only knows what.

Also that it shortchanged. Badly made. And so on. So the same controversies are taking place about the nature of the sacrament as took place in the early history of Christianity. Also, the good and bad trips correspond to the ancient Christian arguments about the state of grace in which you were when you received the sacrament. If you were in a good state of grace, then it redound to your salvation. But if you were in a state of mortal sin when you took the sacrament, it would be down to your damnation. Saint Paul mentions this in the New Testament.

And so one might say people who have good trips are in a good environment. I'll prepare properly. People are bad trips in a bad environment. Improperly prepare and serve the sacrament, redound to their damnation.

And in this case, damnation. Instead of being something of a postmodern nature that's up to date and modern.

As I pointed out, it is an unpleasant state of consciousness, a psychiatric condition.

And therefore you have to go not perhaps to the torture chambers of the devil, but to the dungeons of the insane asylum.

So that watch for these parallels. They're very instructive. History does indeed repeat itself, just as human beings are the same human beings. Generation after generation. And they're always doing the same sort of things in different ways.

So as in the history of Christianity. So in the history of this. Questions were raised by philosophers who said, why on earth should it be necessary to be baptized with water or to eat this particular bread and wine in order to attain salvation?

Because showing their true salvation has nothing to do with material agencies, we would say now to spiritual insight has nothing to do with artificial means. It's something you do yourself.

By your own will, by your own efforts, by, say, your own meditation exercises.

And so this isn't nearly as simple as it sounds because it raises the question of, well, what do you mean by yourself?

And as we examine that question, we have a whole host of sub questions yourself. Does this word yourself refer to your total organism? Does it refer to some sort of psychic entity which inhabits your organs?

And if the former then if you are your whole organism, you cannot neglect the principle that you are what you eat and that, for example, if you don't have the right kinds of vitamins and the right kinds of minerals, you're not gonna be healthy.

If, on the other hand, your spiritual sanity, let's call it that, really doesn't depend on the state of your body, because after all, we know many people with extremely sick bodies who are nevertheless absolutely marvelous as individuals.

Then it would suggest that the functioning of the psyche is fun, but is fundamentally different and independent from the functioning of the physical organs.

But on the other hand, we know all sorts of people who are quite plainly neurotic or even psychotic, but who are also geniuses and very creative.

So if you can function well with a sick body, if you can function well with a sick psyche, who are you?

What are you?

Now, I tend to the view of what I would call body and spirit as being aspects of the same process.

That, in other words, it is the sort of artificial to make a distinction between the human organism and the human mind.

For the reason that a sophisticated view of the physical world does not require this separation, because it does not require the idea that there is some sort of material stuff out of which bodies are made as tables are made of wood. To me, the human body is a pattern dancing in space, a pattern, you would say, of what? It doesn't have to be of anything. All you need is the pattern. Because when you try to describe the component materials of which bodies are composed, what you describe is always another pattern working on a smaller scale at a lower level of magnification. And nobody ever described anything except that.

So imagine them that we have a rope which is made of various materials at the beginning. The rope is made of hemp. Next stage it's made of cotton. Next date is made of silk and so on.

You can think of a nylon or all sorts of things.

The rope might be made of how you tie a knot in the rope. A simple ordinary knot and everybody can see the pattern of the knot. Now move the knot along the rope.

And as you move it, the it is first of all hamper.

Then it is linen and then it is cotton, then it's silk, then it's nylon.

But the pattern stays constant and it is so also see with the human body, the human body has every conceivable kind of materials flowing through it. We are a stream or we are a form in a stream like a whirlpool. And the stream consists of milk and beefsteak and water and beer and every conceivable sort of thing. Our cosmic rays and so on. And each one of us is a wiggle in this field of energy.

And we so long as we wiggle in approximately the same way, of course, we get older and as we get older, you haven't seen someone for ten years, but for some reason or other you still recognize them. Maybe after ten years of not seeing them because you recognize that it's still wiggly and more or less the same way has the same pattern. So you have a continuity in terms of pattern integrity.

And but there isn't any substance there in the sense of the kind of stuff which remains with you permanently. The only thing that continues as you go through life is the dance. You're doing the pattern.

Who does the dance?

That's a question that's really very silly because it's based on our commitment to speaking a language in which all verbs have to be accounted for by nouns. Call their subjects as if an action could only be initiated by a thing.

But when you begin to go into that and really think it through, you see that something that is different from a verb that is to say different from action could not possibly initiate action. Action comes from action. So as Buddhists and Hindus say, all this world is karma, and karma means doing actual motion energy.

So then your body is an energy pattern. Nobody is doing the pattern. The pattern is, shall we say, doing itself and what you are experiencing in every conceivable sense of the word experience, what you feel, what you sense, what you think, all that is you and it's merely a social convention that we think about some agent who does deeds, who feels feelings and thinks thoughts standing as a constant behind them.

What is the constant is not some kind of spook, but the constancy in the form of the pattern through which one recognizes a person even after ten years absence. It's like you would always recognize the, say, a certain Bach invention whenever it's played and say, Oh yes, that's Bach's invention number so-and-so on.

And so it's for just that reason that you recognize another human being. Now, of course, when we have that, when we talk about music, then we say, well, who's playing it?

There is an instrumentalist at the piano. True. But this is a pattern playing a pattern.

In other words, it is all really the same pattern. This pattern sometimes is in a whirl, which doesn't include a piano. But in other times, it's a well, which does include a piano. And the pattern called the being flows into the pattern called the piano. And as a result, there is music.

So if you think that way, when you eat something that's a pattern to.

And you, in relation to certain kinds of food, are in one state, in relation to other kinds of food. You are in another state. One man's meat is another man's poison. And so in the same way you in relation to certain chemicals feel one way, in relation to other chemicals, you feel another way. And there is no way of abolishing our ingestion of foods.

Or whatever. Because if we didn't, we just cease to exist.

But we know that there are certain things that may not be chemicals in the strict sense. They may be simply natural plants lying around like the peyote cactus, the mushrooms, psilocybin Mexicana, the plant, cannabis sativa, otherwise known as marijuana that's growing around local weed or Amanita muscaria. There's a mushroom. And if we eat those things, our consciousness changes. Now, some time ago, the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association formed a joint committee for legal purposes to try and find a definition of addiction.

And every time they thought they had addiction defined, they found that their definition was indistinguishable from a definition of dependence on food.

And they had the greatest difficulty in pinning down any distinction between a food and a drug like the Food and Drug Administration.

What is the difference between a food and a drug?

Obviously we can see there is a difference, but we can't pin it down. It's like when St. Augustine was asked what his time. He said, I know what it is, but when you ask me, I don't. And so in a similar sort of way, we can see a difference between the food and drug in that food is something that comes directly from nature. Whereas on the whole, a drug is something that

has to be prepared in a special way, is a sort of extract quintessence, a distillation, a concoction or something in a pill.

That's a very superficial distinction. That's all a matter of how you cook it.

And so it is argued by some people that the human organism needs psychic vitamins as well as Robert called bodily vitamins, and that your psyche cannot be in a healthy state unless you take your psychic vitamins like that cartoon in The New Yorker.

Well, two very hip parents are saying to their little girl, how can you expect to have hallucinations if you don't eat your mushrooms?

Now, there is a cost to a sense in which the possession of all the exercise of spiritual insight is analogous to saying being a good painter or a good musician, and you can't accomplish that without a great deal of practice so that you have it in your bones, how to do it.

And I don't for one minute deny that a Buddha, an enlightened one.

Has his enlightenment in him in very much the same way that a painter has his skill. And obviously, the capacity to exercise the skill all the time will not come because the painter took certain vitamins, it may be that he will not be able to exercise his skill if he doesn't take the vitamins.

But we can't attributed the insight that he has, the capacity has for dealing with it directly to anything that he eats.

On the other hand, various painters who have taken psychedelic chemicals.

Have been enormously encouraged in their work because they saw. Into the world more deeply than with the naked eye. And they came back to their painting and tried to bring across that vision. And many people have found that it was, in fact, very helpful.

They could remember what they saw under the psychedelic experience and with great ingenuity, translated by technique, by discipline into a remarkable painting.

So obviously, then the psychedelic chemicals are no substitute for skill, discipline and wisdom in the sphere of religious or mystical experience.

Nevertheless, they are an extraordinary boost to give a person a real understanding that there is something in the nature of deep inside of union with God or whatever you want to call it. They give him a taste of it, a taste which many people never, never have. And from that initial taste, there arises the enthusiasm to pursue the matter further. I do not see why this should not be so.

In view of an integral way of looking at soul and body, spirit and matter.

Really, the burden of proof as to why it should not be so rests upon those who claim that it shouldn't.

Why?

Must any genuine spiritual inside be independent of what you eat or what you drink? Since you yourself are really addicted to eating and drinking.

Let's take another parallel case, and it's very instructive. Which is an enormous number of people are apparently addicted to music. Now, music, when you look at it from a strictly practical survival point of view, music is a waste of time. You don't really need music, do you? I mean, you could go on and you could do your business without any music at all. Music's a luxury.

And yes, it is a major industry today producing music.

And I suppose you could say Ed Dalton made the suggestion that people who are addicted to music have a disease called colitis. And really, music should be stopped as a terrific waste of time. It achieves nothing constructive and is really therefore very bad for you because you become hung up on it. You can't do without music if you're a real music lover. And even if music isn't something you eat. It's just something you listen to. That boy, can you become addicted to it?

So she would get rid of it.

Dancing is something you do. It's also a total waste of time. And of course, Righteous Baptist and people like that have always condemned dancing. Say that's in no way of behaving. They think everybody should always be dignified and shouldn't jigger around. Well, Sir Wilhelm Reich was perfectly correct in saying that people like that, people who are afraid of orgasm, they're afraid of the lilt.

You know, in dancing, there's always this kind of motion if you really dance.

And that sort of goes all through you like a flip in the middle of you, like a whiplash, you know where it goes flip all the way through.

And if you can't do that, you see you've got a rigid body. But even that you see doesn't depend directly on any kind of food stimulus, drug stimulus. But still, dancing can be very addictive. You just plain get to like it. You have to do it. The strange thing is, of course, that the psychedelic chemicals are not addicting, except in the sense that you may belong to some in group, and all the members of this in group are constantly boasting to each other of how much of this sort of stuff they've taken. And so to be respected by the group, you have to keep on taking it. But none of it has the same kind of physical addictive properties as the opiates or alcohol or tobacco, where if you relinquish their use, you'll get remission symptoms, which are very uncomfortable. And this just doesn't occur. In other words, let's say. Well, take any of mescaline, LSD, psilocybin. So far as I'm concerned, for my own personal reasons. If they all vanished off the face of the earth tomorrow, I wouldn't be too unhappy. I would only be unhappy for other people so far as I'm concerned. I've seen what they have to tell me. I've got the message. I don't need it anymore.

Because I do feel that they are really more like medicines than diets.

And of course, one should not become addicted to medicine. And here we get a very curious and amusing difference between doctors and tell him. Doctors are always trying to get rid of their patients. They give the medicine and say, now I hope that will work and you won't have to come back. And they give them a limited amount of the medicine on prescription. But a clergyman hopes he will come back and he will become a member of

the church. And you will pay your dues every week and generally for life get hooked on the religion. Even though there is the Latin saying about the Cross of Christ Crooks, Medi, Jean and Wanda, the cross, the medicine of the world, you get added addicted. Now the Buddha, in referring to his own doctrine, is dynamite. His method likened it to a raft and said, Now, when you cross the river on a raft from the shore of samsara to the shore of Nirvana, when you get to the other shore, don't pick up the raft and carry it with you. Almost get there. Give it a shove and send it back to the other side. But a whole lot of people see are on this rock and they are absolutely fascinated with Iran. And they become monks and permanent religion people. And they go back and forth, back and forth. You know, they're all very man who can't let go of Buddhism and they're addicted. So you see every way. It's in the very funny sense, true, that religion is the opium of the people in so far as people become addicted to religion as a permanent situation. And so they're hung up on it. And this is one of the great parts of Zen training is to get you free from Zen. If you don't get free from Zen, you suffer from what's called Zen State.

So.

Religion, then, can be addictive.

For we'll say it doesn't have physical remission symptoms, but it causes psychological addiction. And so in the same way, we might say that taking psychedelics, whether they be LSD or marijuana or what will you can be psychologically addicting.

It's a separate question as to whether that does any serious damage.

Maybe it does. Maybe it doesn't.

But you could become dependent on these things in that way. But if they were used in as medicines as I believe they should be used. Then a few times it requires a little practice to use any of them properly and to get the full insights that they can afford. But once you've seen it, you've seen it. And there seems to be no point in going back and back and back and back to see it again. I will modify that statement in this way if I am making a special study of the changes in consciousness produced by one of these

substances, and I am therefore recording or an otherwise studying the changes that take place, and this is naturally a difficult task. I may need to go back many times in order to get my picture straight, to see how it does it under certain different circumstances to work out all the ramifications of it. And for me, my own reason for being interested in these things at all is that that as a writer, as a philosopher, it is my great life game to describe what is allegedly undescribable. And for example, there's a drug called Dinosaur Trip to mean the empty for shot and this is a 40 minute run where your consciousness is really screwed up. And I was told about this and I inquired of the doctors whether it was, you know, dangerous or harmful or would leave you with the heebie jeebies. And they said, no, it doesn't do anything like that. Just it says about 40 minutes of sheer insanity. And they said it renders people speechless. I said it won't. Random Bishop.

Oh, is that Nana? No. You you you come off it so or. I said, I'll bet you anything you like. Give me a tape recorder and give me this chemical.

And I will tell you just exactly how it feels in a coherent way.

Well, wow. They gave me the first shot, which was about one point three S.S. and although there was a kind of vaguely interesting change, nothing much happened. So then they gave me one point nine C C, I think, and then it came on. It was as if, say, your elbow as a point in my field of vision suddenly came at me. But in a spiral pattern against the background that was spiraling the other direction. So you've got this other thing going on, and then there's suddenly caught hold of my body, sucked it into the system, and twisted my body into the same spiral motion and that everything started seeming to go like this. And it was all converted into brilliantly illuminated plastic. So it became a cross between a toy shop and Times Square, vaguely menacing. And, you know, you hardly knew which way up you were. And so it was difficult. But patiently I talked into the tape recorder, every single thing that was going on. What it was like. Now, a lot of people would say, well, you shouldn't do that. That destroys the experience. When you talk about it, it doesn't. That's the funny thing about all these things that they are much more interesting when you do some work with them. The work seems to throw something into the experience and then it gives you another task back. And that all adds to the interest of the

thing. And I found out that in working with these things, there was no further conflict between the intellect and the intuition that the more you intellectualized, the more the intuitive insight sprung up to correspond to the intellectual. And so instead of therefore having a session in which you just curl up and go into your own little private room and let it take over and you come back and all you can say is, man, it was a gas. So what what's the point of going on a heroic journey and not bringing something back? The whole point in every myth, heroes who take strange journeys must bring back a feather of the fabulous bird, a claw of the dragon, or the beheaded head of the villain that they slew and say, See, here it is. So I always feel it's necessary in any of these adventures to bring something back. And so you get the great intense fun, really the most stimulating thing I'll say saying we're going to devote this session to the study of a particular problem. One of the best LSD sessions I was ever in on was conducted by a group of people who were all very competent in the world of painting and sculpture. They knew art history. They knew how to do it. Very well trained people. And we sat in front of the first cubist painting that was ever done, and the whole session practically was taken up by a discussion of this painting. And it was absolutely extraordinary and rewarding. And may be that what we came out with in the end was not the truth about the painting. It may have been our Rorschach blot that we projected something into it. I think that's very likely, but nevertheless, it drew us all out in the same way I say. There are certain people who have a marvelous capacity for drawing other people out, making them be at their best, making them talk at their best. And so the picture did that for us. And one person present was a very famous and very successful sculptor. And he said minds. That's what I call art criticism. But the whole conversation through this was completely sane. Even though it might have had some projective elements in it, like a project on a Rorschach glove and see your own individual scene in it. But because we were all talking together, we evolved a common scene. We evolved the idea that this particular artist living at the beginning of the century was a master of technique.

He knew all the European techniques and therefore that he had painted five superimposed paintings in five great classical European style and integrated them into the Cubist. We could see Flemish paintings. We could see French

impressionism. We could see primitive Italian, Flemish and so on. There is levels altogether.

Of course, we will never know his debt. Well, they had his intention or not. But it sure made sense at the time when I looked at the painting before the experience. I thought I knew what it was about. Now I look at it after the experience. I have no idea why I thought it was a painting in Cuba, style of a hillside with a village on it. But now I can't see that anymore. I just can't see it. But I can again catch glimpses of the different levels that we saw during this experience. So I think then that.

The the the these kind of chemicals.

Art tools and very strong tools like an automobile is a very strong tool. It's a death dealing engine. And you have to be very careful when you drive one. Now, of course, because what is good for America is good for General Motors, etc. The other way around to everybody sort of makes driving an automobile the test of whether you're competent.

So they say if you took LSD or marijuana, should you or shouldn't you drive an automobile automobile? This is the test, whether it's a good thing or not. Now I submit that you should not play a violin while driving an automobile. You should not make love while driving an automobile, nor should you read a book. All of these are very creative activities, but there are certain concentrated absorbing activities that are incompatible with piloting a death dealing engine along a freeway.

And that's because in a certain state of consciousness, you would be incapable of being in charge of an audit of an automobile. Doesn't mean it's bad unless you're a hopeless sucker for the policies of General Motors.

But these things you see, they are powerful, dangerous tools. Which puts you into a state of consciousness, which, if you don't know what's going on, can be quite terrifying. In other words, if you take a journey of this kind, you should have a map and you should know what you're liable to encounter. Let's take this now, for example.

I thought, you know, when I first investigated this, that it wasn't. Couldn't possibly bring anything about like a mystical experience. And the first time I tried it, it didn't. It had brought a most interesting aesthetic experience that I wouldn't have called it mystical. But later on when I said this and a lot of people realized that this was my opinion, another psychiatrist came in, he said, I just don't think that you have been on the right track with this, are you? Try it again. So I tried it again with him. And to my great embarrassment, it produced a mystical experience. And there was no could be no question about it. Now, how do I know it's a mystical experience? Well, I have had mystical experiences of a mild nature, the popular spontaneous, that we're not connected with any sort of drug.

And in some sense, I can compare it with those.

But these experiences went much deeper.

And the basic feature every time variable is what I call polar awareness. Now, what is polar awareness? Polar awareness is to see that what you do and what happens to you are aspects of the same process. Ordinarily, we pull them right apart. The voluntary and involuntary, the behavior of the organism, on the one hand, the behavior of the environment on the other. But it becomes utterly clear in the state of consciousness that what you do think initiate will and what you don't do. But what happens to you are one of the same process. When you are steering a car and you move the wheel, are you pushing or pulling the wheel? Now, push and pull a formerly opposed terms, but actually when you consider it on a steering wheel, you are simultaneously pushing and pulling.

I now then imagine that I put out my hand to pick up my pipe.

This is normally a push motion, isn't it?

And this pull motion.

Now, under the effect of one of these chemicals, it becomes apparent that this motion is also being pulled and that when I pull it towards me, I'm being pushed.

At the same time as in steering the car. In other words.

As I said before in the first session, I feel myself simultaneously to be the puppet of nature.

The cork on the stream and to be in charge of everything that's happened.

If I take either one of these interpretations by itself, I'll be wrong. But if I take them both together as two ways of looking at the same thing, the one modifying the other. Then I realize that these two ways of talking that I am a puppet, that I am in charge. I talk that way because I don't understand.

If I did understand, all I could say was that I see that my behavior or what has formerly been called my behavior and the all other behavior are not really separate. They are one single process.

And so what happens on the inside? The skin goes with what happens on the outside. It isn't that what happens on the outside controls on the inside or vice versa. Just like when a snake does, wiggling along which side moves first is left or right. Right now they move together. So in exactly the same way, you get the sensation that everything going on out there and everything going on in here is all absolutely connected, like the two different ends of any moving object.

They go this way or that way or this way or that way.

And you see with the most total clarity that this process that's working this way is in every way harmonious, that what is happening is what ought to happen. Including people's objections to what is happening now to happen to. You just see that everything in this universe is in accordance with the Buddhist doctrine called G.G. Gate. This means the mutual interdependence of all things and events that everything in the universe is vitally important. The whole universe hangs on every single event or thing that is in it.

And without it, the whole could not be.

It all is of a piece as its title had to shut the down, said the only true atom. That is the indivisible unit is the universe itself. Or if we take anything out

of the universe and separated, it is ravel at all its edges.

Because everything is interconnected. That's what you see.

And you see it with just complete clarity and you say, my God, what's the matter with me? Why didn't I see that before? It's so completely obvious. At a somewhat deeper level of this experience, it also becomes obvious that this is a little bit more difficult to describe. But you see absolutely clearly that you and the eternal energy of the world are the same thing.

But that energy is pulsing and it all energy is only known in terms of power station.

In other words, constant pressure applied without palace is not energy because that constant pressure applied is all one direction.

Energy is dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit dit.

Very slow or very fast. So slow that you don't notice the pulse or so fast that you don't notice the pulse, but it's still pulse. So to be and not to be. Life and death appearing and disappearing are all forms of it. And therefore, you live. Let's go back to our vision of the world as energy patterns and imagine that we make a picture of these enemy energy patterns as ripples, you see. Go back to the image of the water ripples appearing and disappearing in water. You suddenly see that all this, the people around you, the houses, the mountains, the stars are ripples in a kind of energy water. And they come and they go. They come and they go. They come in. They go. But the water is always there.

And that's you.

That does this marvelous mirage going on.

But you are it, you're not just the ripple that comes and then disappears.

You're the whole process only. You don't always know it for the simple reason that part of the fun of the whole thing is to forget it.

And we imagine that you're all lost and alone. And while we want a thrill, that is and it does all these things and it does it and ever so many dimensions, as is not only this universe that we see now. There are probably infinitely many universes that could be visualized by different sense organs, different receivers, different wavelengths as on the radio.

Now, when you get into that state and you're not ready for it.

You may get scared absolutely out of your wits.

Because you suddenly feel the unaccustomed sensation of I'm doing the whole thing.

And you see everything that you do notice outside you is known to you as a transformation of your own nervous system. And insofar as that is you, then you are the behavior of the man working out there on the roof. And if you think that's the case, if we say, oh, heavens, I'm in charge of the whole universe on a sticky situation, that it's like the kid who turned himself into the Los Angeles police on a bad trip. Little piece of paper would said, Please help me sign Jehovah.

Or on the other hand, you may feel the opposite, that you are absolutely powerless and that everything you do is simply the determine effects of anything, and then you think, well, how can I rely on that?

How do I know that I'll be able to think in English the next minute? How will I remember who I am? Well, I know the way home.

How can I be sure I won't commit a murder or commit suicide or do something dreadful? You suddenly see you have no guarantee. Either way, you know, if your God, how can God rely on himself to be always sensible?

The real spooky.

So naturally, a lot of people feel completely insecure. No ground to put their foot on because there's no longer anything other. You see that, for example? Other is a different kind of ally. You see that self and other simply presuppose each other. You wouldn't know who you were. You wouldn't

know what you meant by me unless you felt something other than you. Well, that implies the two go together. They're inseparable. No one life. And then that that disturbs people. And so as a result of that, they start calling for help.

And as you panic, the panic is exaggerated because everything that you feel is exaggerated is more intense.

And people think up the most weird horrors, the paranoid, and project all sorts of ghastly schemes that are afoot to destroy. That's why the underground press is so full of paranoia of all these so many of these people are on LSD. They get very paranoid.

But if you understand the principles of this, if you understand what organism environment unity is, what reciprocity is, what the doctrine of G.G. Mulga is, instead of getting frightened, you say, well, well, well, look at that now. It was true, after all.

That's the way it works. And you just relax.

And you let it, you happen because there's nobody left apart from the whole experience to permit it to happen or not permitted to happen. You are simply what goes on and you're not either controlled by it because it's no you separate from it to be controlled by it and you don't control it because there's no you separate from it to control it.

It is just what gives. So it's neither voluntary stick on the one hand nor deterministic on the other.

Now that's a difficult idea to get through into people's common sense. But anybody who has had a deep experience, say the straight mystical all through one of these chemicals knows exactly what that means. Just as a person who is a mature student in physics understands Einsteins relativity theory almost without it having to be explained.

And for me, that is a great mystical experience.

And furthermore, it's very valuable for the reason that I mentioned in the first lecture that we have to realize our real our actual full energy relationship to the external world so that we can create a human civilization which cooperates with nature instead of opposing.

Yesterday afternoon, I was talking about the relationship between psychedelic experiences and mystical experiences and pointing out that there were really two major features in common. One of the sensation of polarity of you as a subject, a Noah, a center of action. Get this astonishing experience of being inseparable from everything that you had hitherto defined as other than yourself. Because you understand that the sensation of self cannot be experienced except in relation to the sensation of something other, and therefore that there is something in common between everything experienced as other and everything experienced the self. It's as if there was sort of a conspiracy like Tweedledum and Tweedledee agreeing to have a battle. And you see and you have the vivid sensation of the motions and behaviors going on inside you, which are voluntary, being simply it were the other face of all the motions and behaviors that go on, whether inside you or outside you that are involuntary, that they were two sides of the same coin dancing together. And this is a very fascinating feeling and a very good feeling.

If you have the there's something iffy about this, which I'll come back to a very good feeling on the whole, because you feel that the whole arrangement of life of the the world of the universe is fundamentally harmonious.

Even though you can understand that there are tragedies and agonies, nevertheless, for some peculiar reason, you see that those are. Shall I say bands on the spectrum of experience. The spectrum of experience is vast, is multidimensional, and that the energy of the world is playing on all parts of the spectrum.

So it ranges you see on the what we could call a pleasure pain scale from extremes of ecstasy to extremes of agony.

Now what we feel you see, we always feel that the extreme of agony is threatening because it can bring about death and we are up. We have been carefully trained to try to avoid experiences on the agony extreme of the

band. When you were a little baby and for example, you vomited. Your mother may have reacted dizzy and that taught you that vomiting was not a pleasant sensation, although in fact it is. And when people got sick, your parents got anxious and said, Oh, you are.

And you learn to imitate those reactions. When people died, they started crying and had a funeral and it was all very solemn. And so you learned that dying was a bad thing. But all these attributions of good and bad to the natural events of life are artificial. There are social conventions there, a game being played. And when we play games, we take various elements like, say, opposing your playing poker and you've got chips and you say red chips where so much blue chips were, so much white chips worth so much. And you put your valuation on the chips. So in exactly the same way life is going on and you put your valuations on it. Your parents put valuations out because they were playing games with life, competitive competitions.

Who wins, who loses, etc., etc. Easy. And so they put all these values on them. And consequently, these are so ingrained in everybody that they find it difficult to be liberated, to see everything in what Buddhists call it. Such as. Now, such news means this, and this is a very, very common feature of psychedelic experience that you see that everything is simply a dance of energy. It isn't good, it isn't bad, but it is beyond good and bad good with a capital g that it's just great. It's a fantastic achievement. Sea life.

And it's going do do, do, do, do, do, do, do, do, do, do.

There are all sorts of ways that it it it it is a goody goody goody goody goody goody, you know, doing all these dances and that's what it's all about.

And therefore, in a certain sense, anything goes. And yet in another sense, it isn't just anything goes because the fun of this whole thing is to make patterns.

To figure out games, to do something with it.

And it's doing this forever and ever and ever and it's going to surprise itself because you know what a shock death is. No, it just blows you right out.

But, you know, if you observe the world, you see that it keeps coming back. So for heaven's sakes, don't worry yourself with images of being annihilated forever. You know, of being, as it were, buried alive in the dark. And to be confined in darkness for always and always and always, which would be just unbearable.

Just forget it. That's his complete hallucination.

After you dead, you know where you'll be someone else, just as you are now, you know, you came into this world, came out of this world is more correct way of saying and experienced yourself altogether new. Well, everybody who comes out of this world has the same experience and it keeps happening. And when one of them is finished and feels itself disappear, then as we know, another one starts. And that's you all over again. That's a difficult thing to understand because most people are unaware of the reality of intervals.

Of spaces and there are spaces, intervals between all human lives and those spaces join the lives together, whether they are spaces is what the ordinary little space or whether their spaces of time, intervals of time. And you can understand this when you listen to music and realize that the melody that you hear is a result of hearing the intervals between the tones. If you don't hear the intervals, you just hear a succession of noises and you don't hear melody at all.

So in the same way that the intervals between lives that join the lives together, you don't have to imagine any strings attached. And his soul spook trance migrating from one life to another lives. The lives are joined simply by the interval between them. And to become aware of space in this way is the most important thing. Most people are completely unconscious of space and regard it as nothing.

Then so I said this then is a major feature of psychedelic experience, which is in common with mystical experience, is then we'll call it first the sense of polarity and of the games. The such list of things that life is simply what it is, that it has no absolute value, but you put your values on it like you put values on the chips in poker. But actually, let's suppose you let me give two

illustrations of such a.. Let's say we consider the word yes. And that we mean by something that it's affirmative. But say yes several times.

Yes, yes, yes. Yes, yes, yes. Yes, yes, yes. Yes, yes, yes. You begin to hear it as a nice. Yes. Is it funny that we make that noise? Yes. Yes.

And suddenly the meaning evaporates from it and you get just the noise. So in exactly that way, you begin to look at everything. I'll take another illustration when somebody doesn't know about. I mean, shrug of the shoulders. And you do it once and it has a meaning.

But imagine you're watching someone going, you know, and suddenly you see everything is like that.

It. It doesn't mean anything.

But it's fascinating because it is just a certain play of pattern. Like you're fascinated when you look at a crystal. You like to turn it around, look at all the angles. And the thing and all the patterns are a pick up a seashell, pick up a fantastic rock, admirer of fish, the sea. And this way of looking at it, that it just everything is a fantastic pattern, has no meaning, except it's just what it is, dancing like that. Did you ever see a lady go this way? Go that way? Mm hmm. That's what it is.

And that's such a..

And then the second aspect is that you can often come to a level of experience where you get in touch with the final basic energy that is operating in all these patterns, diagrams and games. And this is generally experienced as a sensation of intensely brilliant light.

As if you realized the current inside your nerves and saw it as this brilliant light.

Somebody hits you on the head hard. You see stars. See, because then you suddenly experience the current inside the nerves. And with psychedelics, you very often come to an experience of absolutely vivid light in accord with the physicist's realization that everything is really light, that this whole

world is light throbbing in different vibrations, so that wherever we encounter something dark or something solid, it isn't actually against light, but it is a form of light that is going so fast in its wavelength that it has effects us as the experience of density and impenetrable ability. If light is too bright, it smashes your eyes as quite as effectively as somebodies fist can smash your face. So what? Everything that we call density and impenetrable city is not. It is really in effect. Strength of light.

Now, these are the two features then of two principal features of psychedelic experiences which correspond with mystical experiences.

Now, I want to talk. Particularly today, about the aspect of danger in these things.

Because you will see in what I've been saying so far, come on me, that there's a departure from common sense.

For example, people say, oh, I want my life to be meaningful, I want it all to make sense. And therefore, when you propose the idea that life really doesn't make any sense at all. That is there some kind of jazz going on? This is threatening to people. They say, is it, after all, a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury signifying nothing. But as our age, Blythe said once when commenting on this passage from Macbeth, it is said so well that it doesn't seem so bad after all. Maybe the whole thing is a tale told by an idiot full of sound and fury, but it's the sound and the fury that are important listening.

But that's an idea which we are not used to. We are taught to think that if your life doesn't have some purpose, you're a washout. You're just an idiot. But maybe it's a very good thing to be an idiot.

To be a complete fool.

And simply to sit and watch the wave, know how good a thing it is to sit on a beach and just watch waves breaking and dissolving, you can sit for hours completely fascinated. And children like to do this. I just sit by a pond and drop pebbles into it and see all the concentric circles coming out of the plop.

While you could say, well, it's much more important to go into business and achieve some substantial results and raise a family, why you're just making a bigger splash. That's all.

And you have children and the children go, bla bla good. The bird, the goody, goody, goody, goody, goody, goody.

Finally they give when they start in better living and how they make sense and they talk and so on. But it's all just the kind of jazz. I mean, raising families and businesses and getting food and eating and going on and going up this way and so on. It's like gun hair growing or trees coming out and everything should be all over the place.

That's scary. If you've been brought up to think that it's supposed to mean something when you see it doesn't. And that's just what's happening.

Like people get frightened and they think they're going insane. And they wonder whether they can remember the rules. Well, now, in getting into this predicament, the most important thing to understand.

Is the immense sanity giving power of letting go and not trying to hold on to any sort of security? This is a I think this is one of the most important things in life to realize how powerful and how great in conferring order and sanity and a feeling of comfort on any conceivable situation, it is to be able to let go. Now that there is a difference between this kind of relaxation and being merely limp in the sense of when you hang a cloth over a clothesline, it is limp, it simply drops. And there's a subtle difference between being completely relaxed and being merely limp. You see, when you are as a physical body or completely relaxed, you still have muscle tone as you have a sudden vibrancy going in you.

You are not just a bunch of jello or kind of grease that if you relax, you will form a nasty blob and eventually slip through the floor.

There is the varsity and strength. So in the same way, if you relax psychologically and completely let go of things. You will find that you have psychological terms, energy. And you cannot really do anything skillfully,

any art, you can't talk, you can't think you can't have sexual orgasms or anything like that unless you have learned fundamental relaxation.

So when in the midst of some sort of psychedelic experience, whether you are using LSD or whatever, or whether you have an experience that comes upon you spontaneously and you get scared that you're going to go out of your mind, you're going to lose control.

And I'm gonna be in charge anymore.

You do exactly what you do. If you find yourself in a typhoon and see when you find yourself in a typhoon, what they do is they turn off the engines because in a big steamship, if the propellers get swung out of the water and turn on their own, they shatter the ship by vibration. So they turn off the engines and drift cause they keep an eye on how near to land they are, but they try to get as far from land as possible and just drift in the same way. If you're in a sandstorm in the desert, there's absolutely nothing you can do. So the Arab League, he wears a wall by noose and he crouches down on the ground like a fetus in the womb and simply covers himself with his burns and doesn't move until the sandstorm is over.

And you know, Edgar Allan Poe story about the vortex, about the man who gets into the middle of the thing where it went well.

The calm center is. I had a friend in London years ago. He was a psychiatrist and a very wise one. And he wanted to see a royal procession celebrating the king's jubilee or something. But he wasn't going to walk out onto the street at four o'clock in the morning and wait so as to get a front seat. He came just a few minutes before the procession started. There was this milling crowd of people pushing and shoving and so on. He just leant on the back of the crowd, did nothing else but lean, and in all the jostling he learned. And then they leave. They found himself in the front row.

So when any kind of terror starts and you begin to feel uncomfortable and uneasy, you just let go. Now, why does it work?

It works for exactly the same reason that you got long. You had nothing to do with it from the conscious point of view. All this remarkable brain and

bones and everything came into being you or even your father and mother didn't understand really how it happened. They knew they had to do certain formalities to get the thing started. But really how it all works. Nobody understands, but it does it of itself. It's why the Chinese call nature a run, which means of itself. So spontaneity and this extraordinary organization of intelligence happen.

And we we we are afraid of it because it is scary from the point of view of individual consciousness, as the Simons says.

The Lord, I am fearfully and wonderfully made, and that means I am scary to myself.

And so we think that we know better and that we ought to make certain corrections to nature so that it will function more desirable. But that's quite doubtful, you know, whether we really ought to do that. It might have been better to leave it all alone as the great diarist sages of China had always advised his leave life alone.

They say the man who train first man who trained horses was called polo.

So you get the name of the game of polo from him and that he ruined the nature of horses by doing this, we could say to that by our technology, we really made an awful mess of things.

It perhaps you see what we call cost, where we are stuck with it. That's the nature of karma.

Once you once you've interfered, you're stuck with it. You've got to see it through.

But it could be argued quite persuasively that we never should have done anything like that. That we should have followed our feeling and just let live happen.

And then, of course, we wouldn't have any of the problems we have now in terms of atom bombs, population bombs or all these problems.

You see, it would not have occurred only from the standpoint of civilized people, we should say, of human beings in that state. Well, they're just barbarians. They do what they feel like.

And from our standpoint, that is not very pretty because we've got a special concept of what it is to be very pretty, which is all stuck about with Ding Dongs and clothes and bells and whatever, you know, houses.

But the fish, the cats, the birds live with their curious dignity and they make no. You know, you remember Jesus when he said, consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. And I've never yet heard a sermon on that passage where the preacher commanded it. They all say, well, that's a great life. But of course, for all practical purposes, it's impossible. The most subversive pathogen that's been out anxious for the morrow.

They take care of itself. Drift be like a leaf on the wind.

I remember when I had my very first mystical experience. I was 17 years old.

And. I was in a great state of tension trying to find out something and suddenly I abandoned the whole thing. And worked.

You know, you live, it flipped, you're inside. And I felt like I was a leaf on the wind that happened to be at the time of year. It was autumn and there were many dry leaves floating around and skittering about. You know, how leaves play like their little children let out of school, go particularly along the street with the wind.

And I felt exactly like that, as if I didn't own anything, didn't have any responsibilities. Didn't care whether it went this way or whether it meant that I was completely released.

And I felt completely one with a leaf being blown by a wind, and I was the wind and I was the leaf and this wind was the wind blowing where it listed that Jesus uses as an analogy of the spirit. You know what list of means it blows where it likes, not where you hear. It's nothing to do with. Listen to the old English list of means that blows where it wills.

In other words, at random and to let go in that sense.

And allow and and really consider the possibility that everything in life is completely out of control and at random, but go with it. This is fundamental to any kind of strength, any kind of real control. So that what happens in a psychedelic experience is that when it is valuable for the reason that it can be a very threatening experience, it can suddenly show you that you are not really in control, that anything might happen.

And this, I think, in a way is the center of the whole thing, why these sort of drugs are effective is that they throw you off your normal function and they're out.

You see that this is why there are a whole complex of drugs that are quite different, but act in the same general way. What they do is they throw you off. And as I said, I think earlier in the seminar, we gave you a sense of something clear change your state of consciousness so that by contrast with your habitual way of feeling things, you say, I feel odd. Now, it may be odd good and it may be odd bad, but you feel odd. It's as if everything the whole said, sorry, I'm your whole consciousness has had a change in it and you can't really figure out what it is because it's common to every particular sense impression, to seeing, to hearing, to to white, to blue to red. Everything has been subtly altered as if it were buzzing, as if it were at a strange angle, as if it had become luminous, as if it were suddenly transparent, as if it were squirming a bit. And because this is common to everything you say, this is clear.

So you suddenly are out of control. Things aren't ordinarily what they should be. And of course, the same thing can happen in sickness. Some people when they are dying, have the sense that everything is completely wrong. It's all out of order. It's weirdly out of order.

Now, these then are opportunities to let go. Give it up. Don't try to control anything.

And as soon as you are really persuaded by some kind of event to do that. Like the person caught in the typhoon or the sandstorm or people who are dying. Anybody in extremis will recognize that he just has to give up.

There's nothing else to do. And when you do that, you suddenly discover you have enormous reserves of strength.

Intelligence and power. If you let go.

But is the common sense militates against this. They say, well, if you let go, you just become a slob who will just become nothing at all and you will be sucked down the drain.

But it isn't true.

It's only by complete letting go that you have a source of strength.

Which bounces right back at you.

So then when people get the horrors and the terrors.

In using, say, LSD, you also act to panic and go running off to a doctor or turn themselves in at a hospital and say, please, please, please, I'm.

I'm lost in the corridors of my mind. I've been chased down some endless passage and I can't find my way back.

Help! Help! Help! I'm lost.

And then, of course.

Because if a psychiatrist doesn't know what to do and thinks this person is really in a very serious condition, he gets anxious.

And his anxiety instantly community Kate's itself to the patient who gets more anxious and they come around and they look official and they give medications and this, that and the other, and the person is completely spooked.

So a good psychiatrist can handle anything like this. Just.

Treats it as if it were the most normal everyday occurrence.

People think they're going to die.

People think they have are about to lose the power to breathe, that their hearts are going to stop, that their brains are going to dissolve into phantom drip and feel all those sort of sensations that all those sensations you see of being out of control are the sensation of the dissolution of the ego.

That's what's happening.

Their ego is a what you once called a cramp in consciousness and in Sanskrit, there's a word some culture, which means essentially contraction and the the give out man, the the the ego is a sum culture.

And do you often feel if you experience yourself organically, thoroughly, that you're contracted, can you feel a constant strain in yourself? It centers right between the eyes. Yeah. And triggered Barrow, made experiments with electro and settler graphs and things to see what was the difference between the state of a person who had a cramp here and the person who relaxed it. But it's not only here. You feel it all over you. If you become aware that through all the day long you are in a state of defensiveness. Europe tightening where you needn't tighten. And a lot of people experience it here. And as a result, generate ulcers.

There all sorts of places where we feel this this holding on.

It doesn't do any good.

Cos I can't tell anyone. You just simply you should relax because that's as a sort of double bind, because the moment you say should you inculcate a state of mind which is, um, relaxed.

Thou shalt love the Lord, our God. You better watch out if you don't. Well, you can't love on that basis. You can't love because you know that you ought to love in self-defense.

It's impossible.

Love is something. Not under any ego control at all. You have to let go to let love happen. Maybe it will, maybe it won't. But that's none of your business.

So it's very, very frequent in psychedelic experiences that people become vividly aware of how tense now defending themselves against everything all the time on the watch out.

But almost all the energy we expend in doing that kind of thing is waste.

So that if you stop doing it because you see that the only way to stop doing it is you can't will yourself to stop doing it. You can only realize that it's completely useless. That it doesn't achieve anything at all, it just wears you out. It's absolutely no good. It's like having a sense of guilt is an entirely destructive emotion that doesn't do anything for anyone.

There are a lot of existentialists today who say that unless you feel a anxious and be guilty, you are not living a genuine existence.

Imagine, you know, you're not authentic because if you're a real human being, you know that if you exist, you might not exist.

Therefore, you try to be or not to be. If you're a human being, you know that you're not really up to what you might be and therefore you feel guilty because you're a little defective.

And all this is posturing. It's a great pose. People say to be real. You've got to be a. Yeah, that's that's all play acting. It's just a joke. Yes, I am deeply sincere, you know. Yes, I am terribly sincere. I really mean this.

You know, do I really need to exist to be here as an organism? I mean, good lord, I am here, you know.

And, well, I can't help it.

It has nothing to do with my ego that I have feet and that I exist and that I'm here. Do I really mean it or don't I? Well, I guess I do. I mean, my my

physical existence here is perfectly sincere. It's about as real as anything can be.

But I didn't intend it. I don't have to say no. I mean, if somebody threatens me, then I may bounce back rather strongly. But I don't have to make a sort of cause out of it.

So are they.

The notion that I ought to feel anxious all the time, that I ought to feel guilty all the time is simply a way of people who really don't have a very good sense of existence. And they drum something up like lying on a bed of nails because that makes you feel more real.

It hurts. It's a kind of masochism.

Well, you can do that if you want to. There's really no reason why you shouldn't.

Except that I think it's a sort of a drag.

So the point being that people who who say, well, you should lie on a bed of nails and feel that makes you feel important, you've done something that most people don't do and you are you're a bit far out and therefore perhaps they're more real. I say, OK, but just please have a sense of humor about what you're doing.

Don't take it quite that seriously.

Try to convert everybody else to sleeping on a bed of nails. Because it's not to everybody's taste.

And but a lot of people you see who sleep on beds of nails just because they're very insecurity, because they feel that unless they suffer that something awful going to happen, they try to convert everybody else to doing the same thing. So that's one way of finding out that knowing that you are right is to get as many people as possible to agree with you. Like be bad to log the monkeys. And Kipling's story in The Jungle Book will keep

exclaiming. We all say so. So it must be true. And so to feel guilty and to feel anxious and then make a religion out of it and say this is the way any authentic human being feels. And if you don't, there's something wrong with you. You know, like a lot of people who are being psychoanalyzed feel that anybody who is not being psychoanalyzed is neurotic. Philip Brief puts it in his book on Freud, *The Mind of the Moralists*. He says, The characteristic institution of our era is not the parliament, but the hospital, that everybody is being undergoing therapy. Everybody must admit that they are in the costs of being cured, but is not cured. Nobody can claim anybody who got up and say, I am perfectly psychoanalyzed. I have no further problems would be regarded in this day and age as someone who would in a former age get up and say, I'm absolutely holy. I'm the perfect saint. That is immediately spiritual pride. You can't possibly claim that all saints are measured as saints by the degree to which they declare themselves to be sinners.

I am. My sins are worse than yours. I am more sorry for my sins than you.

You can see them from the point of view that these chemicals give you.

You become aware of all these intricate games that people are played. I remember once long ago, Dana and I had a wonderful psychedelic session in which we were listening to the radio on a Sunday evening and all these preachers were coming on with their messages. And the only one that rang true was a Negro revivalist. And he was stopping to make any sense at all.

He was saying that gift is about it. That is it. Now, our congregation was saying that I am an. You know, if you got that far, they shut him off and change the program.

That was all right. There's a poor little man who was talking in an echo chamber, so it sounded like a great, great cathedral.

And he played records of hymns and then he came on with this Bible message.

And he kept saying, if you want a copy of this message, be sure to send one dollar to the station.

Be showed us in those your dollar and we'll listen to that. Oh, yeah. Isn't that grubby? But then you listen down into this voice saying that. Be sure to send in your dollar. You realize this is a poor little creatures saying, well, I've got to make a living somehow, too. And in that voice, that awful corny voice saying be Sharon sending you down, you hear a crying child.

Oh, you hear a lost animal calling out, please help mama. I I want.

I want to help you listen down into that and you go further listening to the sound. And finally, the human voice becomes like breath going through a flute.

You. And do you think at first that's sad. And after a while you realize it isn't. It's just one of the ways things happen. It's the fundamental sound. It's the ohm. It's the voice of God playing a particular tune.

And you think marvel of marvels. You heard the divine sound through the throat of a Baptist preacher.

Incredible.

So, you know, that's that's one of the really great things about this kind of experience. You can tackle you can confront things that in the ordinary state of consciousness you think were downright awful.

And learn to understand why they're there.

You can take people that you thoroughly disapprove of and you can begin to understand why they are the way they are. For example, from my point of view, I've always been an argumentative person because I liked the discussions and talking about philosophy and religion and so on, and I won't argue about anybody's religion anymore.

I regard all the different opinions as so many different flowers and a garden. And they need each other. In other words, if somebody disagrees with me, then I know where I stand. If I said there wasn't somebody who disagreed with me, I wouldn't know where I stood. So I have to thank him for pointing out to me what I think and say. Keep it up. That's great.

We're all you see by our differentiations of point of view. Making up a great pattern, which you could call the intellectual life.

It depends on that.

But the basic point that I want to make in all this. What I am really talking about is how through the use of the psychedelic chemicals, you can be so shocked, you can be so disturbed that you will learn that you've got nothing else to do but completely relax your controller, your sensor, your ego, and that to the degree that you really let go and don't try to hold onto life anymore.

You just you become enormously strong and able actually to control things.

But all fundamental control depends on giving up control.

And this paradox, which scares the hell out of us is the is the main lesson of the whole thing.

Now, the final problem that comes up in this discussion is what we might call psychedelic control. The whole question of. Since there is a widespread circulation and knowledge of these substances among us. What are we going to do about it? I want to make the initial point that there is a very strong difference between controlling something and suppressing it. If you are controlled to go back to the great General Motors image of life. If you are controlled as a driver of a car that is quite different from a person who never drives, keeps the car locked up in the garage. If you are controlled as a writer, you are not a person who never picks up a pen. If you are controlled as a dancer, you are not a person who never dances.

But this has been utterly misunderstood throughout the whole history of the Christian West.

And.

In the United States, we just haven't learned from any of the historical lessons. I recently was discussing this problem with an Indian tribe. And a tribe which incorporates the Native American church where they use peyote

in a religious ceremonial. And the significant thing about this particular order. Is that the peyote Indians are exemplary in their tribes as stabilizers.

They are stable in their families, in their work, and they don't drink alcohol, which for some reason is extremely demoralizing to Indians. And they are very much against it.

They won't allow it on the reservation at all because they can't take it.

It may be a question whether we don't have the same predicament in reverse. Can we take peyote and stay sane? We're used to alcohol, but it doesn't help us to be particularly sane. That does something for us, I guess. But the peyote Indians are really exemplary. They are wonderful people. And the peyote ceremony is absolutely marvelous, although it's part of tested endurance. People who practice Zen talk about the session, you know, where you sit in zazen practice for a couple of hours maybe. But in the peyote ceremony, you sit all night from sunset to dawn and you hardly move except once at midnight when you get a drink of water, pass around and you can go up to the john if you want to.

They say.

Because they think that their religion is legal. There have been court tests of it.

And that they their view is that peyote being a natural plant is God given, and the government has no right whatsoever to interfere with it. They would say, for example, that if the growth and distribution of peyote were under government regulation and they would get what they were given the special privilege of being able to use it because they are a church, they would still protest and say this is not the business of any government whatsoever.

Because.

It grows and all things that grow and all things that are natural are essentially good. And in this, they concur with the Hebrew view of things. Because in the Book of Genesis, it is explained that God created all things whatsoever and only of all things, the tree of knowledge was forbidden.

Costs that's always a problem of why it was there at all. But every time it says every herb and every plant is given for the good of man and the Hebrew insists that, in other words, the material world, because it's the creation of God, is a good world and that evil can only arise through the misuse. Of natural things. So they very strongly. The Indians contest the interference of government in the use or possession. Of any natural plant or herb whatsoever, and so naturally then in this case, under this category, there come three of the major psychedelics and actually there are more. But the three that are best known are peyote. The cactus, the mushrooms, psilocybin Mexicana and the hemp plant from which we get marijuana.

I suppose you would also say tobacco. Incidentally, we don't smoke real tobacco. We smoke treated tobacco. The Indians smoke real tobacco and they mix it with willow bark. That's rather a different scene.

So.

When it comes, however, to LSD and to die methyl tripp to mean and synthesize drugs, there might be some cause for dispute about this.

Just as there would be if we completely freely circulated penicillin or barbiturates, opiates and strong acting drugs of that description, we might say, yes, there is some good cause for imposing rather strict controls on the actual possession or purchase of these substances. Just as there is an obvious reason for controlling the purchase of dynamite or TNT or licensing people to own guns, drive cars and and so on. But you'll notice there is no law prohibiting the growing or possession of Amanita Panther Arena. Amanita Panther Arena is a mushroom that looks very like edible mushrooms and is deadly poison. There is no really effective antidote to it, but it is not forbidden by law. There is no law against growing belladonna, deadly nightshade, so the whole nature of a law against especially the possession of something that grows naturally on God's green earth has a certain degree of insanity about it. Because they're at the root of many points of view from which this can be considered.

First of all.

Anyone can use a gun to kill a person or you can just use it for plinking and shooting tin cans. It is not the possession of a gun which is criminal. It is the misuse of a gun as it is also with the misuse of an automobile. And therefore the very nature of crime consists in a specific action which misuses some substance to the detriment of other people. When you make a law in which the possession of a given substance is a felony, you thereby invite endless corruption and problems. Let us consider, first of all, the problem of marijuana.

It's very easy indeed.

To prove that someone possesses marijuana, all you have to do is sprinkle a little dust of the substance on somebodys coat and then you can declare to the police that you have reason to believe that they possess marijuana and they can vacuum, clean your coat and find some small dust of marijuana there. And you can be put in jail for five years. In some states, you can even be put to death.

Although this hasn't happened in quite a while.

In other words, if you have a political rival and you want to get rid of him, you just plants and marijuana on his premises and and tip off the police. If you have a wife you want to get rid of. If you have an enemy, then a description.

This is what you do.

And in turn, if the government wants to get rid of you because they don't like your politics, they can just send the police around with a search warrant to your home and they will carry in their pockets a few roaches. You know, which are the butts of marijuana cigarets. And I just find it. And something that you have to see a law against possession is is completely insane because it invites all those sorts of possibilities. In the case, you know, like when Al Capone was giving trouble, they couldn't get at him directly for any of his crimes. So they found an error and his income tax. Well, it's so much easier to find someone guilty of possessing marijuana and the penalties for possessing it are worse and higher than those for fudging your income tax or for armed robbery, all sorts of quite desperate crimes are

punished less heavily than possessing and especially pushing or selling marijuana.

And so far as this particular herb, which is what it is, is concerned, the laws about it are based on pure superstition.

There is not one single reputable scientific study of any description whatsoever that can prove a link between the use of marijuana and crime and insanity. There is no proof whatsoever that it leads inevitably to the use of heavy stuff like heroin. It is all worked up by Mr. Slinger, who used to be head of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. His history is rather interesting because before that time he was a great prohibition enforcer and the law put him out of a job and he had to find a new job. So he worked up the myth that marijuana was a very dangerous drug and got himself made head of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. And he's got it. He's worked all over the world. He's got it written into international treaties. And an enormous amount of nonsense has sprung up around us.

Now.

And the British government back at the end of the last century realized that marijuana was an extensive use in India and they had to decide what to do about it, and they made a very, very extensive investigation and published its results in several volumes and concluded not to take any steps against it in India. The United States surgeon general investigated its use in Panama and they decided that there was no point taking any action from their standpoint. They found nothing particularly wrong with it. And when Mala Guardia was in charge of New York, he had the New York Academy of Medicine make a very thorough investigation of its use. And their report was that they saw no particular harm in it. And at most it could be called a social nuisance. So but for some reason, the ACMA, the American Medical Association, condemned the New York Academy of Medicine for premature judgment and unscientific investigation. But you know what lies behind that? They did. One of the difficulties of the whole situation is that the use of marijuana is a substitute for alcohol.

And alcohol is big business. So cigarets.

And there's a fear among producers of alcohol that if people got onto marijuana, they wouldn't drink so much and so they have a slush fund, quite considerable sum, which they spend, keeping up the notion that marijuana is very destructive. Also, it's very easy to grow. And although I don't think that if it were legal, many people would bother to grow it and prepare because it's quite a problem involved of cleaning it and getting out stocks and seeds and all that crowd. I don't think most people would bother so that the tobacco companies could very well switch crops, be quite easy and fact much cheaper than growing tobacco.

And they could supply marijuana cigarets in beautiful packages with all kinds of psychedelic colors on them and wonderful brand names and make a terrific business out of it as well as the get the excise tax that would naturally be imposed on it could finance a whole new war.

But one must face the fact that in the free use of marijuana, there are certain dangers.

But perhaps not such great dangers are as are involved in the free use of alcohol.

But I would want to say there a clear warning that there are varieties of marijuana which are extreme, extremely strong, especially in the form known as hashish, which is simply marijuana resin concentrated.

Which if it were commonly used, we should run into certain social problems. And I'm going to deal with this first and then later with LSD because the situations are rather different.

The social problems that we could run into are that people who are under a very strong marijuana influence.

We often don't know where they are.

Can easily get lost and confused. They are not liable to be violent unless there is some completely separate predisposing reason for them to be violent. It does not of itself make people violent. On the contrary, it makes them quiet Pacific and slow down. But you could get very confused. You

might also get paranoid over fearful. And you might also become, in a certain sense, irresponsible because one of the characteristics of marijuana is wonderfully described in a story I forget at the moment, its exact origin, but it's about a Negro and a young white boy who are close friends.

The Negro is a hand on the farm and by the boy's father. And one day the Negro explains marijuana to the boy.

And he says that it makes everything transparent. You see right through everything. Not in the literal sense that it becomes like glass.

That's a metaphorical sense that you understand what people are up to.

But again, it's. And you get to laughing.

That induces a certain kind of what I would call loving cynicism, where you see the schemes, the.

Ego inflating and promoting tricks that everybody's up to.

And you see the unimportant of a great deal of activity that human beings consider to be extremely important in the case of almost all psychedelics.

This is true because what happens is you suddenly slow down. And you realize that this moment is really worth living. And in fact, that's the important thing.

What's going on when you look around you and you see people going about their everyday business and they all look frantic. They're quite insane, rushing off in cars and driving and getting there and making it on time and delivering that stuff and so on and so forth. You think one of Earth's the matter with him? And in this respect, you get into a state of feeling which quite apart from anything to do with drugs, is the normal state of feeling for, say, an Indian. That's why in the United States we can't understand the Indians and never have gone on with them. And all our best efforts to do something good for them are always futile because, for example, we want them to have big factories, better pay and but go and live in Los Angeles because they don't want to live in Los Angeles. They say we're quite mad

because we work our men work for four days at some frantic job so they can take a little time off to go fishing or hunting. We'll say we're there already. We will run it. We fish, we hunt, and we're happy with that. Indians live in a kind of present which involves both the past and the future, but they don't have our idea of time as a clockwork thing. Tick, tick, tick, tick. What you keep up with Indians value time and a very special way.

For example, when they have a meeting on some important question for the tribe, they'll come in there for four hours or so, they'll sit and just talk. And at the end, for reasons that the white man can't understand.

They've come to a decision because they say time made the decision.

You know, you ask them, what do you think about so-and-so? What would you like to do? And they won't give you a direct answer because it's not the time for the answer. They believe that if you wait around and let it cook, time itself will deliver the decision. And we think that's terrible, that it's improvident, that it's if you don't make up your mind, make up your mind. Now see, decide. Now you can't. And I've always known this and have constantly run into trouble because I would put off decisions because I knew that the moment for it wasn't right, that when things developed in a certain way, I would know what to do. So under the influence of these substances, one does intend a little bit to become a sort of Indian. And as they say, the only good Indians are dead Indian.

It's that it's that whole attitude you see to nature and that absence of the competitive spirit which is in Indians that the white Protestants strongly disapprove of white Catholics do American Catholics and Protestants, crypto Protestants.

And so that wouldn't be the problem from the point of view of our culture that if the use of marijuana was widespread.

People would get a bit mañana in their attitudes to things and say, oh, let it wait. We're busy. What's the point? And they might be there for a lack of pep and push and ginger.

A little poem by HB Martin thought that troubled a businessman during a sleepless night. Supposing that St. Peter at the door finds pep and push and ginger. All aboard.

Well, now, in that sense, then, I think a widespread use of marijuana, especially if people started using it almost as frequently as they used tobacco, would result in a lot of extremely lazy people lounging around. Although I would say it would be stupid to use it as frequently as one uses tobacco.

Because he would lose the the the benefit of it. It would be something to be used. Well, I would say certainly not more than twice in a day because it has a certain sacramental quality to it.

In other words, why you can do a job and smoke a cigaret. You know, and forget that you've got a cigaret.

And you can to a certain extent. Drink and do something else, you know. But if you are smoking marijuana, you shouldn't do anything else at all. You should really like you would sit down to do justice to a marvelous dinner and you should eat and not try to smoke while you're eating or watch television. You should really do justice to the dinner. So in the same way, if you use marijuana, you should really do justice to it and be quiet. Yes, by all means, listen to music, et cetera, et cetera, but don't do anything that will distract from that state of consciousness. Like don't drive a car while you're playing the violin.

Now.

This leads me to think that there is a good reason why a substance of this kind should be rather difficult to get. The Japanese have an idea about views. A lovely view. You should not have a lovely view too easily visible.

You should make a little bit of effort to go to the place where the beautiful view is, because then you won't just take it for granted. You really devote yourself to it.

And so I don't know that if marijuana was what is the best way of controlling it as distinct from suppressing it and making it a little bit difficult to come by.

Either you make it expensive or you make it necessary to grow your own. And illegal to sell it or to market it. That could be a possibility. But you could perfectly free to grow your own and take care of it and cure it and do everything that has to be done.

But if it is as easily come by as a package of cigarets, I have a feeling that it might in some ways lose its effect. You see, if you go back into history, you will find all kinds of documentation, documentation for similar outcries and fears about tea, about coffee, about tomatoes and of course, about tobacco.

All sorts of tracts were written, say the tomatoes.

There they were very suspicious. And as for tea. Why? Tea was terribly expensive when it first came on the market in the West. And Dr. Samuel Johnson was a tea addict and a society hostesses were embarrassed when he came because he drank such moderate quantities of tea and it was very expensive. GUEST.

All these things have been looked on with immense suspicion.

And of course, they're all relatively harmless, especially tomatoes, and.

But to see this sort of superstition keeps going, keeps running. Now, I suppose that when tomatoes were suspect, that city people really sat down to eat a tomato.

Oh, gee, we've got this dangerous fruit. That's fantastic stuff. And so when they ate a tomato, they made it a big thing. And so the tomato tasted gorgeous simply because it was valued. Now, in exactly the same way when we say we've got some pot. No, this is great stuff, terribly illegal. So let's not trifle with this. Let's really sit down and enjoy this situation.

See? Well, that adds an enormous amount of value to the effect that it has. Now, I'm not saying that it's all psychological and there's nothing to do

with the chemistry, but it's always mixed.

We are psychosomatic beings and therefore the expectation, the setting in which one dad does anything like this is of great consequence.

It's just the same, say, with wine.

Then you get one of those gorgeous French wines and you've got this bottle and the special label and it's that year. People sit and drink.

Oh, that's.

But actually very few people can tell the difference if they're blindfolded between a cheap petri wine and a fine French one.

Yes. Naturally, the person who is an expert on wines with no blindfold what it had. But the game of guessing wines is tricky.

And most people can't tell.

But the build up, you see, if the thing has got the build up on it coming in the right looking bottle and so on, then you have a marvelous time.

So if the if marijuana does indeed have beneficial effects and then to a certain degree, it emphatically does mean it is the most perfect tranquilizer of all of them. You can forget Librium and things like that, Milton. They have nothing of the effect of marijuana. It will get people off alcoholism.

I know a doctor who is just he's a very respectable doctor and he is fighting mad because he can't prescribe marijuana to his patients and he is deluged with alcoholics. Doesn't know what to do about them.

And even though he is a he's a pillar of society, he's president of a county medical association and all that jazz.

So it is a it is unquestionably a healing herb, but it like everything good in the world, it has to be used judiciously.

And so there would be a danger with very cheap, enormous supplies of marijuana that people out of their minds would just smoke and smoke and smoke to be in the groove or something for some reason of that kind. And it could be troublesome.

But obviously, the solution to that particular problem is. Simply put, primarily to see the total unreason of any law prohibiting possession.

If anybody wants to have their own plants and grow it and use it, there is no conceivable legal reason why they shouldn't. Selling on Assad is another matter.

That should obviously be subject to some sort of regulation.

It might be a tax regulation that makes the price high or or whatever, but I'm not going to mean that. That's a question that shouldn't be decided until after a very careful discussion. But the idea that it's a killer drug or a sort of a demon thing is this is pure superstition and rather malicious superstition that you realize that this really perfectly harmless activity as compared with smoking, tobacco or drinking. There are fifteen hundred people in jail on fairly long terms in the state of California alone right now.

And God only knows how many throughout the country at your expense.

Now, when it comes to the problems of the more strong psychedelics like LSD, the problem becomes trickier.

Because LSD can be so disorient into many people and so terrifying that it is not wise to use it without the right sort of preparation and help. But of course, for that very reason, it's exciting.

When I was giving a lecture sometime ago on some subject not directly connected with these psychedelics at all. At a private high school, rather posh school, immediately the lecture was over.

I invited questions and all the questions were about LSD. So I said to these boys. I have given you a lecture on the Chinese philosophy of nature and you ask me about LSD. What's the reason for this? Well, a set of men into

our household with each other and that little talk went to huddle with each other and talk. And they said, well, we think that our parents and grandparents did a pretty good job exploring the external world and learning how to control it. We would like to explore the internal world. And furthermore, because it's forbidden, it's that much more interesting. So there is the challenge here. And young people are always out for adventures. You can't they wouldn't be young people if they weren't. And one reason why we have so much trouble with young people is that we coddle them.

We make too much safety.

Other people don't coddle their young like that in Japan, for example. Children have an enormous amount. Little children, especially an enormous amount of liberty in dimensions in which we don't have liberty. For example, I was going along the edge of a river or canal in Marseilles and about 20 feet above the canal.

There's a wall of water pipe crossing the canal on a few concrete supports, and a small boy was crawling across it, having a wonderful time.

Very dangerous. We would have a fit. We would build a fence all along thing. And we would have, you know, like at schools, wherever there's a school entrance, there are policemen with stop signs and the children are herded across so they won't be knocked down by cars. There are children are even escorted in groups to, to and from school in Japan.

You'll see a little thing, this high little yellow hat on and a knapsack on its back and danced down as a crowded street. Bicycle taxis, cars going every which way. Mad confusion. This little thing is going along all by itself.

I remember Felix Green once told me that he gave a lecture at a high school and it was a great banner over the auditorium of the proscenium arch in white letters on Red said safety first in all things.

You know, well, that's a way to die. Death is safe. You can't get into trouble if you're dead.

Also, if you go into solitary confinement, it will be rather difficult to get into trouble. So stay home and be safe, although there are more accidents in homes.

So we must realize in our attitude to children that while, yes, you advise your children about streets and cars and things like that, there is no such thing as safety. There never was in life. And there never will be. And unless you take that as your first premise in living that nothing will happen, you must be in secure.

There isn't so any security.

Nevertheless, you can't just say, all right. No. No restrictions, no controls on anything.

Because then people could obviously go out and buy tons of dynamite or private tanks and machine guns, mortars, howitzers and whatever.

You know, there are a lot of men who would love to end the Howitzer and have a terrific crash with a shell. Every morning you go out in the middle of the bay and just blow off.

So something has to be done.

I would say if and when it comes to LSD then, that we really got a dragon by the tail.

In this particular chemical, although I think that it's a primitive chemical, that is to say that it's very unpredictable in its results. And I'm quite sure that if research is pursued, we will be able to get something that is much more easy to handle than LSD, but as effective in a creative way. But you see, there isn't that research really being done except by illicit graduate chemistry students who are working out all sorts of things, alternatives to LSD so as to be the law against its possession. Now a law against the possession of LSD. Whatever. Its wisdom is completely unenforceable for the simple reason that you can disguise LSD as anything in the world. You can, for example, take get a solution of LSD and alcohol and you can put a piece of Kleenex into it and pull the Kleenex out and let it dry. Then you've

got a filthy old piece of Kleenex, you jam into your pocket that looks might be something you blow your nose on and all you have to do is take it out. Drop it again, an alcohol, soak it out. And there is the stuff you can disguise it as peanut butter, fingernail polish, just anything at all.

Cookies and chemically in a in a smallish quantity, say, of a few hundred micrograms. It's very, very difficult to detect. And you would really have to know. We would have to otherwise.

If you suspected that a given person wasn't wearing nothing but a suit, you would have to analyze everything on him to find out whether there was any LSD present.

It's simply unenforceable unless you are tipped off. Unless you know in advance that the person has it in such a place. But you could smuggle interstate through into the country vast quantities because the the basic dose that will, as I say, turn a person on is as low as 50 micrograms.

Micrograms and millionth of the ground.

So.

Therefore, the only solution in all these problems is the solution of facing facts, that is to say, of bringing everything out into the open.

You cannot abolish the problem.

In fact, as you try to do so, you will only intensify.

That's always been true because if you prohibit something like this. Well, of course, everybody will want it.

Forbidden fruit is sweet and therefore there is always an organization to take care of the supply of prohibited things, whether it's hors or possibilities for gambling. There is an organization of criminals. Who will undertake to do so? But the trouble is that whenever they deal in any business, they have no conscience about the quality of goods they deliver. So you remember the prohibition, the quality of the liquor you got from your bootlegger? The

illicit whores. Who is to say they don't have venereal disease? Illicit gambling? Well, obviously, the house always cheats. And the one armed bandits rob you and I'll give you a fair chance. Everything controlled by the mafia becomes crooked through and through. So when naturally then if the mafia were to move into psychedelics, heaven only knows what we should get. And a lot of the reason for the fact that there are these terrible stories about people who have complications with LSD. Is that what they took was not simply LSD. People will cut the supply. You know, you just sell you sodium by carbonate with a tiny bit of LSD. They do all sorts of things. Mix it with other drugs. So the solution, as I see it, is to bring the whole thing out right into the open to encourage research on it. And I suppose the at this present time, the maximum sort of control that ought to be imposed on it is to make it something prescribed by doctors. Now, this isn't the ideal form of control, but it's a practical one. And then in places like major university campuses have LSD research centers or psychedelic research centers where anybody who wanted this kind of experience could simply apply and there would be facilities for experiencing it in a helpful environment.

When young people get adventurous, what they need is not police and prohibition. They need help. They need the best information and the best guidance that's possibly available to do a dangerous thing. And once someone wants to go to learn to fly an airplane or he can apply and it needs a license, but he gets the best advice possible. I want to be an astronaut in this space. Well, you could go to school for it. And I visualize the possibility of psychedelic museums where you would have.

A gorgeous set of buildings in lovely grounds. Gardens or by the sea. And there would be. It would be equipped with a big library of art books with reproductions of all kinds of masterpieces from the whole world. There would be a collection of tapes and records with beautiful sound systems. There would be glass cases full of objects like seashells, crystals, ferns. There would be a conservatory with plants of all kinds. You know, growing and equipped in this way. Then if you wanted to take it, you would go in for a three day session. The first day would be forgetting a relaxed and for learning something about the properties of it, getting an idea of the map before you went into the territory. The second day would be to take the chemical and do anything work on any problem you wanted to because it is

peculiarly suitable for working on some particular problem. There's a book by Stafford and Golightly called LSD. The Problem Solving Drug. And there are ever so many case histories in that of engineers, architects, musicians and so on who had specific problems to solve and who use this for doing it. So that would be the second day. Then the third day would be for evaluation, because after you've been through, unless the experience, you need a good day's rest to get back into the swing of things. But to think it over how to write about it or to do something about it. Supposing you had seen a particular image that you wanted to preserve while on the third day you could paint it out or draw it out or write it out or whatever you wanted to do. And the existence of such places then would put the youth above board out in the open and not something that is simply done.

In an illegal situation, you see, one of the problems with most psychedelics is that they do tend.

To foster paranoia.

And if a situation is illegal, you can get all sorts of ridiculous paranoid fantasies as that your best friend, as a representative of the police, and you can see every reason why he really should be. Because the capacity of these chemicals is that you have an enormous power of projection.

You can see. You know, how in the ordinary way you might be looking at this sort of wall here, which is not irregular paint patterns on it. Well, you can sit here and just in a perfectly ordinary state of consciousness and see pictures and you can see trees and people and all sorts of things. Leonardo da Vinci used to make a regular practice of looking at a dirty old wall. And fine paintings in it. That's, of course, how many here we believe many of the cave. Great cave paintings were done. Is that those people looked in the marks on the rocks and saw buffaloes and deer and just follow the markings on the rocks. And for that reason, created images of animals that were a stunningly accurate and realistic, because if you use identity thinking, you'll do that.

I remember one night I was up here and I was walking by the window and there was a that I usually keep that table here.

And I looked in the window, to my astonishment, I saw a man sitting at the table on this side facing the window. I was looking at the reflection in the window, a rather scholarly looking gentleman with a little imperial beard resting his head on his hand like this and reading a book.

There he was right there, and I analyzed that for a while and I could see exactly what was going on. There were things in the fireplace paper and stuff that built themselves perfectly into this image.

So then you can see these things. People, for example, who hear voices. I've got a theory about this and I believe it's correct. Naturally, in any place, there are all sorts of noises going around on around you. Sound of water and pipes. The sound of a gas heater. Sound of people working in the distance. Sound of the wind. And you can project meaningful voices and sequences of ideas onto these sounds and actually hear voices.

So if you check with someone else and say, now, look, I hear a voice talking or I see a picture on the wall or I see a vision. Do you see it? And at first they say no. But if you then I actually understand that you are projecting. You can point out to them where you see it and they will say, oh, yes, I see how you see that.

But of course, it isn't there in the ordinary sense.

So with the psychedelic chemical, you have a tremendous power of projection. Your power projection is increased a hundredfold.

And in fact, you can play games with. You can take anything and turn it into practically anything else by looking carefully enough and you'll find out a reason for turning it that way.

I play this game quite deliberately. Now, in the ordinary state of consciousness, I play projections and see shapes. Just that anything. This is wonderful what you can do. And especially if you take something a bit chaotic, like a Rorschach blot or Dario a wall or whatever you want, you can have an infinite fun seeing images and.

But the problem then is if there is an unconscious reason for seeing certain images, if you're afraid, if you're mistrustful or anything like that, you can see in a human life situation.

Say your relationship to your family.

You can see a pattern of relationship which is absolutely misleading.

And you can see the best reasons why it is this sinister situation.

And then you're in trouble.

So when therefore, the use of LSD is totally illegal and people take it, they tend because they are scared of what they're doing to have the paranoid reaction altogether reinforced. And so naturally, the illegality, the reasons that the government puts forward for making it illegal are of the nature of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

By making it illegal, they make it harmful. Then they can say, look at all these harmful results. That's why it's illegal, but it's harmful because it's illegal.

Partly, it can also be harmful simply through ordinary misuse.

But I think our answer is to bring the whole question right out into the open and to deal with it as a fact that exists, that cannot be suppressed. It should not be suppressed and try to control it because you see, it said it's only one step, one link in a long, long, vast process of scientific work, which is. As I said earlier, once you started to interfere with the world, you can't stop.

And man, as many, many scientists now say is no longer passively undergoing an evolutionary process, is involved in it, and therefore we are reaching out to try and control ourselves. Our brains are nervous systems by surgery, by electrical stimulation, by chemicals, all sorts of things we're using to try and find out how we tick.

And I suppose we've got to go on and go on and go on doing that until we. For some reason can call a halt and see that we don't need to do it anymore.

But you see, LSD and psychedelics are just a part of this whole thing.

And it has to be faced. But one final word, it.

It is not something and none of these things are understandable, uncontrollable.

From what we might call it, purely scientific point of view. Because the mumbo jumbo of the purely scientific approach is in itself a kind of game.

Involved in many sciences is the myth that situations can be observed objectively.

And therefore, scientists make a special effort, as it were, to be very serious. And very analytic about certain situations, which is often quite right. But when you come into an LSD situation and you are investigating someone on its influence and you come in with your scientific pomposity, he immediately sees that you're a freak.

And quite asinine.

And so it gives a rather bad impression in the hospital, for example. Hospitals are a big game then the disciplines and the routines and the things that go on in hospitals, they do an enormous amount of things that are simply precautions against possible legal action in the future. And so now in any hospital, the doctors and the nurses have a great deal of difficulty doing their business because they keep filling out papers, hours and hours and hours of paperwork goes on. So that the record is straight. Soon they won't treat people at all. They'll just record all sorts of things and they're just make records. They don't have to do anything. It just records something that didn't happen at all. The songs, the records of straight.

And it's getting that bad. It's getting that bad in universities happens that way, too.

So in those environments.

The psychedelic experience can get very, very clear and frightening.

So the question is what sort of people are qualified to investigate LSD? And the answer is a present in a way no one. And in another way, I would say simply those who've had a great deal of experience with it.

You might say it, certainly psychiatrist, some qualified.

Least of all practically because psychiatrist tend to be very scared of any kind of irregular reality. They are guardians of what we call sanity of the way the world is on a bleep Monday morning.

They're frightening, very frightened of the unconscious, especially psychoanalysts.

They always speak about the unconscious with a hushed voice. And we mustn't go fishing in the unconscious. It's a very dangerous field. Only a qualified person should investigate the unconscious because the unconscious is the big mad sink. You know, of the primordial slime out of which life issues serpents and menacing dragons.

So perhaps a psychiatrist has some disciplines that might help with using psychedelics. But here, there there should be. Generally, it needs the wisdom of a psychologist, of a pharmacologist, of an anthropologist, of a specialist in the psychology of religion, of mythologies, of a poet, a painter. And you would have in other words, in my psychedelic museums, you would have to have a team of people with all sorts of knowledge to combine somehow the sort of skill that is necessary for understanding psychedelics.

As I said, are the best people are really those who are most familiar with the territory, like you may be a specialist in mining. You may know all about mining. But to get into a certain territory, what you need is an Indian guide.

He will show you where how to get in and how to get out.

Although he knows nothing about mining and it may be that in the investigation of the LSD to be a great deal of helped know, no, not a lot about neurology.

But the neurologist needs an Indian guide, the Indian guide as the person who's been in the place quite often and knows his way around. And if you have taken LSD many times, you begin to know your way around.

The landscape becomes familiar, you know, all the different states of consciousness. And so LSD, people begin to formulate their own lingo. They know a state called the plastic doll. They know a state called the Magic Theater.

They know a state called I call it the any winning.

They know a state called the Great White Light. They know a state of the wiggles where the walls seem to breathe. And if you look at a flower, it's all rippling as if it were under water. Say they know all these things. They know the state of paranoia of getting lost, wondering whether you can get back. And they have because they're familiar with them all, that nobody gets frightened.

And psychiatrist, if they are to be effective, their psychiatrist should be people who are familiar with all kinds of states of consciousness and they should work if somebody is way out of his head.

He should be able to consult a person who knows exactly where he is and can come in and be quite familiar with that state.

So that he can say, oh, yeah, I know where you are. I've been there myself. And it's like this, you know. But as it is, you see, psychiatry is not really exploring the mind.

It is trying to stand outside and understand psychiatric problems through looking at patients and writing down their symptoms without really knowing anything about it. And therefore, all the terms that are used in psychiatry to describe symptomatology are completely unscientific. They they they have no scientific spectrum of consciousness and it's all its possibilities at all. There is no such idea. You could write a textbook called The Spectrum of Consciousness and you could with the quotations from literature and photographs and so on, illustrate almost all the known states of consciousness of which man is capable.

But nobody has done such a project. And that would be basic reading for anybody who expected to be proficient in psychology or psychiatry. These things have to be done and.

Without fear. But with these these chemicals and other words are not something to be afraid of. They are simply something to be respected and handled with reasonable care.

Out in the open and not in know sort of a dingy pad or in the back of a car.

The Psychedelic Experience

Almost all the great religions of the world are in some way associated with a drink. Judaism and Christianity with wine, Islam with coffee, Hinduism with the milk of sacred cows, Buddhism with tea. And in one way or another, these sacred drinks are used for sacramental purposes. And the sacrament defined at least in the Anglican Church, as the outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace is a very common feature of religion throughout the world, although one which is, I would say, highly disapproved of by many people living in the modern West under the influence of Protestantism and humanism. A sacrament. In other words, is a method of giving spiritual power or insight through corporeal means. As, for example, in the sacrament of baptism. Orthodox Christians believe that through the pouring of water, a physical substance, a person may be in some way united with the power or the grace of God, or that the right formula set by the right person over bread and wine may transform them verifiably into the body and blood of Christ, so that whoever partakes of them on the principle that you are what you eat, becomes transformed into Christ behind the more obvious drinks of sacramental liquids associated with the various religions. There are some religions which imply more potent substances, and so one associates Islam and the whole Arabian culture with the use of hashish. And no one can doubt who knows anything about the effects of the substance that the people who painted Persian miniatures and who designed the great Arab asks of Islamic civilization. No one can doubt that those people had had the sort of vision which comes through participation in hashish. Likewise, the earliest Vedic texts of India mentioned is something called Soma, and nobody really knows what Soma was.

But one may guess in view of modern practices in India that it was some derivative of the plant cannabis, which is today in India and has probably for centuries been used by certain types of yogi. For example, the Shiva worshipers use it very widely in the form that is called bum, which is a drink or ganja which is smoked in China.

There was for a long time in the dullest school of philosophy, a quest for the elixir of life.

And this was associated with Darwin's alchemy. And when you read alchemical texts, you must realise that they are always veiled. The dullest sages were apparently looking for an elixir of immortality that would convert a human being into any model.

And it was suppose that if you hit on the right elixir when you became an old man and your skin shriveled, it would eventually peel off and reveal a youth underneath as a snake changes its skin. And there are statues in certain parts of China, a venerable old sages with their skin falling off to reveal a young face below. Many sages and and indeed even emperors died from drinking concoctions that purported to be the elixir of life. One of the ingredients of the elixir was always tea. And of course, tea as drunk. In Buddhist circles is not the tea that you ordinarily drink. The real ceremonial tea of the Far East is not steeped tea leaves, but tea ground green tea grounds to a very fine powder. And this is has hot water poured over it and then with a whisk it is stirred up into a thick mixture. And drinking a few cups of this puts you in a state of extraordinary wakefulness and therefore has long been used by Buddhist monks for purposes of meditation.

It has a mild psychedelic or consciousness expanding effect. The Tibetans likewise brew an incredibly thick tea, which they mix with yak butter and to acid is an appalling concoction. But to them, very soothing and comforting and also wakeful. And as you know, throughout the AMA, Indian cultures, religion is very greatly centered around divine plants. The use of the peyote cactus, the use of yogi of mushrooms such as psilocybin Mexicana, the convulsive Alice type flower obliquely, the use of its seeds, and a very considerable number of other plants which have been cataloged by Professor Shorter's of Harvard. Even seaweeds. All sorts of. Funny things are considered divine plants, and the mushroom psilocybin Mexicana is

known, of course, as Tale Canal among the Indians, a word which means the flesh of God. To an enormous degree, then throughout the world there has been the use going back as far as we can find any record of some sort of plant either chewed or distilled or boiled or whatever, which transformed consciousness and was alleged to give mankind the vision of divine things. And therefore it was in the precise definition of the term, a sacramental plant. Now, then, the objection to this is very strong in the modern West. And there indeed have always been people who found that this kind of practice was to be deplored. And I want to add in a moment to go into the reasons why. But it must be said in the modern West that the use of any material aid to spiritual insight or development is always looked upon with disfavor because it is described as a crutch and our type of culture feels happier if it doesn't use a crutch. In other words, if you do it yourself somehow or other the use of a crutch or as people call it. With that question begging word, a drug seems to be something which is a sign of weakness. If you are a real gutsy fellow, and if you're going to get this thing in a manner which is natural, legitimate, and the manner in which it will really stay with you, you ought to work at it by your own efforts. And you will find this extremely exemplified in, say, Christian Science, where they didn't want to use even ordinary medicine for physical health, even though every Christian scientist is dependent upon daily food, both vegetable and meats, and eats them quite gaily without any feeling of guilt. Whereas actually he ought to realize that if he had sufficient faith, he would be able to live even without air. I suppose as a crutch on which we depend on Earth is a lamentable ball on which we have to stand in order to hold ourselves up.

But if you explore deeply into the doctrines and the history of almost all religions whatsoever, you will find that there is simply no. Do it yourself way. Invariably, whatever path and whatever method is followed, there comes a point in which the efforts of one's own will or of one's own ego have to be abandoned. You know, perhaps that in Buddhism there are two schools which are respectively called gimmicky and tricky. In Japanese, gimmicky means one's own power. Tariq Qi means another's power. And most forms of Buddhism are classified as gimmicky. On the principle of the Buddha's final words to his disciples, be lapse into yourselves. Be you a refuge unto yourselves. Take to yourselves no other refuge. Work out your own deliverance with diligence. And so in Zen in ten die in the Sarah Varda

or Southern forms of Buddhism, you will always find that meditation practice or spiritual growth is a matter of using relentless effort to control the mind, to be concentrated, and so on. But as this effort develops, its term always is that you reach an impasse in which your will and your ego comes to a state of absolute frustration, where you find that there is nothing that you can do to reform yourself, to make yourself unselfish, which is of course, a form of lifting yourself up by your own bootstraps that not only is there nothing that you can do, but is also nothing that you can not do. In other words, your energy will be as phony as your relaxation. And at this point, in the process of yoga or meditation or whatever it is, there must transpire a state of surrender of total giving up. And it is precisely at this moment that the transformation of consciousness, which all these various religions are after, can come about because in one way or another, all of the religions, without any question so far as I can see. I would say the great religions of the world, we might exclude a few weird cults, but all of them are concerned with achieving a state of consciousness which is no longer ego centric.

Furthermore, a state of consciousness in which we see through a trick which during the egocentric state we always play on ourselves.

And that trick is that we become unable to be aware of the relativity of opposites, black and white. Light and darkness. Good and evil. Pleasure and pain. Life and death.

All these things. All say one's self and the external world. While the South and the other.

All these things in the egocentric state of consciousness seem to be separated, opposed to each other, whereas the most elementary logic should tell us that they necessarily go together. In other words, if you are a superior person in any way, morally, intellectually, physically, you have no means of knowing that you're a superior person except through the presence of relatively inferior people. And where are they to disappear? You would be in limbo and you wouldn't know where you were at all. The higher always depends on the lower in the same way as the flower of the plant, depends on the soil, the rows upon the manure. And so to the subjective, the self goes along with the objective, what the self knows. And an inseparable union

that we have managed to screen this out of our normal consciousness and to conduct our lives as if we could make life exist without black and light, without darkness and pleasure, without pain. But when the egocentric state is surpassed, it is seen that these things all go together. And the curious consequence of this is not that the world is thought to be a near balance between opposing forces. Not a simple compromise.

But somehow it becomes obvious when you see the unity of all opposites that the world is transformed into a thing of glory. It's very difficult to explain that logically, but it simply is so with reference to this different kind of consciousness.

In other words, what happens is this that everything that you tried formally to exclude and to deny and to overcome is seen to be part of a harmonious construction so that the whole world is seen as profoundly harmonious with everything in it is as it should be.

And this is so difficult to explain to people who don't see it that there are many people who have this kind of experience remain tongue tied. Not only is it difficult to explain to ordinary people, but it's very shocking to ordinary people because it seems to undermine all the game rules and all the moral rules of the social order. And to be saying that it's the evil things and bad things are perfectly all right because they are actually in a secret harmony with the good. And if you understand that superficially and you are not a very intelligent person or a very sensitive person, you might indeed run amok and justify any kind of conduct whatsoever on the grounds that it's all part of the universal harmony.

And this, of course, is why there has through all the centuries been a kind of ease of terrorism, the kind of secrecy attached to these deep matters.

Those to the state of consciousness itself and to the various means of bringing it about, whether those means be sacramental or whether they be some form of meditation, prayer or other type of spiritual discipline.

In both cases, let me remind you, in both cases, there has always been a certain secrecy about it, or rather, these things have not been taught to people or given to people who were inadequately prepared.

And this is a grave, grave problem in the modern world, because we are today living in a world where there are very few secrets.

That is to say, scientific knowledge of any kind is of necessity, public knowledge, or at least public among scientists. There are types of scientific knowledge, of course, which laypeople simply cannot understand, because the language in which this knowledge is expressed say, for example, mathematical language has to be learned and is difficult to master. And so many popularization of scientific ideas are at the same time partial falsifications, because these ideas cannot be said in English or French or German, or even though they can be said in algebra.

So in a way, all knowledge gods itself, because to understand it, you have to follow to some extent the past, which was followed by the people who discovered it. But nevertheless, as a result of scientific technology in the modern world, an enormous number of things, very dangerous things made available to fools.

Not to mention the fantastic powers of destruction, which technology has given us. And so it is very difficult indeed to keep secrets in this day and age. Everything has been published, all the mysteries practically have been let out.

And in the sort of ancient Hindu philosophers, this would be regarded as a sign of the final decadence of the world. The coming on of the Kali yoga or the black destructive epoch at the end of the cycle in which the whole world is destroyed.

Be that as it may.

So I would start out by saying then that even among those religious or spiritual disciplines which follow along the lines of an extreme exertion of the will, they those gimmicky or self disciplines eventually come to a point which is the same as the charity. That is to say, those that rely on the power outside the individual will be beyond or deeper than the personal ego. They come to the same place.

Of course.

Really, the difference between the two schools depends upon a definition of oneself. If you start out by defining yourself as your ego, then what is other than you or a greater power than you will seem to be different from you. But if you start out by defining yourself as something more than your ego, then the power which transforms you will still be your own. For example, most people define their hearts as something other than themselves. We say I have a heart rather than I am a heart. The heart is an engine for most of us, which supports the existence of the ego. And somehow we have it. It's an engine that goes on in us, like the engine in our car, which if you're not a mechanic, you don't really understand. You just use it. And so if you think of your heart as other than you, it is something that mysteriously happens inside you beyond your control. But on the other hand, if you regard your heart as very much you as the center of your physical being. Then you will be accustomed to think when you beat your heart that you are doing it. So for people who come in the Judeo-Christian tradition, they are in time to feel that their heart is not themselves. The psalmist says, Behold, I am fearfully and wonderfully made. He looks at his own body and is astounded and says, Since I don't understand it, it must be the work of a God who is other than myself. On the other hand, when a Hindu defines himself, he doesn't define himself merely in terms of those types of behavior which are voluntary. He decides himself also in terms of involuntary behavior, and so his heart seems as much himself as anything can be. So it's really a matter of semantics as to what his self and what is other within you. Depends where you draw the line. But it seems to me unquestionable that in all spiritual traditions whatsoever, there comes a point at which the personal ego, the individual, will reach a limit by one means or another, and where it is transformed by something that is not willed, but seems to happen spontaneously.

The Christians call it Grace. The Hindus call it Prasad.

The Buddhists call it body illumination, but in every case it happens of itself or as the Chinese would say, it is, John, of itself. So spontaneous.

So there is really no grounds. For objecting to sacraments, because they are something that come to us from, as it were, outside and do something to us which is beyond the control and understanding of the will, it always is that

way. But now this is not an experience in which the will and the ego have no part to play, no part at all.

And here comes the danger of all types of transformation, of consciousness, mystical experience, sense of union with the divine or whatever you want to call it, however obtained.

It is essential that they be what I would call grounded, brought down to us, harmonized with everyday life and with human society. And this requires a disciplined.

Every tradition looks with disfavor upon those who simply steal the divine secrets and enjoy them without some kind of discipline. That should go along with it.

And thus the destructive effects of all these things are particularly manifested in people who have no capacity for the kind of discipline that must go along with them. And that is true not only of sacraments and divine plants and yoga practices. It is true of all things whatsoever which we might enjoy the cause enjoyment of any kind is really impossible without an accompanying discipline.

Just think of a few things which are pleasurable and which can be simply snatched and swallowed. Start with candy. Would there being such a thing as a palatable candy bar unless there was some expert in the making of sweet meats? Think of booze. You know, it isn't just alcohol up on throws down, that is to say, if you want to have any lining left to your stomach, but skillfully prepared wines and liquors required based on a long tradition of the vintners art, which is a discipline. Consider roaring along in a fast car and you have an exceedingly short career in this thrill. If you don't know how to drive and the car itself depends upon the skill of master mechanics, I can't think of any pleasure at all.

Which does not require an accompanying discipline. Take sex. A lot of people do take it like that, and they I guess have a kick out of it, but it has no profound pleasure to it unless there is the discipline of an intimate relationship with another human being, which requires a great deal of

intelligence. And also the merely physical aspect of sex is a considerable art which very few people ever seem to learn.

That is why our culture has sex on the brain and is perpetually thinking about it and perpetually obsessed with it in a kind of way arresting way because there is so little satisfaction and so little discipline and so little knowledge of how to use it.

So every pleasure whatsoever involves. A method of grounding it in method of integrating it with everything else, and thus if there are ways of attaining what is potentially the greatest delight of all the sense of the divine or whatever. I'm using that word as the vaguest possible word, the sense of transcending the gulf between the individual and the eternal universe. If you snatch that and have that experience and you don't do anything with it and you're not properly prepared for it, you're liable to get into the same sort of trouble as you would get through the insensitive use of any pleasurable thing whatsoever. And it is for that reason, then, that it is very true to say that psychedelic substances, the chemical chemicals derived from the divine plants are dangerous. There is no question about it, and especially those like LSD, which produce their effects as a result of taking an extremely small quantity.

You know, if you want to get drunk on beer, you have to get put down quite a bit of it. And there is a limit, you know, to how much beer one can swallow in an evening. It's a pure bulk, but you don't run into that kind of limit with far more potent substances which don't involve any difficulty in eating. You see the way the Indians take peyote cactus, it's pretty difficult to put down. It's nauseating even though they get used to it. But even so, to chew all that stuff. And so there is a limit set that way. But in these highly refined delicacies, there isn't that kind of limit.

And our culture is full of plain, downright goofy people who will try anything and don't know anything about it. And at the present state of affairs in the United States, the whole matter of psychedelic substances is in a state of inane confusion, which beggars description. So let me say, first of all, a little bit about the the the the nature of these things. They're called drugs, but this is obviously a word which is unclear. There is no definite clear line that can be drawn between a drug and something used for food,

say, like vitamins. A group of physicians and a group of lawyers got together not so long ago to see if they could arrive together as a legal definition of addiction. That is to say, dependence upon some chemical. And they kept finding that whenever they thought they were right on the definition that they've really got somewhere, that their definition also applied to dependence upon a foodstuff.

This is a very, very difficult thing to define now as between various types of chemicals that do produce changes in consciousness. There are wide differences.

All of them could be said to be addicting in perhaps a psychological sense. That is to say, supposing you belong to an in group where taking LSD is dirty guy.

It is a thing to do. And everybody compares notes as to how often and how much and engage in a kind of one upmanship with each other as to how often they've been on a trip.

Well, this is asinine because you're following this practice simply to be one of the boys or girls, as the case may be, and to remain in an in group when you should. If you have disciplined yourself in the use of consciousness transformation, you should assume come to see the folly of belonging to an in group.

So in that sense, some of these things could be said to be addicting. Others are addicting. In a much more physical sense, the opiate, for example, has a very difficult withdrawal symptoms if one doesn't use them constantly. But this addicting factor is not characteristic of all substances used for this purpose.

In other words, not everything that is used for the expansion of consciousness is a narcotic. This, of course, is. I'm going over things that some of you are elementary. The word narcotic means sleep inducing and that which makes one soporific which drowns or dims the senses. So of course, alcohol is a narcotic in sufficient quantity. Opium, likewise is a narcotic is used for dulling the sense of pain. Morphine is a narcotic in the strictest sense of the word, but substances such as mescaline, which is the

derivative of peyote or a chemical synthesis of the same thing that is in peyote is not a narcotic. LSD is not a narcotic. Psilocybin is not a narcotic from the mushroom. And cannabis is not a narcotic because these substances tend to do something very different from producing sleep. They tend instead to produce a peculiar kind of wakefulness, a sharpening rather than a dimming of consciousness.

And so they must not be lumped in the same category as things which are true narcotics. And I would say it would be part of the definition of a true narcotic. That is, it is also addicting as alcohol is addicting as the opiates are addicting, that you become dependent on them and only with great difficulty can shake them off. The same is true, of course, of tobacco. It is very difficult for a hardened smoker to drop it, and it is therefore addicting.

Although I doubt whether it is actually a narcotic in the sense of the sleep inducing thing or an insensitive something, it makes you insensitive.

Now, our absurdly paranoid government agencies have never learned in 50 years how to handle these problems, despite the lesson of prohibition.

The authorities still think that the only way to deal with even dangerous narcotics is simply to suppress them, not clearly realizing that this makes them all the more attractive and that it creates an enormous crime problem which without suppression would not exist because the minute you suppress something and it becomes illegal.

People know that there must be something extremely exciting about it, and it's it's very difficult to suppress these things and you can suppress it a little bit. In other words, you can pick out a few feral guys and make terrible examples of them by electrocuting them or putting them in prison for an incredible number of years. But this invariably only scratches the surface because when something wrong or illegal is really popular, there is no way of suppressing it because all the hotels in the United States would not be sufficient to jail all the criminals involved. This has never worked, and why people don't learn from history is beyond my comprehension. It becomes much worse as people become aware that there are an enormous number of varieties of things that will produce psychedelic effects and that in

particular such substances as LSD can be compressed into such small areas or volumes that the detection is virtually impossible.

So at the moment it becomes a racket and something. Therefore, which organized crime can put a good price on the possibilities of playing games with LSD are enormous. It's a real good racket and all it will do, the suppression of it is to encourage the proliferation of crime and lead to total nonsense.

We have never really understood what control is. We don't see the difference between controlling oneself and strangling one's self. In other words, the person who is a controlled automobile driver is certainly not a person who has no car or keeps his car locked in the garage. A very controlled dancer is certainly not a person who never dances. The control of things is not the suppression of them, but their use in a sensible and proper way. And this has not penetrated the consciousness of our authorities. You cannot suppress sex.

You cannot suppress mankind's fascination, curiosity for whatever motive in other states of consciousness than the normal. These things are eternally fascinating to human beings and will always be pursued. Whether you think it's a good thing or whether you think it's a bad thing makes no difference. It will be done so at the present time. For example, if some people wanted to make experiments with any kind of consciousness changing material, say LSD or masculine, they are in the ridiculous situation that they cannot even pay a psychiatrist to sit with them and take care of them while they do it, because that would be illegal. What they will therefore do is not have a psychiatrist, not have any experienced or responsible person, and they will try it out all on their own without any preparation and endanger themselves because these things will come under unfavorable circumstances.

And with people who haven't got a good psychic balance can bring about prolonged bouts of psychosis and lead to a good deal of trouble. But the difficulty is that we are, as a culture, not prepared for the control of these substances. And that is why there is a panic. That is why we are doing things that are worse than probably. Worse than allowing them to circulate freely.

I would not for one moment advocate the total free circulation of these things so that anybody could go into a drugstore and buy it.

But I think although I wouldn't advocate that, I think it would be better than suppression, less destructive.

But what you see we don't know, is how to apply a proper control to the transformation of human consciousness by means that are relatively easy because we are not clear.

One of the reasons is we are not clear as to the role in life of these chemicals, nor are we clear as to the role of the physician.

This I want to consider, you know, of course, that in ancient times there was no clear distinction between priest and physician. An individual might be primarily a priest and secondarily, a physician, but in course of time, the function of priest and the function of physician began to separate. And with the advent of scientific medicine, because the development of the sciences was always opposed by the church. Therefore, priests tended not to practice scientific medicine and the practitioners of scientific medicine being other than priests, the religious and the medical professions separated and in the development of medicine in the West. The deep concern of the physician was to preserve people from death to be a healer, and the function of looking after death was abandoned to the priest and the minister. So when the doctor in treating a patient gives up hope, he is out of road, he doesn't know what to do beyond that point.

And therefore, the priest is summoned.

So the the work of a doctor is throughout curative.

He is in all his activities opposed to death and regards death as the enemy. This is, of course, not true of every individual physician. It is true of medical ethics and of the generality of physicians. So that, of course, terminal cases. Are people being tortured, beneficent? Yes. With a good motive, but nonetheless being tortured by being kept alive in a state of near mummification, because while there is life, there is hope. And in the next few days, there might be some amazing medical discovery which would

cure them. And it would have been a shame to let them die and not reap its benefits. Yes, there always might be. So if the physician is in general out of role and does not know what to do in the face of death has a very important connection with another aspect of the physician's trade that he does not know what to do with chemicals or drugs, which do not have the function of healing a physical disease.

In a way, all consciousness expanding drugs have something to do with death. Why? Because all spiritual disciplines are, as young pointed out, preparations for death.

It is a commonplace of these disciplines, spiritual disciplines that what you do in them is die in the midst of life. You are born again a second time, and that death refers to the death of the ego.

That is to say, you leave behind the state of consciousness in which you thought you were no more than an isolated individual center of consciousness that drops back. And so in that sense, you've died. And spiritual disciplines very often involve, as an aide to that, the contemplation of death. We think it's rather ghoulish nowadays, but monks used to keep skulls on their desks. Buddhists meditate in graveyards. Hindu yogis meditate beside the burning guts on the banks of the Ganges, where they are always confronted with death. Knowing this is going to happen to me, good. Jeff once said that if anything would possibly save mankind from its idiocy, it would be the clearest possible recognition by every individual that he and all others around him are almost certainly going to die, because this, when it becomes something perfectly clear to you, surprisingly, becomes a source of intense joy and vitality. Because when you have accepted your own death in the midst of life, it means that you've let go of yourself and you are therefore free. You are not any longer plagued by worry and anxiety.

You know that you are done for anyhow. So there's no need constantly to fight to protect yourself, because what's the point? And it isn't just you see that people spend all their time really doing something to protect themselves. Like say, taking out an insurance policy or seeing that they eat properly. It's what we do that doesn't issue in any action at all. The constant inner worry, which leads to no action except more worry. And that is what

has given up. You see by a person who really knows that he's dead. So do you see that transcending yourself, going on the arm? Your ego is the great preparation for death.

Now then you see we come back to the medical profession. If this profession takes the side of the ego against death, opposes death, regards death as the supreme evil, then the doctor really is out of role at the bedside of a dying patient. And he also is out of role when it comes to the handling of drugs that are not designed to heal death, bringing sicknesses, as we ordinarily understand. But what happens? What happens? We'd actually very few people take priests seriously.

I mean, even even churchgoing Christians, because this is what happens when somebody in the family of a good Christian shows signs of mental derangement, the priest is very seldom called in.

One calls in a psychiatrist.

Why? Because in our culture, he's a scientist and the scientist has a far greater reputation for magical power than a priest or minister.

We only call in the priest when all hope is abandoned. The scientist hasn't been able to work and say, well, maybe proud. Do some good and the poor priest gets it. In our Catholic priest, our Anglican priest.

By and large, they are very used to handling death. They know what to do.

Come in and open the book at the right place without any embarrassment. Proceed to administer the last rites. And really, that's rather good. I mean, here is a man who knows what to do. It isn't flustered in the face of death. That in itself has a calming influence. Not a lot of people feel that this isn't really the way to handle it because they don't really dig or understand this. These last rites. And if the priest is called in only in desperation, this argues that he doesn't have very much power anyway, may have power to do something with the Lord in the world beyond, but very doubtful in this world.

So under such circumstances, both the priest and the physician. And I'm referring, of course, to the priest as he is found in the United States or in Europe at the present day. They need to take another look at death. And to bring out the all important fact that life without death has no value. Death, as Norman Brown pointed out in his book, *Life Against Death*. Death is what confers individuality upon us. It is your limits in time that constitute you just as much as your limits in space. Death, therefore, always overshadows the whole of life. And life would have no meaning, no point if it didn't have death to balance it in breath and out breath coming and going.

A rising and falling are mutually interdependent. So death is a very valuable and very important thing which is being swept under the carpet.

So then in a culture where priest and physician have become widely separated, the sudden bursting upon us of sacramental substances is an embarrassment to both. It is embarrassing, first of all, to the priest for many reasons, because supposing we were to say psychedelic substances are not the province of physicians and psychiatrists, they are the province of the clergy, everybody would throw up their hands.

But these people have had no scientific training. They only think about neurology. They don't know anything about the subtle effects of these things on the human organism.

How could they be responsible? And alas, it's true. The clergy have not had training in neurology and so much the worse for them. On the other hand, the psychiatrist, with very few exception and the neurologists have no no training in theology. And when they most of them and they talk about theology, they reveal their abysmal ignorance of the whole matter. So the thing absolutely fall back between two stools and there is no class of people, although there are individuals. There is no accepted. There is no recognized class of people who might be called, for example, field botanists. All CEO neurologists and we very much need the development of such a profession. And until we have it, we will be in a difficult situation as to how to deal with drugs, if you will, or chemicals that do not seem to have as their primary use the healing of a physical disease.

But there is a sense in which these substances are medicine rather than diet.

What is the difference between a medicine and a diet and medicine is something you need when something is wrong, when something is out of order. A diet is what you live on permanently. Of course, corrections in diet can have a medicinal effect.

But surely there is a very true sense in which we can say that our world, based on the ordinary egocentric consciousness, is very seriously sick, psychically sick.

I'm not going to you know, everybody knows why we can see it all around us, that we are stark staring, raving mad and are busy preparing to destroy ourselves, and that is a sickness which needs some kind of remedy and maybe even a desperate remedy. The use of things that would lift us out of the egocentric situation could therefore be met, considered medical as healing for a social disorder. But again, I would say that they used in that way should be used as medicine in the sense that they don't become diet, because in my experience and of course in this matter, everybody speaks for themselves.

But say, I consider just myself alone.

I wouldn't feel very put out if, say, LSD were to vanish from the earth tomorrow.

Because I have discovered that this is not the sort of thing you sort of take every so often, like you go to church or if you do that, it's something that you can take several times and gradually diminishing quantity and then you had it. Beyond that, it's up to you to integrate your vision with everyday life and with all the various kinds of knowledge that say enough is enough.

But there are other people who seem to think that the great thing to do is to start out with a little and then keep on going, making it bigger and bigger and bigger, as if they were looking for something that should lie at the end of the line.

And then it becomes a diet. Now, that is indeed getting hooked on medicine and doctors don't like to hook you up medicine, and very rightly because the ideal of a good doctor is to get rid of you as a patient. He doesn't want

chronic patients. Poor people always hanging on to him, always rushing for help. He wants to set you back on your own feet. And that is an excellent principle. This is where the doctor really has something to say to the priest. Course, priests tend, by and large, to want to hook you.

In other words, to keep you coming to church so that you will pay your dues. And the church will prosper. So the more people they can get hooked on religion, the merrier. Now, priests in this way ought to learn from the doctors and try and get rid of people by telling them the gospel or whatever it is they have to say and say, now you had it go away because you see, if you do that, you will create a vacuum and there will always be filled just as when the doctor the faster a doctor can get people out of his office, they go round and tell everybody, this man cured me. I didn't have to go back to. So more people will be coming in. There are always plenty and plenty of people never come to an end. So in a way, the religious man ought to handle a huge turnover of people coming through and going away, coming through and going away. Then he's really working. But he should not get them hooked on the medicine.

Indeed, there is a famous Latin phrase Crooks met Tina Mundy, the cross the medicine of the world, but people get hung up.

You see on the cross and Jesus, didn't you remember? According to the the Christian mythology, Jesus came alive again afterwards. He didn't get hung up only for a while. And so in the same way, if Christians really believed in the inner meaning of the doctrine, they wouldn't get hung up on the cross either, except temporarily. I am crucified with Christ. Nevertheless, I live.

So also, when it comes to the use of any technique whatsoever, whether it's yoga or LSD or what have you for spiritual awakening there applies to it. The Buddha's symbol of the raft, the Buddha likened his method, his dogma or doctrine or method to a raft. It's also called a genre of vehicle. Hence the Mahayana, the big vehicle, the Hindu Yana, the little vehicle. And it takes you across the river of which this shore is birth and death. And the other shore liberation nirvana. Now you get on that raft and you go over. And when you get to the other shore, you leave the raft behind. Same way they say in Zen Buddhism, their technique, the use of the Koran or meditation problem is like knocking at a door with a brick when the door is

open. You don't carry the brick inside, you leave the brick behind. So with all these things, they are means to pyre and they have as their objective deliverance from means. The Christian mystics speak of the highest state of contemplative prayer or union with God as a union without means. And I would extend the the sense of the word means even to ecstasy. In other words, ecstasy is in variables in the great religious traditions, not a final state. Ecstasy is an intermediate state. So, for example, in in Zen, when the experience of Satori or awakening comes about, there is an ecstasy. You feel marvelous. You feel as if you were walking on air. You feel absolutely unobstructed. You feel as happy as a lark. You feel, you know, this fantastic bang.

It's marvelous. But that in itself is only incidental.

Zen saying says that Monk, who has a story, goes to hell as straight as an arrow. In other words, to have it is to cling to it.

And if you think that the ecstasy is the important thing, it isn't. The ecstasy is an intermediate stage to bring you back to the point where you can see that everyday life that your ordinary mind, as they say in Zen, is the Buddha mind that everyday life. As it is, is the great thing and there is no difference between that and the Divine Life. So this is why you should read, especially there's a new little book out on Zen. Edited by Lucian Strike. What's the name of it, Jenna?

It's Powers Poems. Six. Yes. Well, yes.

This has got some very good things in it about how the great masters insist that for everything you seem to have attained, every great insight, every great ecstasy, you must drop it. Let go of it and immediately. Go ahead. Because in the end. Thank you. If you think that. Here it is. Zen poems, prayers, sermons, anecdotes, interviews by Lucian Strike and Takashi came out.

Don't say good. But they insist on the point that so long as you as you think that there is a state of affairs in which you can say about the big thing, whether it's God or whether it's Nirvana, Brahma, the Divine, the Tao, I've got it. You haven't. Because the moment you regard it as some sort of

object, some sort of state, some sort of thing, which you can lay your hands on.

You've put it away from yourself. Did one thing you can't lay hands on as you never find it out in a million years.

You can't find out who it is that wants to find out who it is. It wants to find out who it is that wants to find out. Now get at it. You see, but that's the thing. It's the thing that is most close to you, as Francis Thompson said, nearer his he than breathing closer than hands and feet. So what is absolutely central to you is what you can never make an object of knowledge. And so when you finally get to the point that you don't have to have anything because you're it and you don't even need to insist on yourself that you're it, because you have to insist on that, it means that you doubt it in order to go around saying to yourself. Be still and know that I am God. I mean, that's the beginners thing. That's for beginners. When they really get at the end of it, there isn't a trace. See? No. No means I left. No method. No. No getting hold of it. No meditation, no LSD, no nothing. Because it's just the way it is. But before a person sees that then means are used, whether it be yoga, whether it be chemicals, whether it be anything else.

So let me sort of sum up. In the last analysis. All spiritual awakening involves something beyond the will and the ego. You cannot do it yourself. So it makes little difference what you use for this.

Some ways are easier than others. It's easier if you use SEO Botany, a divine plant than if you just bang your head against a brick wall.

But with the very ease of it, there is the danger that you may neglect the discipline that must go with it. In the banging your head against a brick wall method, they are sure at least that you know the discipline before anything happens. And so that is the danger in a relatively easier way. But of course, as Aldous Huxley once said, to insist upon using the more difficult ways to attain the mystical state is rather like having to burn down your farmhouse every time you want roast pork.

The problem for us is that we don't have that.

The split between the role of priest and the role of physician has left those roles impoverished. And so there is nobody who is really competent to deal with death or to deal with preparation for death. And that's what makes it a problem for us.

Finally, that the most subtle danger in all these things, whether it be yoga methods or whether it be chemical methods, is fixation on ecstasy, not to know how to go beyond ecstasy and beyond looking at the divine as something that one can possess personally.

I was saying yesterday that psychedelic experiences tend to have two aspects. As a matter of fact, you can classify their effects in many different ways.

And people who say there are three things to be remembered or for things to be remembered about so and so are really making this in order to put a point across. You sort of classifications that are always 530 things to be remembered about anything. So don't take this too seriously. But I'm doing it to make a point.

And these two aspects are on the one hand, the alteration of sense perception and on the other hand, intuitive insight.

And if we could say that the intuitive insight is the aspect of psychedelic experience that corresponds most closely to the natural mystical experience, which does not necessarily involve the types of sensory alteration or alteration of perception so often involved with the chemicals. Nevertheless, it's hard to draw a very straight line between these two aspects because every so often the sensory alterations suggest some kind of insight. I, first of all, want to go into the nature of some of these alterations, typical alterations, and discuss them.

But first.

You are aware, I suppose, that these chemicals are often classified as hallucinogens. That is to say, chemicals which generate hallucinations. And this has seemed to me a very bad word indeed, because, of course, hallucination always carries with it some kind of condemnation. It's a pejorative word. And I have rarely come across an instance of where the

use of LSD or mescaline or psilocybin has created a genuine hallucination for a hallucination. Is the appearance of something to a particular individual unseen by others, which he believes to be part of the real world. In other words, if you saw a ghost, it might be claimed that this was a hallucination. If you took the ghost is really out there.

But things like that don't tend to happen.

What might be classed as hallucinations are of two kinds. Vision is seen with the eyes closed. But of course, you know that these are visions. You know that you are under the influence of a brain altering chemical and therefore unusual things are likely to happen, which you are not going to mistake for events in the external world. And therefore, when you close your eyes and behold, the most amazing patterns are constructed out of jewels, moving with splendid order in the dark or see infinite complexities of ferns where the stems sprout fronds and the front sprout fronds and the front let sprout from lands.

And forever and forever and forever, or marvelous arrangements of crystal arabesque translucent colored balls moving in space in many dimensions. Enormous temples, vast architectural creations with every kind of wall and tower and cauliflower going on forever and ever through gigantic spaces, getting involved in thistles with prickles upon prickles forever and ever and ever. Visions of Persian palaces, of courtyards, of outbursts, of dancing, girls and angels and knights in armor. All sorts of fantastic things will appear before closed eyes. But you know all the time that these are visions. And of course, they create the most extraordinary questions. What are they?

Because although they are visionary, although they aren't there in the external world, they very much are in the internal world and they must have some kind of neurological basis. What are we looking at when we see those things? This is a question which nobody knows how to answer for in some way. There must be a physiological basis for this kind of patterning. Is it that we are getting a glimpse of patterning processes within the brain, processes which organize our ordinary thinking about things?

After all, you know that when you use the telephone and you dial somebody, there is a machinery which handles it all.

But if you go and look at that machinery to find it has an extraordinarily interesting design. The patterns of electronic equipment are sometimes very beautiful, but you are not aware of those patterns. When you make a telephone call, you are aware of voices and that's it.

And bells ringing.

So it may be in the same way that within our minds, our brains that are perfectly marvelous pattern organizations, which we become aware of only under special circumstances. In other words, what one tends to do with under the influence of a psychedelic chemical is to become aware of being aware. That is to say, you turn your senses back on themselves and one is only inclined to do this when there is an alteration in the normal form of perception. That is to say, in seeing you do not notice your eyes, in hearing you do not notice your ears, especially if they're healthy. But if some disease should attack the eye or the ear or some temporary inconvenience and you see spots in front of your eyes, you know that those spots are within the structure of the eye. And if there is singing in your ear, you know that that singing sound is within the structure of the ear. And this turns the sense upon the sense. So in exactly the same way, if something alters your normal way of seeing things, your attention is diverted from what you see to seeing itself. And this, of course, this awareness of awareness, turning your back upon yourself, even at this still rather superficial level is the beginning of a process of self exploration and self-knowledge. But it takes a little alteration to do it, as it were, to fasten your interests, because when your eyes are seeing perfectly, there is nothing to fasten on. You see, the eye creates a visual space of total clarity and emptiness, although that's all inside your head and you find it difficult to attend to that which has no distinctive features. But when an alteration is introduced, there are some new distinctive feature to cite, but these are very hard to pin down.

I gave you an illustration last night of the feeling that everything is at a funny angle when a picture, as I said, is out of alignment. You know, it's wrong. It's clear now supposing everything gets out of alignment and everything has a sense of being funny. I don't mean funny haha. I mean a bit funny. Queer.

Everything is just odd, just a little bit odd.

It's as if everybody had suddenly gotten pointed ears and not only people, but everything has pointed ears on it. Little projectile sticking up to this point.

It is enough that elephant that's foxy. It's something something funny and leaves on trees suddenly all pointed ears.

We forget that this other impression is very strange, very hard to pin down. So one of the first inquiries that is always interesting in the psychedelic state is to discuss with yourself what is the difference between this way of seeing things and the normal way you can get a group of people sitting around and talking about that. And it becomes one of the oddest conversations because people can't quite put down what it is. They all agree there's something funny. Everything is a little bit off and yet it's. The same as it should look, but it's off.

And what do we mean by that? We really don't know.

And it would be very difficult to establish a physiological basis for this. It might be done. But you see, it's light as in the same way as when you put on colored glasses. Everything becomes colored with the color of the glass. And soon your consciousness will start to eliminate that effect. And it will begin after a while to look normal as it does when you wear sunglasses. So in the same way, if you put on a glass for every sense that you have and the name of that glass is funny, everything will look funny.

And so.

But nevertheless, this discussion, what is the difference between normal awareness and funny awareness focuses you on the whole thing of awareness, on the whole process, which does not ordinarily happen unless you do meditation practices designed to do exactly that.

So another thing that is comparable to this that happens is what I would call the feeling that everything is significant.

This is a funny word taken literally significant means something which serves as a sign which signifies something other than itself. I say this is a

very significant remark that you've made means that it has a deep meaning.

But there is another sense of significant, which means important.

Valuable, interesting in that sense.

Now, how can you possibly describe a state of mind in which everything appears to be significant?

Logically, this is absurd. Just like everything being off center at a funny angle. But nevertheless, there are however absurd it is, logically, it is nevertheless a characteristic of this state.

For example, that supposing somebody reads, somebody sits down and reads poetry.

Well, you see the meaning of the poetry in the ordinary way, but you also see a lot more than you normally notice. That is to say, every tone and texture of the reader's voice, every clearing of his throat, every pause to take a breath, every gesture is integrated into the poem. It becomes important. It becomes significant. It is as if there were some sort of signal system in the brain which attaches cues to various experiences so that, you know, for example, the difference between a direct experience and a memory. Some experiences have the here and now cue attached to them as when you sit and look at somebody, other experiences as when you close your eyes and remember the face of a friend who is not here, they have the memory cue attached to them. So you know that that is not a here and now. So in a similar way, our experiences are, we attach to them cues important. Notice this. There are other cues unimportant, don't bother. Or perhaps no cue at all. Now here in this state of consciousness, everything gets cued. Everything, everything you look at becomes important and you realize that it's only an arbitrary kind of human scheme of selection that says these things are important and those are not.

Because everything is important to something.

You then get this curious sense is that it doesn't really matter what you look at or what you listen to, anything will do.

Only there does remain a residual of value judgment so that you are still capable of saying, I would rather look at this than at that. But if it so happens that you just for the sake of experiment, choose to look at what you would rather not look at, it in turn becomes absolutely fascinating.

Among the other alterations I've thought of quite a number of them, I mentioned already the motion alteration where the world seems to breathe, where walls seem as if they were made of cloth with an electric fan behind so that they they wave where the pile in a carpet to look closely into it.

Every little bunch of threads constituting pile can start to wiggle.

Now, similar to that is what I would call the experience of grain in the census.

Once I was in this experiment and I was looking at the millions in windows like crazy, and although I wasn't seeing any more Malians than they actually are.

I wasn't seeing double. Nevertheless, the arrangement of one after another gave the impression of doubling. It was like seeing double. And yet on account, I counted the same as a person in the ordinary state of consciousness. That one seemed to be a replica of another, of another, of another of another. And the same would be true in looking at any sort of regular pattern in a carpet or whatever. But then the doctor said, look at your hold up a finger and see if you see that double.

And no, I said no. Oh, but yes.

But what I had seen was that just beside my finger, there was a wisp of cigaret smoke and this wisp being just at the same height as the finger right here became. A basis for an identical image of a second finger.

In other words, just the same way as you work the Rorschach blot into all sorts of shapes. So I work the Rorschach cloud of smoke in the air into a second finger behind beside the first. And for a moment it seemed just like it until I detected the source of the illusion.

This led to examination of stones and very quickly I suddenly somehow got into the impression that the whole space of the visual field seemed as if handfuls of pebbles had been thrown into it and the whole visual space was constructed out of ever so many insulating concentric circles. You know, for example, in the way that color pictures are sometimes reproduced. There are several techniques. They depend on the various kinds of screen that are used for printing. Well, there is a type of screen that is made up of ever so many circular patterns, all interlocking and into meshing with each other.

And so the whole visual world seemed to be based on a screen or grid of this kind.

Now, the interesting thing was that I could not at any point isolate actual lines in space forming this grid. Which did not coincide with some ordinary sense perceived object.

In other words, there was nothing to be seen that would not ordinarily be seen. And yet my eyes had organized what is ordinarily to be seen into this pattern of ever so many concentric circles.

It's as if. In other words, when you listen to an alarm clock, you know, the old fashioned kind of go tick tock, tick tock, tick tock, tick tock, tick tock.

Now they don't. They go. Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. But you hear kick clock or tick tock because your mind resents the monotony of tick tick.

And then, you know, very afterwards you can rhyme doggerel to this clock and you can hear tunes in it. It becomes the beat and you fit tunes in with the beat and things like that. Well, in just the same way that you do that, so your eyes can organize what they see into patterns, which we would say in the ordinary way aren't there. They can pick out waves as I see a row of people sitting with their heads on top. There's a thing like this is the rippling right through, if you see.

And it was ever so many things like that can be done.

And so you stop when you see that asking questions, what is the right way to organize, the way you see the world? Everybody running around and agreeing, of course, that they see the world the normal way and the proper way. Yes. But is this actually so droll? It's an agreement. Supposing we had agreed to see it a different way, because the world, as I've often said, is essentially an enormous Rorschach blot. It's profoundly wiggly, any except in places where men have tried to straighten it out by building straight wall, straight highways and so on. But the natural world is wiggly all the way through, including our own bodies. Well, how are you going to interpret these wiggles? How are you going to decide how much of a wiggle constitutes one wiggle?

What is a unit of wiggle? See?

So we apparently what has happened in the course of minutes and many, many millennia is that persuasive human beings have said, well, now, look, this is the way it goes and everybody's got to agree with me. Surely this is this is the way it goes. And everybody says because this guy is kind of rough. Yes. That's right. That is the way it was. So whether these people were powerful, physically or powerful, persuasively, we've all more or less agreed to see the world the same way, although we have not agreed yet.

You see, to speak the same language, we're still using an enormous number of different languages. But these things you see these organizing patterns which we project upon the world are, as it were, the languages of another kind. They are patterning methods, methods of thinking, structures of thinking, which we use to organize the external world in exactly the same way that one uses the the string bag of longer tubes and latitudes in which the world is hung on to organize it all the celestial latitude and longitude to organize the stars. These webs, these grids are fundamental to organized thinking about the world numbers you see are a similar kind of patterning. And the mathematician knows all kinds of patterns. Lattice is matrices and so on, which can be used for organizing things.

So.

Another aspect of this grain experience in the senses is what I would call pointy ism, you know, pantheism is a school of painting that was invented

in France, especially associated with the name of Siva, where the painting is composed of my new dots in many colors. And this is a very common psychedelic phenomenon, similar to the concentric circles that I just mentioned, to see everything consisting of points. Once again, you are not able to specify actually to put a needle point on any one of these points. And yet everything that you see, the ordinary vision of the world seems to be made up of my new dots. And you begin to wonder. I offer you know that after all, you have many nerve ends all over your body. There are endings of nerves, and these are especially sensitive in the retina.

And you wonder. Am I becoming aware of the multiplicity of my nerve ends of every single unit that picks up the external world?

And therefore I see in the external world a point corresponding to each one of my nerve ends that picks it up?

Well, it might be that, but as you think about that, you are liable to get fascinated with the idea of one nerve in one point, one as it were. Basic unit of sensitivity.

And I have christened this basic unit the eenie meenie the anyway. It is a fundamental, you might say, a unit of conscious life sensitive life.

And when you begin to think about this one unit of conscious life, that extraordinary things begin to happen because you realize, well, we've got really down to simplicity now we've got this as well. One fundamental point, which is what is called in Hindu philosophy, A, Bindu B in the U Bindu is an atom, but not a physical atom in the sense of what our physicists mean by an atom. This is an intellectual atom, the finest that any grain can get. It's almost like the Euclidean point having position that no magnitude except that it isn't quite as abstract as that. The any we need is very much alive. It is a unit of and I use this word to indicate what is common to all senses, a unit of sight, of sound, of touch, of taste, of smell. And all these senses, as you begin to realize with psychedelics, are really one sense specialized in five different ways.

That's why you, in certain cases hear colors, see sounds and so on. It all seems to go together. Well, of course it would. Because they're all

specializations of our basic sensitivity. All senses are fundamentally a sort of touch. So the any meaning is is a fundamental unit of touch. Now, as you know about a neuron, a neuron is such that it can give either yes or no as a message. That is to say, either it fires or it doesn't.

So then the eeny weeny is like that. It's either black or white.

But you begin to see that it's both because black always involves white and white always involves black.

So this anyway is one but two faced.

Also, it's being one implies all the others, one implies many because you can't think one unless you can think many, you can't see many unless you can think one. The concepts are inseparable. One doesn't mean anything unless you know what many is. Many doesn't mean anything unless you know what one is. So suddenly the any weenie being one implies all the others. And being itself, it implies an outside, which is not itself.

But if you can't have the outside without the inside.

In other words, if you can't have the space around the any weenie without the any meaning, and you can't have any meaning without the space, then somehow it's very difficult to say that the any weenie with the one little unit and everything else are different.

Then they go together.

And this leads you into the most fascinating of all aspects of psychedelic experience, which I would call the experience of relativity. This gets us back to significance. What is it bought?

Now, we human beings think we're important and that we have a very complex civilization that we have, that our libraries, our cities, our organizations, our institutions, nations, our wonders of religion and philosophy and art and architecture and so on is the most complicated and the most significant thing that ever existed on Earth.

And when we look at and realize that there are little cells in our bodies that have a sort of independent civic life and that there are all kinds of microorganisms which when we see them, we don't see the familiar human shape.

We see something more or less globular. We say, well, that's a very primitive shape compared with the shape of man.

It doesn't have a highly organized nervous system as ours and therefore is obviously an inferior creature.

But with the psychedelic use, you have time to think about things you don't ordinarily think about.

There are now not so hurried, not so hurry. How do you know this thing isn't as complicated as you are?

You haven't been really looked. Start looking.

And we know a scientist can start looking and he can find that one small, tiny micro organism has very complicated indeed. And why wouldn't it be that from the point of view of this micro organism, its affairs are extraordinarily complex and very important? I mean, imagine just something that we know a lot about. It's a long way from a microorganism. It's considered a bee. What do bees know about subtle distinctions between different kinds of honey that we've never thought of? Supposing a bee is arranged that it does exactly what it likes. And yet at the same time, this is always socially acceptable.

Pretty groovy sort of civilization now. Wouldn't it be? You never have to stop to think. Would this offend anybody or anything like that? You do just what you feel like doing. And it's everybody. Except it's perfectly fine.

You play the rules automatically. Well, human beings would say that's not much of a challenge. After all, it's a much more significant if you could do something wrong, if you could make a mistake. Well, that's our way of thinking of it. That's our particular taste that we think it's more fun to play that way. They may think it's more fun to play it the other way. They say,

well, why don't you want to introduce all that nonsense for when you can live a perfectly satisfactory life like a bee? Why do you want to go and bring in a kind of principle of evil choice just to make everything messy? Well, it's another form of game. You know, every game has some kind of a forfeit in it.

You've got to lose something in order to find it to win it back. And that's the essence of a game. That's why you shuffle the deck of cards at the beginning to create chaos. So and then you work against it. You see that everybody has something as some kind of thing that's a forfeit to play their life game. Otherwise, there's been no game. See, we think it's important to survive. Well, it isn't. But we say so. You think it doesn't make the slightest difference whether you live a short time or whether you live a long time. After all, here are these fruit flies, drosophila. They come and go, come and go, come and go with extraordinary rapidity. Generation after generation in a few days. And but far from their point of view, this is perfectly satisfactory normal life because I think the same about myself. And if I cannot assume similar processes in other creatures which are going on in me, then I am reduced to total solipsism.

That is to say that there are people who argue that although you can learn Chinese, you will never. However much you study Chinese and however much you speak with Chinese people, you will never do anything really that understands Chinese because you weren't born with it. You are always translating it into English. And so you're permanently precluded from understanding another culture. Well, you can carry that argument right down to understanding another person of your own culture and say, well, he's another person and you never really know another person. So we all are broken up into island universes which have no real communication between each other at all.

Well, the only reason I reject that is that it affords that basis. It is a game rule which has very little play in it. In other words, it's like it's as boring as tossing to see whether it will be heads or tails. But the assumption that other people and other cultures really can be understood and that the further assumption that things that are not human, that maybe insects or mammals or fish also are highly civilized is far more interesting assumption than that.

They are merely creatures of no importance.

But so you see that, though, that it is an assumption that we ought to go on living and that. But it was he. It's a meaningless assumption when you really examine it because mere going on mere quantitative length of time is just so much time. It has no special qualitative meaning to it. So we say a person died a glorious death.

He died for some great cause, you see. And when he went out to sea. But we say that thing that went on for a few minutes. Short life. He was a young man. He went up in a band. But it was a glorious explosion. And everybody builds monuments to him and says he was a great man.

So there is a value then to the short and explosive as well as to the long and dull rock of a seen. But when you're really fixed on a game rule, you see like you want to go on living.

It's very, very difficult indeed to see that you really don't have to see.

In other words, what this so often comes down to this relativity. Well, let me postpone that for a moment. I want to further the idea of relativity. So what you see then is that at every level of being, all creatures are confronted with the same tasks and have the same problems and are really in the same situation. The infinitely small is as big as the big candy and the big is as small as the small can be.

Because after all, when you get down, down, down, down to the most Manute things you can conceive, it turns out that they are surrounded with spaces that are relatively as vast as the spaces between the bodies of the solar system or between the different galaxies on the large scale. So if there are beings of any kind of sensitivity, dwelling on these Manute points is whatever they will look out and are what we see as galaxies will not be visible to them at all.

They will find themselves in the same sort of universe we find ourselves in because the kind that you see, every creature that is sensitive finds itself in the middle. So each one of you is in the middle of the world because you radiate a sensitivity.

In other words, the extent to which your eyes will see your ears will pick up sound is always the so-called outer sphere.

And you can expand that sphere by instruments, telescopes and radio astronomy or whatever it may be.

Telephones.

But still, you are in the middle.

That's the most important place. Everybody's in the most important place. The middle. And we say, man, is the measure of all things. It's a funny feeling that man stands in the middle causing deaths. He knows, as it were, so much higher than himself and so much lower than himself.

Probably equal in both directions, so much bigger, so much littler. So when you get down to very tiny, that thing two feels at the same place that you do, but you might say, oh, well, but not.

But really, it's very tiny because after all, we are fairly tiny. And there may be, in other words, beyond all the galaxies that we are aware of, vast systems that we have no knowledge of at all. And they are, after all, bigger. Are they?

Are you sure bigger or are they just in the same place?

You see, eventually you can construct a scheme where you get bigger and bigger and bigger, and that bigger is the same place as the tiniest because round in the circle.

That's you might say at first. Difficult to think about, but it is perfectly logical concept, perfectly simple. Only it's unfamiliar.

So is the sense. You see, as this grows, you realize that everything is in the same position. I remember I was thinking about this once and at the same time listening to Hindu music. And the concept of this immense relativity was really moving in me and I was full of marvel at it. And it was

somewhat terrifying. Somehow the Hindu music is a very Hindu music is very deep stuff.

You have to have a quite a trained ear to go and see that it is something just as profound as anything written by Bach or Beethoven. But I suddenly said, you know, there are moments in this music when God himself calls out for help.

I don't know what I meant by that, but. But something like this.

In the Hindu philosophy, as you know, they believe that God plays hide and seek with himself and that he.

As it were, half the time, whatever time is anywhere half of it is. He gets lost deliberately and forgets that he's gone and he gets as lost as last can get, you know, which is the end of experience that we call the screaming moments.

And that's when God calls out for help. Immediately answers, of course, because he wakes up and finds out he really is. But once you begin to see through this relativity thing that everything is central. Everything is as important as everything else. However big, however little you realize it's all God in the same position. But now that begins to scare you because you say, well, I can't believe that I am God.

That would surely be very blasphemous because I all I'm not very good and God is good and that I am not very powerful.

And God is supposed to be all powerful things in what we put. You mean you're not powerful? Isn't a question of whether you are powerful or not powerful. Powerful and impotent are just two opposites of the same game. If you didn't feel some lack of power, you wouldn't feel any power. I mean, you couldn't be all powerful because that would mean nothing. There would be just nothing happening. You were all powerful that it would mean power and impotence to be able, not to be able. Our two phases of the same thing.

So in the same way is the voluntary what I can do and the involuntary. What I can't or can't help doing are they. They are phases of the same. You wouldn't know one without the other.

And you begin to see. Isn't that fascinating?

And then in a funny way, you begin to realize it's a sort of secret that you are willing.

What happens to you without your will?

Because you see that you couldn't will anything unless there was also that that was other that you couldn't will that was beyond your control.

And it begins to dawn. You begin to see the whole thing that you're not just something fighting the world or on your little lonesome, but that the whole thing that you think you're fighting is the other side of you. But you put the whole game is to make it seem as other and as strange as possible. That's fun, because that's getting way out. That's that's making excitement. And you say, well, now, why then can't I just switch it off?

Couldn't I suddenly realized, bang like this sitting here, that all that I is other than me, all that I don't well is really me. Why can't I just do that? See, I only ask you, you think you can't because you think about it superficially. Would you want to? Would you want the disintegration of the other? And find out that it's merely you in the sense of your ego?

The self has to contain something more complex than merely. Ego has to have an element in it which seems to resist.

See, when you move your arm like this, you have what are called antagonistic muscles and dependent on these is motion. I prefer to call them complementary muscles, but still they are called antagonistic. It's all right. So when this muscle contracts and the bicep contracts, this one relaxes. And so the opposite way when you do this. Now you see they play with each other against each other. And so they make a movement possible.

So it is with the voluntary or the involuntary with the power and the non power where I conquer and where I surrender.

Did you get this feeling now? See that? You see, I played it all the way through everything. Every creature, every center sensitivity, every weenie in the world is the same one. They're all in the same position. But the whole thing is to look as if they want it, because that's the the hiding part of the game, the concealing part, so that every single any winning or human being or whatever you want.

Any unit of sensitivity, however you want to measure it looks down and looks up and says, well, those things aren't me, though.

They're where they're very different things. Especially I don't like spiders or snakes or whatever it is that you don't like and. No, no, that's that's that's that's not human. And we talk about snakes, eyes, you know how they have no warmth in them. What do you think I'd look like to a snake? I often said, what about it? How do the teeth of a gorgeous girl look to an oyster? So then you realize, you see that the whole point of it is that those things have to look different. That's the whole point, that if you didn't feel they were not human and there was something else, you wouldn't know you were human. And so they on their side look at you and you as a human being have some claim, although it's probably merely relative to be the most predatory monster on us, because the fish stay in the sea, the birds pretty much stay in air, but human beings range through an ocean and everything after their prey is opposing, the sharks could walk.

So.

When all this starts in.

You begin to experience an extraordinary kinship with all other forms of life, not only kinship with insects and worms and bacteria and so on, but also people, because you begin to see that everybody is faced with the same problem you are. Everybody has the same death problem and that everybody's workings aren't to be easily dismissed as good and bad and say, well, that's good and that's bad and therefore I can feel. Well, what's the point of all this judgment?

As a matter of fact, people judge despite the fact that Jesus said judge, not that you'll be not judged, but what's the point of it all?

Well, the point of it all is so that I feel that I am right.

See, because you can despise other people in certain ways or other classes of people and say, well, they're not that terrible.

But you wouldn't know you were in the right unless you had all those terrible people around you. I was talking in a previous seminar about in groups. And just for those of you who weren't here. I'll say briefly. Everybody's trying to get themselves into an in group, that is to say, to be nice people. And everybody who does constitute an in group thinks that they're the nice people and that the outsiders, even though they belong to a very fancy in group, are all nasty people saying.

And so if you're in any given American town, say, long live on the right side of the tracks and you know, the nice people and they're all those bums and [Unrecognized] and whatever Mexicans over there and you say, are they on their hands, say, gee, those we really live a real life because we have to face poverty.

We have to where we are right down close to the bone. And here, although it is rough. The meat is sweet. And those people don't know it. Those wretched. They're all big buses. And they own all the land and they own all the property. And they are a worthless bunch of junk.

They're not even Christians and they don't want anything to do with them. And so they feel they're the real in Group C, but neither one can know it is the real in group without the contrast or the other thing. You will depend on people who you could look down on in order to be able to feel up. And so you should recognize this and say thank you very much for giving me the privilege of being an improved, because without you I wouldn't know where I was.

And so you see all these human games running together and you begin to feel, gee, isn't that marvelous? You know, at first it starts being a kind of cynical. You see everybody's out after himself and that some people are

very loving and very cooperative because they realize that this pays, that this makes other people love them and that they're playing a game just like the people who are hostile and grumpy and aggressive and rude. And they get their way that way will see everybody's playing the game, being selfish. And the first is gives you the horrors they are.

We all, after all. Nothing but little horrible island selves. Each one out for itself.

And as this becomes very uncomfortable, if you've got to you know, if you've been brought up with a Christian conscience, then you begin to see what is it that you're being selfish about? What is it that you love when you say, I love myself? This it becomes exceedingly puzzling. You realize that what you love when you love yourself is always some other object than yourself.

You like eating ice cream. You like beautiful views. You like your house. You like your friend. You like kissing beautiful girls. You like this, but it's. Not me.

You suddenly realize you can't separate yourself that you love from everything else that your self implies. Then you know, which is up. But it soon terrified and you suddenly see the whole thing. And this can become with psychedelics a very, very vivid thing. The whole universe has a colossal energy play going this way and that way. Totally indestructible. And it's all you.

And you didn't know it.

It doesn't mean you're the only one. This thing proliferates in millions and millions of centers, but it's all one center.

And you can get the physical sensation of the thing being enormous, as it were, sort of center of light, of joyous, loopy, glorious, loving bond like that. And this will only usually last for a few moments where you feel you've actually put your finger on the center of reality. And it is this true men, this luminous energy, just beautiful.

And then as as this passes off, you see, as it were, the reflected glory of this in everything you look at.

And at that moment, you see in the experience, you begin to come down.

And as you look more and more, you see, of course, I don't object to being in a different state of consciousness than what I've just been in.

You go back to being ordinary because now I've seen what ordinary consciousness is underneath. It's this fantastic game of hide and seek and perfectly all right to come back, because actually, since all is one, there is no difference between my perfectly everyday existence and this stupendous vision of glory that I have just seen, because the one implies the other. They go together. This is the game. This is the hide and seek. And so you can come back into an extremely integrated, restful, quiet sense of peace.

Never forgetting that you have seen relativity and that relativity is the key to the fundamental unity because that which is related all extremes are related to each other in a polar way. They are not things that are separate from each other, as if they are opposing forces of light and darkness came from such opposite ends of the cosmos that there wasn't even a joining point between them and met in a clash. It is rather that as a flower expands from a center and blossoms, you could draw diameters across it.

Picking out opposite petals, but they all come from the same center. I have left around a number of what I would call psychedelic books, which you will notice consist very largely of photographs of pattern in nature, crystal structures, shells, bone structures, leaf structures, animal kills, erosion patterns, patterns in marble, all kinds of pattern in nature, because for some reason or other, the strongest one of the strongest effects that I had from the use of psychedelics was a vastly renewed appreciation of this dimension of the natural world, a kind of perception that the whole world is pattern.

This is a very strange feeling because our common sense normally faces the world on substance. We think of an primordial and more or less solid stuff which is found in dense forms as in granite or a ball of steel and found in very refined forms such as a gas. And we think that all the world is shapes

of forms of this primordial stuff. But one of the extraordinary consequences of using psychedelics is that everything suddenly turns into transparency. I think that's what some physicists have tried to say. I'm thinking of Sir Arthur Eddington in particular, when he remarked that it seems to turn out that the stuff of the world is the same as the stuff of our consciousness. As if awareness itself and material substance were really not different. And whatever this means scientifically, the psychological implication of it is somehow to make the physical world light lighter in every sense, somehow less heavy, less burdensome and lighter in the sense of more permeated with light. If you look, for example, at those reproductions of Persian miniatures that I brought out, you will see what I mean by the vision of the world as being lit, interior lit, illuminated from within. Not the interesting thing about this from a scientific point of view is that the physical description of the world does not require the concept of substance. It requires only the concept of pattern because upon a physical analysis, all substances, however solid, are finally described in terms of patterns, the patterns of their molecules, atoms, electrons and so forth.

And it is always the description of the pattern that seems to count. Common sense seems to urge us to ask the question, but what's the pattern made of? In other words, if we see everything reduced to a lot of circles and winding lines, we want to know what are those lines made of?

But when you think it through. The only way anybody can ever tell you about them is to describe still smaller patterns within them. Nobody can really think of a way of talking about stuff, because if it has no pattern and it's just sort of homogeneous all the way through and has really no shape in itself, I can't imagine a way of talking about it. But you can not and describe and make out delineate patterns. And so the world takes on from this point of view what I would best call a musical quality. Music having the peculiarity of being a language, a form of art in which the principal delight is pattern and the whole meaning is in the pattern.

Music, you see, really doesn't mean anything at all. It's a great art, but one can have the absolutely magnificent music which represents nothing and describes nothing. One enjoys it simply for itself. In the same way as you

might enjoy fireworks or watching ripples on water or watching the shapes of clouds.

They don't mean anything.

And yet they're orderly. And so wonder comes peculiarly aware of this world as play. I have described an experience in the joyous cosmology, which was actually based on an experiment with the Mexican mushrooms with psilocybin in which. I was listening to some Hindu music at the time in which the players were doing nothing but vocalizing the rhythm of drums, and they have a way of doing it with the syllables that deed it. DA dee dee dee da da dee dee da. So on. And they get up to a tremendous speed saying this. And it was the most gorgeous babble.

And then they were playing these various instruments and all the sounds became I became peculiarly aware of the nonsense in them. There was, for example, an oboe sound which sounds like somebody singing with his nose pitched.

Oh.

Now there's a lot of them children love to do that. It makes a fascinating noise. Why is it fascinating? Heaven only knows. But in this southern of Brad. Brad. That sort of savage, they weave together with incredible skill. They have Hindu music involves the most complex orders of pattern. And to count it out is quite difficult. But they do it with Cannes summit skill, especially with drums. And as a result of listening to this, everything became that. Everything became Hindu music. And so people you see when we listen to our own music.

Well, that's very serious. And we take it all for granted. A violin and this is a piano. And these seem to be very normal noises. And we've so long been accustomed to them that we take them for granted. And we think that they're perfectly sensible. Whereas, of course, if you listen to it with New Year's there, nothing of the kind been taken like an organ, for example. What a monstrous construction of pipes and playing all these sounds through them, blowing through holes is simply fascinating when you hear the Hindus who do things musically that at first sight strike us as ridiculous

because they concentrate on using sounds that we avoid. But we do sometimes use those songs when we are, especially as children. I'm trying to see what funny noises we can make. And so they will do things with their voices that sound to us like some sort of clowning. But to them, of course, this is all perfectly normal and serious music, unless, of course, they are turned on when they're listening, as they very often are in India, and it's perfectly legitimate. Their thing that they did, they forbid, is alcohol.

It's difficult to get in India and.

But they dance a big bang. I remember I was having dinner in Kyoto with a Buddhist priest and a little party and naturally all the Japanese, including Buddhist priests, drinkers. And he passed around beer and Saki and fairly plentiful quantities was sitting at the table, a Hindu man, very intelligent fellow, and I noticed he refused them. So a little later I said to him, do not drink for religious reasons. He said, Oh, no, it is not that. It is just that I don't need it and I don't want to come myself. Was there something I don't need? I said, Do you drink then, bum? Oh, yes. You said you would like. It is a very good drink. And as you know, a ban is an infusion of cannabis indica. And so I suppose the Hindus hear their own music from that point of view very frequently. Cannabis is hemp vulgarly known as pot.

So that the impression you see of this music at the time and in the state of mind, I was in in becoming the music and becoming this sort of marvelous nonsense, everything became that. And so I could see life behaving as patterns do so often behave. Look at a tree. You see, first of all, the heavy outline of the trunk. Then the trunk gives birth to branches and the branches give birth.

The twigs and the twigs give birth. The leaves and the leaves give birth to has and veins. And if you go on looking with a microscope, there is wiggle after wiggle after wiggle after wiggle, all coming out. And yet all adding up to the perfection of this tree's pattern, like some sort of symphony. And so I could see all the wiggles and patterns of human imagination and behavior as being involved in this and the things that we call good, as well as the things that we call bad, the things that we call healthy, as well as the things that we call sick. The enlightened and illuminated and liberated point of view, as well as the egocentric and point of view in bondage, all of them as

being integral parts of this terrific playfulness which the Hindus call the Leila or sport of creation, or better play better than sport play in the sense of playing the piano, playing the drama and so on, not play in the sense of the trivial.

So it was one of the most astounding feeling of being entirely a patent and nobody was making the pattern. There wasn't a patina outside the pattern.

The pattern itself, was it? It grew itself. It created itself. It was spontaneous. It was all there was. And water.

Water was a..

And so one is constantly reminded of this by all natural forms and objects in which pattern is very apparent and in which at the same time transparency is apparent. These two aesthetic qualities go together to be suggestive of the psychedelic experience. And so it seems more than ever natural to surround oneself with not only the objects of human art, but with dried flowers and herbs and grasses and seashells and various kinds of rocks and crystals.

And I know a very great sculptor and she she's not a sculptor. She is really a mosaic artist and painter. And name is Louisa Jenkins. And she is a great admirer of Talha the Shah, not the very progressive Jesuit theologian.

She is a Catholic and she has caught this feeling of universal pattern from him. And her studio is an absolute London museum. And she sees the artistic significance of everything. For example, we were having dinner with her one evening and she was serving Japanese saki in those small cups. Cups were white and one of them dropped off the table and split in two and we were about to pick it up and throw it away. She said, oh, don't throw that away. I said, I have a use for it. And a little later she presented me.

It's hanging in the dining room there with a an amazing face made of a flat disk of cement and the socket cups have been turned upside down and used as the eyelids for this creature.

Well, the thing is that her whole studio contains yes, she's a painted this. This is Leviathan, the monster of the deep.

Her whole studio contains things like skeleton leaves, feathers of the most intricate type fish, skeletons, animals, bones, marvelous pieces of driftwood, gorgeous blocks of quartz, everything. That is absolutely fascinating. A child would go out of its head in that studio.

But somehow this intimates a world which is entirely design pattern and it has an extraordinary levity and joyousness to it.

It seems to be a world that is immaterial in the double sense of the fact that it is not material and that it doesn't matter in the sense of when something matters, that it is grave and thus heavy. It becomes, in other words, a universe whose whole meaning is playfulness. But playfulness must, in order to succeed, must have an aspect which simulates tragedy and can play and not play so that one can realize play. It is fundamentally play, but it plays very serious games or plays at seriousness.

Now, this leads me to a question that is important about the use of psychedelics. All the people who have been involved with it talk about games.

Game theory is very fundamental to it. Now, when Timothy Leary and Richard Alpert were at Harvard, both of them started out in their work as very, very respectable scientists in psychology. They knew all about statistics.

And Timothy Leary, while he had been here at Berkeley, had done some very careful statistical analysis of psychological mechanisms and so on. And and got his doctorate and was a very respected scientist.

Then they began working with psilocybin.

Well, they made what was to their colleagues the fatal mistake, not just of experimenting on subjects and making careful notes and analysis of how they reacted, but they took it themselves.

And then they slowly began to realize that what is called serious scientific inquiry is a kind of game.

And you can see it as that, of course, without being under the influence of a psychedelic.

Just by reading some of the literature, especially in the social sciences, where you will find it amazing jargon are used and that you have to be able to speak that jargon in order to belong to the academic fraternity. If you don't talk that way and if you don't acquire the special rituals of the fraternity, you are not one of the boys.

And an enormous amount of these investigations are truly trivial.

I remember for a time I was associated with a certain university which has a famous Department of Education that's in the state.

And I remember reading the subjects of Masters dissertations when their degrees were awarded at commencement.

And what they had done to see was to choose subjects about running schools which were as specialized as you could get. I mean, somebody got his master's thesis from writing about the relationship of windows in a classroom to the circulation of air for the children. Now, this is fundamentally a job for a constructor or architect or someone. I mean, you know, and this qualifies one for a master's degree in education is simply fantastic.

But all those sciences and this is particularly true of the study of English.

They want to become scientific and that means studying something minutely. Well, it's very important sometimes for a physicist or a chemist to study something extremely minutely. But what these other people are doing, because that the physicist and the chemist have acquired a certain power and status through their studies, they are simply trying to copy the method of doing things in spheres where this method is not particularly applicable. And so it becomes strictly a game, especially in psychology, where anything that is studied has more variables in it than anyone can think

about. And so but it does make a very, very pretentious thesis to put forward some really good psychological statistics. So I shall have more to say about psychological statistics and the humanities. But so it becomes a game of staying in a certain caste.

Well, they saw through this, you see, and they felt at once that it was really rather ridiculous that they were doing this game and the psychology department at Harvard University and all as they ought to be mumbling in their beards and looking very grave. So really, the funny thing was the union, the university couldn't stand it. And there was a question as to whether they were resigned or actually fired. It was probably both, but they just couldn't go on with it. But now then it followed from that that they had to react to the opposite extreme and play another game altogether, which was, of course. What game is that? The opposite of the academic game is obviously the beatnik game, which is another game, too, because that, too, has its uniform, its rituals, its language and everything. And the moment you begins to start talking that way, you align yourself with a certain group.

I mean, if you dig things instead of appreciating them.

So that that puts you in a certain thing because they are there in group language, just as the academic people do to all games.

But now the problem becomes this.

There is a danger when you see how gamey life is. Two of overtly to regard everybody as playing games so that when somebody says something to you which is supposed to be either serious or sincere, that two things are not the same. You treat it as a game gambit and a person who is by no means ready to admit that he is playing games is very, very put off with this. Because you say you don't take me seriously, you're treating me as just as if I were playing games.

And so to when people get swept away by the notion that everything everybody is playing games.

They're also liable to get what has been called the holy man syndrome. Which is I am divine and therefore I am above right and wrong. I can do

anything I please because after all, it's only a game. And this is one of the things that in what I would call imbalanced people is very liable indeed to result from the use of psychedelics. And one of the reasons why society is afraid of it.

And this really does present a considerable problem. Of course, we can look to the experience of the past to give us a bit of help in this, because in Asia there have, of course, for centuries been people who attained a state of consciousness involving the point of view, a that the world is a game and that it is fundamentally harmonious and that good and evil are ultimately reconciled. Johnson says in his book, those who would have good government without its opposite misrule do not understand the great principles of the universe. One might as well talk about having the positive principle without the negative principle. And such people are therefore either knaves or fools. Pretty bold statement, but nevertheless, the great Dao is sages, and the Buddhist masters have always known very well indeed how to handle themselves in terms of a relationship to ordinary society and have known how to take their holiness lightly. And if one has to have a halo, how to wear it over one ear. The if you will, as you consult, for example, the literature of Zen. And if you know anything about the way Zen is carried on here, you'll find an astounding ability of the great men to carry the.

Exalted spiritual state in a very human way. One of the great points of Zen is that its ideal is not to become a Superman. Only a man, a human. And so the Zen people do not aspire to any claim of super humanity.

And the last thing that they learn in the very long training, say, of a person who is going to teach them is you might think it would be the first thing, but it is the lasting.

The last thing is they learn is the Zen interpretation of moral precepts.

It comes right at the end, if you read this new book by Muro and Sasaki called The Zen Koan, which is just published there is by Muro discusses the all the stages of koan study. And right at the end comes the study of the precepts. The irritating thing about this book is that it doesn't tell you anything. It tells you a lot of headings, but no content. And one sometimes

wishes that they would either put up or shut up. But it does have in its marvelous translations of Zen poems which are well worth the price of the book.

But anyway, this this thing, this point does come out that it is all part of making a bridge between deep inside and the everyday life of the world. Just as I said, you can't go off into ecstasy, or at least you can. But it isn't a good idea to go off into ecstasy and not grounded. So in just the same way, it is not a good idea to go off into a state of God's omnipotence and divine holiness, etc. and not bring it down to earth.

And this is one of the things that I could really complain about among many people who have taken a great deal of psychedelic substances.

There is this tendency to pooh pooh everything, for example, I mean, and to do absolutely outrageous things. There is a movement afoot called the Neo American Church to put the whole thing on a religious basis. But what do you suppose they do? They have a number of what you might call elders of this church, but they call each one A boo hoo, b, double o h double o boo hoo.

Well, I mean, if some people are just going out of their way to make themselves ridiculous, it is this is the revolution, you see. And for some people, it is fired with a real revolutionary spirit that we are gonna make this thing work or we are going to turn the world on and we are going to do it on our terms.

Cos you can see from the standpoint of deep inside that it's a very cute idea to call a religious patriarch a boo hoo.

I don't know what boo hoo always means in American slang. In my slang it means a crybaby.

Or it means something. It could mean sort of a hot air bag and true Zen masters in their private references to each other.

Refer to one another as rice bags and tramps and bums and all sorts of things.

But outwardly, so far as their contact with the world is concerned, they wear the proper and dignified living out the governments of high officials, which they're expected to wear because people want someone who is in a position of great authority or responsibility to look like it.

So the pope is the only man you can't slap on the back and call Harry.

So it is of the essence of real insight that when you arrive at the point of understanding what for want of a better term, I must call the total harmony of the world. You have to see that in this scheme of things, there really is no person who is superior or inferior in the final sense of this of this world. That is to say, it becomes apparent.

That everybody at his level and in his place. Is manifesting the divine just as much as you are or as much as any Buddha is. This is why it said in the Buddhist scriptures that when you become a Buddha, everybody else does.

And so you have no basis for giving yourself airs and graces or for breaking other people's game rules in such a way as to cause hostility because they in their way playing their games, even if they are limited games, even if they're bad games, they too are all won with you.

And they are not knowing that they're enlightened is at the point where they are very important indeed. It seems sometimes that events could be put on different levels and the levels could be numbered and a level that occurred on number 23 where it was quite right would seem very wrong if it occurred at level 95.

But what happens to us often is that we see an event and think it's at that level 95 when it's really only at 23. And so it seems out of place and it seems quite wrong. So this sensation, this real thorough absorption of the point that from the situation of the deepest mystical union, from that standpoint.

At that standpoint.

All men are equal, all beings are equal.

The problem arises when you try to bring that standpoint into practical affairs.

You can make one of two mistakes.

One, by saying you are all equal, but I am more equal than the first because I know you're all equal and you don't. The other is the more common one. All men are equally inferior. This course is the one from which our culture suffers to a high degree.

This is what results in what you might call a sort of travesty of democracy. You see, all democratic thinking in the western tradition was based on German mysticism. The great tide of democracy came from people inspired by Tala and Eckhart and Souza and Rise Brook, the brothers of the Free Spirit, the Anna Baptist. The levels all those people were the seedbed of Democratic ideas and the idea of liberty. The. Their mysticism influenced George Fox and the Quakers.

But when you translate this, all men are equal in the sight of God to all men are equal on the level of politics and economics. Then the parody is are all equally inferior. And this is why it issued in the various fashions in the West for explaining greatness away as neurosis. Of psychoanalyzing all great saints and artists and so on and reducing their accomplishments to frustrations in sex and toiletry.

This gave everybody you see who was then really some kind of a bum. A sense of satisfaction in knowing that the great are, after all, just as inferior as you are.

And that is a democracy at its worst.

What has to be understood, I think, is this.

In order to integrate the level of mystical understanding with practical life, you have to remember one of the famous stories of Shri Ramakrishnan.

There was a student who had been with him and had been learning that all things in the world are Brahman, other supreme manifestations of the

design. And having heard this, he left the Masters Ashram and went walking down the road. And there comes along an elephant swinging its trunk and looking rather fierce. And there is a man riding on the elephant. And he says to this man, Hey, get out of the way. This is a fierce elephant. But he thought, I am Brahman. Elephant is Brahman. We are all one Godhead and no trouble can come. So he didn't get out, and as he approached the elephant swatted him with his trunk and threw him into the bramble bushes at the side of the road, from which he eventually extracted himself bleeding and bruised. And he went back to the master and said, and told what had happened. The master shook his head and said to him, but you should have realized that the manhood warning you was also Brahma.

Well, so it is like this when you see that all different, all people whatsoever, whether they be high or whether they be low, are manifesting the divine just as much as you are. Supposing you are in a high situation, you know, you really seen the mystery and you see that all people manifest it. You must stop to consider that what also manifests it is the differences between them. That they are arranged in a certain hierarchy, that the king being king and the cobbler being cobbler. They are. But you see, if we these are like these levels I was just talking about level 23 and 95. The cobbler at level 23 is doing all right. But what he is doing would not be appropriate at level 95 or however you want a number it or turn it around. So when we equalize things, we must also take into account.

Everything that is there to be equalized.

Put it in another way. You might say, if I really understand that all is the work of the divine, but would I, should I or should I not be angry when somebody like Hitler destroys millions of Jewish people? Many people jumped swiftly to the conclusion that, of course, I ought not to be angry and then jump to the next conclusion, which is that although I ought not to be angry if I'm not, I'm extremely cold hearted. But I would point out that my being angry at such a state of affairs would be as natural as water boiling when put over a fire. I would be very angry indeed. But this anger is included in the manifestations of the divine just as much as the villainy of the people who destroyed the Jews. They're going to be villainous. I'm gonna be angry. Is it follows like the shadow and the substance? And so you

might say then, if all is a divine, why do anything to change anything? If we see any sort of social injustice or what.

What you will disease if it's all designed to let it go? No. But included in the things that are is change, is irritation, is all the among the workings of the human being. And so the people who work to change things are just doing their stuff at their level and they have to be included in this thing, in this totality. Gotta one said we work with nature even when we work against her. So you have to have the most inclusive view possible in order to integrate these two points of view. And it's an oversimplification altogether to say when you've seen that the divine is in all things, you just cut up your legs, relapse into somebody and watch the world go by.

That's all right for old men and for people who are physically tired and weak. That's very proper. To sit on one's porch and in a rocking chair would be the American equivalent. That's fine. But obviously when you are young, you must be involved in the world because what has to be understood is there is no way of not interfering with life. Even when you glance around this room, you make an effect on it. The slightest little breath upsets things.

Not very seriously. Not very much. But still, it does our existence. The mere fact of existence is an interference. There is no way of not interfering because you are absolutely connected with everything that goes on and every move that you make has repercussions. So one has to interfere. Therefore, the question if you have to interfere. The practical question is how are several ways of doing it?

Which one, considering the fine points, can bring about dangers.

Things like the holy man syndrome. Incidentally, I should mention another point about the holy man syndrome.

Not so long ago, a young psychiatrist came to see me who had some experience in these matters, but he had a very noticeable chip on his shoulder and he was all for emphasizing the point that, say, Zen. He had read a lot about it was a con game.

He said, you know, you're a con man. I'm a con man. We're all we're all con men.

And he he he was everything he did and said had a sudden aggression about it, as if to want to say to make a great point that we are all crooks. Now, when you see that you smell a rat. See, it's all very interesting, but there's a rat here. This person is overcompensating and therefore he hasn't really understood.

If you have to go around, in other words, challenging everybody with your insight, it shows that you are not secure in it. You don't really believe it. Otherwise, you wouldn't have to brag about it.

And this is the result.

This is the cause of all most all the kinds of excess and disruptive behavior that come from the use of psychedelics.

People get the vision and they go mad with it. They just can't keep it out of their hearts. They have to go in and use it to kick the world in the teeth. I even know an old man who should know better. Who says that? When he's got spiritual nourishment, he's ready to kick the well in the pants again. It may be just a jokey way of talking.

I'm not so sure, but that little edge of somehow having to insist on it is the same state that I was talking about yesterday in the first seminar. When you understand it fully, you go beyond ecstasy and come back to everyday consciousness. Likewise, when you understand fully, you go beyond any special claim to be a holy man or to be a real devil or whatever exalted position happens to appeal to you and you'll come back.

But now there's some further wrinkle to this. There always is.

There are people, as you know, who are aggressively ordinary. And this is a peculiar phenomenon in the United States. Well, we very much in this country believe in being natural. And so we feel uncomfortable with ceremonies and with dramatic behavior or dramatic clothes or anything like that.

We feel that that's too much. It's showing off.

So reminds us of the aristocracies of Europe that persecuted our ancestors, I suppose.

And so we we we like things in this country to be folksy. And so we we we many of us were sort of beat up close and especially wealthy people. You'll find no wealthy people on vacation will wear real beat up clothes, jeans and a T-shirt and so on.

And look as grubby as possible because that's natural.

So that's now. And so also then when people realize that they're there in a very they've come to a great exalted insight and they're gonna bring it down to earth, they realize they shouldn't be aggressive about it.

They're gonna be as natural as possible. But you can spot just like that that their naturalness is funny.

It's put on. So I would say to to be natural, really. You don't have to put on any special guys or something for protecting yourself against other people.

But you have to do is to do what you like in the sense that really well, what you like play what role you like so far.

As long as you're comfortable with it for yourself and don't care whether it's natural or not, then it will be natural.

Don't try to be natural because immediately one can detect the seriousness of.

So now this brings me to the last question.

In view of the whole problem of the social adaptation. Unitary consciousness of the world as a total harmony on the one hand and our ordinary, normal consciousness of the world as an intensely competitive system, gravely serious disputes. We're discussing bringing these these things together, fertilizing the one point of view with the other. What are we going to do? So far about the practical problem of psychedelics. I pointed

out at the beginning that we the whole subject falls between two stools because as a whole, neither the clerical professions nor the medical profession are ready for it.

And this is true even of that aspect of the medical profession, which is strictly psychiatry.

The divorce of psychiatry and religion, and it is, generally speaking, a divorce. There are exceptions to this where clergy, for example, in many theological schools are trained in psychiatry and there are a number of small smattering of psychiatrists who are members of some kind of religious group. But by and large, psychiatry is attempting to be a pure science without any religious commitment at all.

And I get the feeling again and again and I talked to a great many psychiatric groups and I talked to them endlessly about methods of therapy and this, that and the other. But I realize I get with it. I realized a lot of it with a funny intuition.

They are completely superficial. They don't even know what therapy is, what they're aiming at.

And so often this is not always the case. Therapy means success in getting a person to behave like everyone else. And to give him the same sort of tastes that everybody else has. So that he's a safe norm.

But even when this is not the case and many therapists say who follow Maslow, Carl Rogers and our most brilliant men, I still get this feeling that psychiatry is dying on the vine for lack of any metaphysical foundations.

Now, I said I was going to say again something about statistics.

Such statistics as there are are showing up today shows that psychiatrist psychiatric treatment by using other methods than the drugs they're using in asylums to quieten people down, psychiatric treatment is extraordinarily ineffective.

Samples show approximately that of any control group.

One third of the psychiatric patients recover from their symptoms in three to five years, and one third of patients under the care of a general practitioner receiving no psychiatric treatment also recover inside three to five years.

And those who were under the treatment of the psychiatrist came out a good deal poorer financially. I don't want to say this in a way as belittling the seriousness and the skill with which many psychiatrist are trying to study their problems.

But they do have an abominably superficial concept of the human organism and of the human mind.

One would think that a psychiatrist would be eager, above all, to explore every possible modification and state of human consciousness. We should be expert. He should know his way around inside all of them.

Just as a linguist wants to master many languages so a psychiatrist should master many madness and many mystical states. He should run the whole gamut from mystical vision to catatonic schizophrenia and know them all from the inside, because then he is in a position to communicate with his patients. He cannot communicate while he remains a mere professor of psychiatry. See? Psychiatry is not something that you can study like the history of Persian pottery.

It's all out there and it's objective and science on an it never had to get involved to be a therapist.

Effectively, you have to be right on the inside. You have to get mixed in with it. And even though this may you may lose a certain objectivity in scientific impartiality by doing this, you what you've got to acquire is the art of being able to get involved and then come out again and be scientifically impartial and then get in again.

That's difficult, but it's worth trying. But the reason you see the psychiatrist is afraid so often to get involved because he's scared of losing his own sanity. And he knows, you know, that we walk on pretty thin ice so far as our sanity is concerned. And so don't muck around that.

He's seen too many of his colleagues work for a long time in asylums who had to be quietly removed to another eye socket. That happens all too readily.

But it is the fear of insanity more than anything, which makes one insane fear of getting lost in all those strange corridors and bad dreams where you're going through mazes, corridors, worrying whether you ever get out without anybody.

What crazy people have an awful time with that corridor syndrome because there are other corridors of the mind.

Therefore, there is a certain protection of one's sanity in being able to go into various states and above all, what I as I said a little while ago, a moment ago, was that the thing that strikes me about psychiatry so forcibly is its lack of a metaphysical foundation.

In which you see it is simply imitating the fashionable point of view of scientism in the 19th and early 20th centuries. To push across the point of view that this universe is trivial.

It is nothing but whatever you want to say, nothing about something or other, definitely nothing but desperately important to get everything down to nothing, but so that we can say no mysteries left about this matter associated with it.

And that said that that said and a manifestation of hostility you see of hatred of life lying under that, because aged people were too afraid of letting themselves go to be able to admit that they could look at this well and say, wow, look at that.

Isn't that marvelous? Oh, really interesting.

Do you think you think these things are marvelous?

But it is as if it's not sophisticated because you see one of the one of the the games of aristocracy in Europe is always to look bored. And there are all sorts of you could put a whole history together of how people copy the

attitudes of their superiors in order to get one up. So if it's good to look, board was a mark of extreme aristocracy and great wisdom. The scientific world, which was a part venue, then imitated a bored attitude to everything so as to gain its status or involved in different. And so that they had no reason to be bored. They were just imitating people. And the aristocrats had some reason to be bored. I'd seen everything that had all pleasures. They were blasé.

So look at psychiatry in turn picked up. The attitude is nothing, but it's just the libido or something and or it's just mental mechanisms or is just neurochemistry or something like that. One of the funniest things about LSD is that maybe it's just neurochemistry, but by when you get inside, neurochemistry is something if you think chemistry matter.

Good heavens, what are your nervous system? You suddenly it is like a conducted tour inside the nervous system. You begin to realize that the nervous system is one of the wackiest things going. It's fantastic. You can't just dismiss it as a nervous system as of nasty porridge in a bottle.

So then this is the thing.

I think that the crucial point that has to be developed before we can handle these substances intelligently is a medico religious rapprochement. And that means reforms on both sides and they are beginning to happen.

You know, you're probably aware that there's a huge theological ferment going on in both Catholic and Protestant churches and among the Jews. The top's blown off the occasional references to it in the paper. But my clergy friends are thinking things today that they couldn't possibly be thinking about 10 years ago.

They're as revolutionary as almost any group I know. You should talk to the local rector here in Sausalito or any crowds of them all over the place. Things are happening.

And what is essentially happening is that they are consciously facing the fact that they need a kind of religion which is much more profound than anything they've hitherto been dealing.

And they are open to the dimension of religion, which has been consistently ignored for centuries. Which I'll call the mystical dimension of at last. Admitting that religion is not just believing certain ideas and following certain patterns of behavior, but must indeed involve the transformation of consciousness, not in the sense of an emotional blow out like a revival meeting, but something which involves a crucial change in the sense of human identity. There is therefore weaving together at this time a whole pattern of movements. More and more it becomes in the biological and ecological and physical sciences clear that the individual is inseparable from the cosmos.

That after all, you are an expression of everything that's going on.

You know, something that rattles around in this universe that came into it as a stranger from somewhere else. And so that behind the facade of everyday consciousness, there are depths of oneself just as truly one's self as your own will, which altogether go beyond your individual organism. And that these we can become aware of these depths, and as we do so, become delivered from being plagued by impermanence and death and temporary suffering.

The psychiatrist has to know this, too, because if he sits in his office and has nothing under in his belly, you know.

That is the what I would call the certainty of eternity. Somewhere here.

He's really just as neurotic as the person he's sitting with and is putting on a mask attitude, looking wise, playing the scientific role, distance of objectivity, not get involved with the patient.

Use all the little tricks when he's really wet behind the ears. You know, you learn a whole bag of tricks. Even if you've been through a didactic analysis yourself, you can just have a whole domain of trickery, therapeutic gambits. There's a little underneath.

So I think that some psychiatrist should be ready to take their medicine.

I mean, LSD. And just for an introduction.

To the realization that there are more things in heaven and earth than I dreamed of in your philosophy.

Human Consciousness

Transformation of Consciousness

Buddhist philosophy speaks of the four invisibles: water to the fish, out to the bird, mind to mankind and enlightenment to the ignorant.

Because you see, you never know your own element. Now, it's impossible, therefore, to give a definition of consciousness because we don't know anything outside it.

Just as the fish doesn't know anything outside water and the bird doesn't know anything outside air.

We don't know unconsciousness.

We only know when we have been unconscious.

And so we are in a very difficult fix to attempt to define the subject of the seminar.

We all know what it is, and yet none of us know what it is. We know we are conscious.

It's the same sort of problem just to try to say what color your eyes are.

I don't mean whether they're blue or brown, but the color of the iris, the lens of the eye, because we say it has no color. It's transparent. It's like pure glass. And yet that might be a color to somebody who had a different kind of eye.

An Englishman and an Hindu were once sitting in the backyard of the Hindu's home, and the Hindu was talking about the necessity of a background for the perception of any figure. So he said. Against what background do you see those flowers? And he said, against the background

of the hedge and against what background? You see the hedge. He said the background of the hills. And against what background? You see the hills.

He said the background of the sky. And he said it against what background? You see the sky. And the Englishman fell silent. The Hindu said, it's the background of consciousness. There you see we reach a limit.

And you can talk until all is blue about whether consciousness and reality are the same thing.

Whether there really is ever any such thing as pure unconsciousness. Whether consciousness is tunnel, whether as the subjective idealists would say in philosophy, there is primarily mind and all so-called physical and material existence is something in mind or something in consciousness.

You can debate that subject forever and ever and ever and come out nowhere.

There is no answer to the question when asked in that way.

But it is helpful as a start to make things at once more simple and perhaps a little more difficult by.

Overcoming at the beginning the traditional opposition between the spiritual and the material or the mental and the material.

By the trick of talking about all things, whether spiritual or physical, in terms of pattern.

Because that's all anybody can really talk about pattern.

You see, it's fundamental to our common sense, which was highly influenced by Aristotle and the Book of Genesis, that all forms are composed of some substance in roughly the same way as sculptures are made of stone.

Or parts made of clay.

But a serious physicist no longer thinks in such terms about the material world.

He doesn't think it's made of anything.

Because what the physical process of nature is, is patterns.

You could say patterns of energy, but that's using the old ceramic language patterns aren't made of energy. The patterning is the same thing as the energy.

So if you use the verb patterning as what the universe is, then you'll get something that you can talk about. You can describe patterns. You can measure them.

You can say what a pattern is doing, although a pattern isn't a thing, a pattern is a verb, it is a process, it's an activity. So we can say patterning is what is going on and consciousness is a kind of patterning, as we shall see. Just so are flowers and human beings and stars, trees, water, our everything. Even space itself is a form of patterning. And this means, in other words, that the universe is what physicists would call an energy field.

And likewise, consciousness is a field in the same way that space is obviously a field, that is to say an area in which things happen. That's the primary meaning of field. A field is a playing field, a field in which something happens like an arena. Only when you use the word field in more in the sense of physics, you mean a field of forces like a magnetic field, like a gravitational field.

And the curious thing about fields is that they exercise their energy in a non mechanical way.

For example, if gravity were non field, that is to say, if it were the ordinary sort of exercise of energy like the propagation of heat or like someone pulling, then when you put something on the ground, you put a good heavy lead plate on the ground that would be absorbing so much gravitational energy and therefore anything you put on top of the plate would be less acted upon by gravity than the lead plate itself. And then anything on top of

that would be still less. And you would reduce the energy of gravity by piling things up.

But you don't it doesn't make the slightest difference to the gravitational field. So in the same way, if you take an electrical coil, say a surrounding a plastic tube, you can put a current through that and you create a field within the tube. You can put your hand inside the tube, but nothing will happen to it. But the minute you put something that is like steel inside the tube, it will get hot, but no heat will be generated until the steel is inside the tube because the coil plus the steel equals heat.

But the coil has to polarize with the steel inside before anything happens at all.

So that shows us that what is operating as a field.

Now, think then of the world as a field characterized by patterning, which for which another name is energy. And. We are going to have to treat consciousness in rather the same way.

Now, one thing that is characteristic of all end of all energies, all energies whatsoever or patterning whatsoever, is that we find it convenient to think about it in terms of the spectrum.

So there is a spectrum of light, the visible spectrum running from red to violet and beyond the visible spectrum. There is a very big invisible spectrum because our eyes respond only to a small section of the measurable spectrum of light. So we have infrared rays at one end and ultraviolet at the other. And then so on our two cosmic rays, gamma rays, hard x rays, all sorts of things on the invisible bands of the spectrum. So in exactly the same way, there is a spectrum of sound. And if anybody was a sufficient scientist of cookery, they would devise a spectrum of taste.

There are certainly a spectra of other kinds of vibration than sound and light.

And there are likewise conceivable spectrum of shapes.

Spectra of emotions.

So we could talk to of a spectrum of love ranging at the red end from lust or the Freudian libido to Divine Love at the Violet and Divine Charity and in the Middle Greens would be things like friendship and endearment and so on.

Each emotion, as a matter of fact, could be thought of as having its own spectrum. Now, then, the curious thing about the world is that it's a kind of interlocking of spectra.

Which the best analogy would be weaving. The interesting thing about weaving is that you've got the two cross groups of cross threads which give you the pattern, the warp and the weft.

And if you pull out either one, there is no pattern, nor is there any cloth. It all falls apart. It needs both the warp and the weft for there to be any pattern at all.

And they together constitute the cloth. Now let's look at a similar illustration in the ordinary, everyday world of this interlocking of patterns. Let's take the photograph of a face in a newspaper. If you examine this photograph under a magnifying glass or even with the naked eye, you will easily see that it isn't a continuous face as faces are supposed to be. But it is a whole collection of dots.

Some are heavier, some are light. And according to the heaviness and lightness, as you stand back, you get, as it were, the illusion of their being present in terms of those dots, a human face.

Now, let me pose the question, what is the relationship between the form of the face and the grid work of dots?

At first sight, that doesn't seem to be any relationship between them at all because the printer uses exactly the same kind of screen with which this process is done for any face whatsoever. So the kind of screen he uses makes no difference at all to whose face it is. Anybody's face can be on it

or any other shape. So you might say the fact that he is using a grid is completely irrelevant to the form of the face.

Take still another illustration. The radio.

When you turn on your radio and it comes on first thing in the morning, the announcer does not say the sounds you are now hearing are vibrations of a diaphragm activated by electromagnetism. This is mediated to through a network of transistors and broadcasting station with such and such people. He does does not intrude the mechanics of radio.

He comes right on saying This is station so-and-so. Welcome. This is this morning's news or whatever it begins with.

So it would seem that the structure of the radio, the wiring, the transistors, the speaker have absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the message that's coming across it.

They live they are in two different worlds altogether.

So it would seem then take another possibility.

What about the brain?

Is thought in emotion or consciousness itself a function of the brain? If we knew a great deal about the anatomy of the brain, would that tell us a great deal about the patterns of human thinking? Or would it tell us as little about the patterns of human thinking as knowledge of radio engineering tells you about the technique of Bach, whom you hear over the radio?

See, there's a real puzzle.

And this is one of the interesting subjects brought out in this extraordinary book called *Understanding Media* by Marshall McLuhan. And I don't think he's clearly answered it because he is trying to say that what is most important is not so much the message or what is supposed to be the content of any method of extending our nervous system, such as radios, such as televisions, such as printing, such as photography.

He is trying to say that the message is the medium.

That is to say you are influenced by television, not so much by the advertising and all the group that comes across on it, but by the fact of being in touch with the world through this particular electronic system with all its peculiarities.

That's a very interesting idea. And he's put up an argument for it, but I'm not convinced that his argument is quite solid.

But I want to go into this question, because obviously you would not hear any music except you had an orchestra in your room.

Were it not for your radio on your phonograph.

And as a matter of fact, even if you had an orchestra in your room, you wouldn't get them to produce any music without those instruments. Now, let me ask the question in another way is that what is the relationship between the piano and what you play on it?

Any you can play anything practically on a piano. And the structure of the piano doesn't make any difference. And yet without it, you couldn't play.

So we've never seen anybody thinking without a brain.

So what is the relationship between? Well, again, you see, it's rather like warp and woof.

The walk goes one way and the wolf goes the other, but by the interlocking of the two, you get something.

So what you've got then are spectra of different kinds. See, when you dial and you move the dial. What you're doing is you're changing the wavelength of your radio.

That is to say, you are moving from one end of the spectrum of waves slowly to the other.

So the spectrum of radio meshes with another spectrum which is being used in the production of music. As a matter of fact, the production of music is an interlocking of many spectra. But we won't go into that because the emotional spectra are involved, spectra of speed, of dexterity, of harmonics, all kinds of things go into this.

So you get the picture of the world as an enormous web where spectra mesh with spectra of all kinds. And they're all mutually interdependent. And through them, it all hangs together.

And the peculiar fact of these spectra is that they come in together, come into being together, almost. The world is not you.

You don't see things appearing in nature except some with certain insects and birds that actually practise weaving. But you don't see plants and trees being exactly woven. What seems happen seems to happen more than that. Is that warp and woof come into being together at the same time. In rather the same way that back and front necessarily come into being together at the same time or head and tail, you don't see creature born as a head and then later developing a neck trunk, feed and tails. It just doesn't work that way. It comes in together, head and tail. Even the spermatozoa has a head and a tail. So then what I want to go into, of course, is the spectrum of consciousness and its many transformations, the different ray and the huge range of the spectrum is extraordinarily fascinating.

So then let me be. Let me first be sure that we are quite clear about this physical conception of the world.

You see, you can also call these spectra if you want to dimensions.

And dimensions is a very useful idea.

You can see that you can't have a physical existence in terms of point line surface.

Each of those is a dimension.

It's not till you get the so-called third dimension, although it should correctly be called the fourth time. The fifth is not till you get the so-called third dimension that anything is physically manifested.

Then you're there. Now, you could say these dimensions are quite different from each other.

The surface is a very different thing from a line, as is a line from the point.

But somehow they all go with each other in a way that we don't normally think of as a kind of.

In other words, dimensions don't seem to bear the same sort of relationship to each other as do opposites, least not in our ordinary thinking.

We think that opposites are mutually exclusive and that you can't have something that is hot and cold.

At the same time, it's either hot or cold, but dimensions are not mutually exclusive.

Dimensions are always dimensions of the same field or the same thing.

And so then you have to think that therefore, of what we've hitherto called the mental and the physical, the spiritual and the material as dimensions of the same thing. Dimensions of patterning, dimensions of energy.

So then you've got this fantastic universe with all these interlocking spectra and dimensions.

And this, of course, is the real harp that the angels play when they talk about you going to heaven and playing the harp. What are you doing?

You've got a spectrum of strings.

And from that, though, when you play the harp, you don't play all the strings at once. Would that be just chaos like when you play the piano? Just don't take your elbows like this and slouch in the whole thing down.

You select.

So throughout nature, all these spectra that are interlocked are being selected from. That is why the eye is select. Only a narrow band of the spectrum of light by the ears to select a narrow band only of the spectrum of sound.

And further than that, by the use of attention, we screen out all sorts of things we don't want to notice. Our senses are further selective to see by influenced by thought. And so this is analogous to plucking the strings of a harp where you make choices as to which strings you will pluck. So when the angels played our harp, the music is everything you see.

So that's the real meaning of what you do in heaven when you go and play the harp. You become one with God and you create the universe. That's the real me.

Well, now, what about the spectrum of consciousness?

I'm going to designate I couldn't avoid it.

I tried to, but I couldn't. A sevenfold spectrum.

That's number seven is awkward. Every kind of phony artist is hung up on seven.

And I wanted to get away from that, that I somehow couldn't manage it.

So let's let's take it like this.

We're going to see from one end the most dull dimension of consciousness or band of consciousness and landing up at the other end of the brightest. So you begin with number one, which is sleep.

And of course, there are two kinds of sleep dreamless.

I'm dreaming.

Number two is top us, as in the state of going to sleep or under the influence of alcohol.

You feel no pain at all or your sort of investor ties than your senses a dollar in blood and you don't feel like being very active.

3 Waking consciousness.

Only I have to qualify this because the others are awake, too. But I mean, our normal everyday consciousness, which we're going to call symbolic.

And I'll explain why as we go through these in detail. Number four.

Sensory consciousness. Number five, cellular.

Number six, molecular. And number seven.

We will just give the name light to it.

Now, I want to make it perfectly clear that these names that I have used are not claiming to be exact scientific names.

They are simply suggestive. We do not yet have a science of consciousness in the sense, the Western sense of science that doesn't exist. And that's one of the things we shall eventually have to do. So these names are rather symbolic names than exactly scientific names. And you must keep that in mind. Now, it's rather interesting that this particular spectrum should best be drawn not on the usual way a spectrum is drawn, which is simply a band, but it should be drawn as a circle of which each of these is, as it were, a cut in the pie so that beyond here is again, sleep, deep sleep, dreamless sleep, because, you know, the Hindus have a way of classifying the states of consciousness, which isn't quite the same as this. They start out with no one. This one.

The waking state, then they take no to the dreaming state. Number three, the dreamless state. And number four, this one, which is called Turiaf simply, which means the fourth and which cannot be described.

And they would say that when you go to bed at night, you think first into the dreaming state. Then you go down into what they call social party, the dreamless state, and you may get back into the fourth.

And that is why sleep refreshes you, because you are new. You as an individual are withdrawn into the center of the universe, into the Ottoman or the Brahman, the primordial reality, the ground of being used to express what she got from the Ark of Burma.

And so that's why you are refreshed every night. That's how you get there. You know who you are really deep in, because as the Hindus teach, everybody is really it.

That is to say, the Godhead is playing at being dreaming up, being whoever it is, your particular personality.

And then it's only at night then when you sleep, that you go back again to being the undivided one and only single essence of the universe. Only when you wake up, you forget about it.

Why?

Because in the primordial state there's nothing to remember. There's no time. And you have to have time working for memory to work.

So imagine then this things as a circle. I say at the top of the circle you have number seven.

Brilliant.

And then the colors of consciousness going right round and meeting again here, here and here.

So you kind of have black and white next to each other at the top.

If we all put this in terms of color, then all the other colors connecting them all the way round. Because, of course, you see black and white, as I will show you later on in the seminar, are astonishingly creative.

You can do everything with black and white.

Black and white really contain all color.

And this is why the Chinese theory of the universe is based on the opposition of the yang and the yin, the positive and negative. The name's Yang and Yin are derived respectively from the north and the south sides of a mountain. This is the primordial image. The yang is the south side of the mountain, which is bright. The yin is the north side of the mountain, which is from the shadow.

Now nobody ever saw a one sided mountain can't be such a thing.

So in the same way, you cannot have a yang without yin.

The symbol of the Armenian, you know, well, I don't even need to draw it. The two interlocked commoners one black, one white and each with the opposite color as its eye so that they look like two fishes chasing each other.

This is a very profound symbol because the idea which goes with it is this that young and in our way of process, where the yin aspect is the crest and the yang aspect is the trough. And likewise, in the same way as you can't have a one sided hill, you can't have half a wave. Half a wave doesn't exist anywhere in nature. There are no half waves of light, no half waves of sound that are always complete waves or none, because you cannot have the crest without the trough and you can't have the trough without the crest.

It just won't work.

Now, however, there is a pulse in this. There is a point where the young force reaches an ascendancy and then begins to drop into the end, where the yin force reaches an ascendancy and begins to rise into the young.

And the Chinese are always thinking about this in relation to tendencies in natural and human affairs, where, for example, the young force of a storm will reach a peak point where it must drop over into the yin force of calm, where the whole book of changes call. The aging is based on this. The aging is a marvelous play with yang and yin, you see. Just let me say this

about it in parenthesis. When you want to make a decision and you've got all the facts and released all the facts, you have got time to collect as you could go on collecting facts about any decision forever.

But the time comes when you have to make it and you say, now I've got all the facts and they really don't help me to decide. Because I might go one way and I might go the other. Let's flip a coin. And everybody's always doing that.

But you see, a coin only gives you two possibilities, two answers, it is either the thing answers yes or no. So the Chinese have a coin, as it were, to flip. Which gives you 64 possibilities.

And you take one of them and it doesn't give you a yes or no answer. It gives you a kind of thing like a Rorschach blot.

Really, it doesn't look like a Rorschach blob, but that's what it is into which you read your situation and make up your mind accordingly.

And this is done, you see, by combining the yang and the yin in a complex pattern, the lead, the imaging consists of hexagons and they are composed of two kinds of lines, an unbroken line.

Like this is a young or positive line and a broken line like this is again on negative lines.

Then they've got them now. There are.

If you take a figure with three lines, which we'll call a tri gram, see?

There are eight ways of making such a tri gram with Yang and the N lines.

This one happens to mean fire, no water, no fire excuse me, fire two positive and one negative in the middle.

Now, if you've got eight tri grams was a possibility of making out of those eight tri gram, 64 extra grams.

So this one would be water and you would get one which was fire and water together.

So to each of those. The book of changes attaches an oracular remark.

And if you look up the Balkans, when you buy a certain process, got your hex the ground, it gives you some light on your decision and the direction it should take by bringing it out of you by its remarks in the same way as a Rorschach blot brings out your psychological disposition.

So that 64 ways of tossing a coin, if you had a 64 sided coin, you could do it that way.

If you could make such a thing, you probably could, but that would be spherical.

So from Yang in the end, from the the extremes of polarity, because you see that light is as intense the alive as you can get. But if you go too far into light, it will burn you up and you'll get darkness. People don't know and they don't realize that the farthest you can get into darkness, it'll start getting bright.

Because you can't have darkness without light any more than you can have light without darkness.

So when we were babies, we were never told this. But it's the secret that light and dark go together. It is the only real secret there is.

Black and white. But what do we we we we've forgotten the secret because with black and white, we're playing another game which is called All Black Might Win. That's what makes everything a thrill.

If you knew you would always win in any situation, it would be just a pushover and life would suddenly seems to have any interest whatsoever.

You would be, as may imagine yourself in total control of everything that happens. A kind of Jehovah type. You would be bored to death. Everything would do. Just what? No surprises? Nothing. You see, when in a game

you're playing a game and the outcome of the game becomes known. Supposing in the course of bridge, the four players all suddenly realize together that one of them has all the cards, it will take the tricks. What do they do? They don't play the game. They cancel it and begin again. Shuffle the pack. When in chess, two pundits are sitting there meditating. One of them suddenly says, Well, it's obvious in 53 movies you're going to win.

They cancel the game. So in the same way, an omniscient God who knew the whole future would cancel the universe and say think up another.

So it is fundamental to the game of black and white that it must seem that black will win and eat up white. That in other words, nonexistence will triumph over existence. Or rather, let me put it this way. Non being will triumph over being, because the secret is that existence is being and non being isolating so that every time you get being you'll get none being just as everything is vibration.

The spectra of vibration, lightest vibration. If I sit next to a girl at the movies and I want to make flirtations with her, I put my hand on her knee and I leave it there. She seems to notice that if I gently pattern me, she'll know I'm there all the time because I go on and off, on and off, on and off, on and off, on and off. And that is energy. You see that that's something happening. And so everything is on off. Only sometimes on off happens so fast that you don't notice the OP. For example, light is a palace station then. And but all light seems to be constant. And so we don't notice the off because our retina is retaining the image of on while the off is happening in the light. So we don't notice the OP except if you'll get an hour flight, you can notice a little flicker to it. And that's why they don't allow our flights in sawmills, because sometimes the flickering of the Arclight can synchronize with the movement of the teeth on the saw.

In such a way that the saw seems to be still when it's actually moving and people get very serious accidents that way.

But everything is on off now, then sometimes you see we don't notice the off, but at other times we don't notice the on. And that is when we were asleep. When in other words, or when we're dead. When the trough the off

section takes a long spin because you see there are big vibrations and little vibrations. Some vibrations happen so fast that we can't measure them.

Others happen so slowly that it takes a century, may take a million years for a single swoop of the curve that goes down or that makes the upper crust of the wave easy. When you look at the wave pattern, you must realize that the crest is measured from the top to the middle of each trough and that the trough is measured from the top of each crest to the bottom of the trough.

They overlap.

So if you can argue it's all trough, you can argue it's all crest. It's a funny world.

So the argument that it's all trough and that maybe just a little bit of crest about winning like that point. These are the people who say, well, we are flashes in an eternal darkness. The pessimistic point of view. Then there are the people who say there really is no death at all. Death is just an illusion that seems to happen. The optimistic and the optimistic point of view is essential to the pessimistic as the pessimistic is essential to be optimistic. You wouldn't know who you were. You see, if you didn't have both points of view. I'm not going to see. And when I teach, I don't try to persuade anybody.

And everybody is at liberty to disagree because I wouldn't know what I was thinking unless there were people to disagree with me.

So in the same way, supposing you're in the social scene like here in Ohio.

There are nice people and there are not so nice people.

There are various kinds of nice people, various kinds of not so nice people. There are, for example, nice people who belong to the country club set.

There are nice people who belong to the art, he said, nice people who belong to the social service set and so on.

And then there are nasty people who would be very variously be defined as the poor, the beatniks, the generally disrespectful people who live on the wrong side of the track or the wrong part of the hill or whatever it is all the wrong town and not the nice people collector boost and maintain their collective ego by talking about how dreadful the nasty people are.

And the nasty people boost their collective ego by talking about what frightful bourgeois squares the nice people are, but they don't need a group realize that they have a symbiotic relationship just like bees and flowers only, whereas the bee flower relationship is harmonious.

The symbiosis of different social groups is this harmonious because each group needs the other to know who it is.

Whereas if you were the only kind of people that well, you wouldn't know who you were. See, in a totally conformist society. Someone is sitting next to you is just like you. There's no point talking to him because you might just as well talk to yourself. In other words, really, truly to be yourself. You need other you don't know what you mean by self unless you know what you mean by other. So this is how young Indian the polarities generate everything. And are absolutely essential to each other. Now, the funny thing is this. If you belong to a certain group of saved or elected people and you know you're saved and elect because of the damned people outside, whether this is a social salvation or spiritual salvation or any kind of salvation, you want to think of financial salvation, whatever. When you realize that you only know who you are because of the, as it were, adversary or enemy or outgroup. You start laughing because that's very funny. It's the contrast from suddenly thinking, you know, wow, those bastards outside and suddenly realizing that they are enabling you to take this pose of coming on tough, which you think is great. And you start laughing. And this is why society, as we now know it, is afraid of this ever getting let out. This is real, really simple. This is terrible subversive stuff.

I mean, all that Marxist is just as just the same thing as us backwards. It's the collectivist idea of the state as opposed to the individualist idea of the states.

But the individualists become collectivists through huge corporations. Lenin said he would love to see these great corporations growing up because it would be just so much easier for the state to take over that already provided the organization.

But you see, there is a tendency within our economy to become a collectivist economy just by progressing with its own whatever it's doing with its so-called free enterprise.

And there will be naturally, therefore be a tendency in a collective economy to fall apart because it all gets so boring and stop everybody out on his own initiative. Again, this thing goes round and round. But the important thing is that we're supposing you believe in a free enterprise economy you must have in order to maintain your solidarity, especially in a very great country. You must have an external enemy. And if there wasn't one, you'd have to invent one because it keeps everybody on their toes. It keeps us from slacking on the job and said, got to beat those fellows and that. Terrible. So we've got to be very serious about that and see how are we. And of course, we lose your sense of humor. When you get so serious, you don't really know underneath that it's a game and you become a butcher. On one extreme or communist on the other. So you have to keep if you want to be a sane human being, you have to know right in the back of your head, right back here, what the Germans call a hint of Dunker, which is where the back of your mind.

You have to see the point that enemies need each other.

Cops and robbers.

Where would the cops be for a job if there weren't any robbers? How would you know you were law abiding if the weren't criminals?

It's tricky, but it's very dangerous teaching, very subversive, because you might think I would say if I realized that what I said is simple. It doesn't matter what kind of a person I am and do anything I want because evil is necessary to good. There's no fun in that attitude because that simply says I won't play.

If you want to sit by yourself under a tree and not play, I guess you could do that provided you don't interfere with our game. And if you come and interfere with our game and say, well, now look, care, you people, you're all wrong.

No, because you think you ought to be good. But it doesn't matter whether you're good enough, you mustn't do that. Don't interfere with a game in order to have this kind of knowledge. That's why all this kind of knowledge has always been esoteric.

And in any esoteric school, people were tested first before they got it. In order to find out what he was civilized. In other words, you can't give powerful tools and powerful knowledge to people who aren't civilized and who have no humor and who have no graciousness.

That's why it's difficult when young people get hold of knowledge, that is that for which they're not emotionally prepared and they are given full and total instruction on birth control when they're four years old. It means nothing at all.

It may mean something positively dangerous, but nowadays you has no way of concealing these things. I said it's a secret, but in the world of science, there are no secrets.

So I don't feel any compunction about talking about these things because if I don't, somebody else is going to because an awful lot of people know about it.

But that is the inside dope. If I may say so. That this. These extremes lead each other and can't manifest without each other.

And the point is how to keep your head when you know that.

So let's have an intermission.

Well, now this morning I was dealing mainly with two key ideas, one of which was the physical universe as a system of inter meshing spectra. Depending on each other and playing with each other in the same way as

warp and woof in weaving. And I underline the notion that these spectra are different dimensions rather than components of the physical world.

And that although I'm using the word physical here, I'm using it in the sense of its original meaning natural rather than the later meaning that has been attached to it.

That is the same material world, the world envisaged by analogy with ceramics. The material world considered as a world made out of stuff.

You see, as we all know, stuff is supposed to be something inert and stupid, which can't do anything.

And therefore, in order that stuff may be found in intelligent shapes, it has to be informed by an external energy, an external intelligence, so as to be brought into shape. And this is the idea of the world based upon the analogy between creation and carpentry or creation and ceramics or creation and sculpture.

Just in parentheses, good.

Sarah, Sarah, ceramics and sculptors don't treat their medium as if it was stupid.

They know that the potter, who is a good potter, knows that there is life in clay and that he has to respond to that life in order to do the work of pottery properly. But those who are not themselves artists don't know this.

And therefore the public has been bamboozled for centuries on the notion that patterns have to be composed of some sort of basic stuff. That was I was trying to substitute for that sort of conception of the world.

The idea of interweaving spectra, which are different dimensions of energy or of patterning, and I used advisedly the verb patterning as distinct from the noun pattern, because when you use nouns in combination with verbs, you obscure language. Watch out for this. This underlies many people's misunderstanding of things is the differentiation of noun and verb.

It's an entirely unnecessary differentiation and it gives one the impression that wherever there is an action going on, that is to say something appropriately described by a verb.

There must be some other kind of thing than an action which is described by a noun. And to this is ascribed the origin of the action.

So when you say there is thinking because the verb has to have a subject which is a noun, someone says, well, who is thinking?

Obviously there can't be any thinking without a thinker, without a who thinks. And that is a question, a problem that arises simply because it is a convention of our grammar, that every verb has to have a subject which must always be a noun. So a noun stands for a thing and a verb stands for an event. And we therefore suppose that events are caused by things. But if you ask a person what he means by a thing, he will never be able to tell you. He will give you a series of synonyms such as object, fact, whatever. But all these are simply alternate words for thing. Then what do you mean by an event, set process, etc.? And he is equally vague.

You can always describe the events in terms of things, and equally you can describe things in terms of events.

If I want to say ordinary while the cat sat on the mat, the dog went for a walk around the house. That's noun verb language. But I can equally say while the cutting sat on the matting, the doggy went walking around the dwelling. And I've changed the whole sentence into verbs and it's still as clear as it was in the beginning. Or I can turn it all into nouns.

The cat seat upon the mat, the dog upon the walk around the house. It's all known.

But in one in a known world, of course, you will have a static world in the verb world. You will have a dynamic world, but there aren't. For example, if you take the word fist, is a fist a noun? Yes, but it describes a process. It's an it's not properly a noun because this noun suddenly vanishes. This thing, fiscal fist disappears the minute I open my hand.

What happened to it? See, I stopped fisting and I went into handing.

So in the the verb language has a little edge over the noun language as being better suited to the kind of process that nature is.

So when you realize that you can discuss the whole of nature in the verb language, you don't have to ask the question who started it? You don't, in other words, have to seek for a noun as the explanation of the verbs. You don't have to seek for something that is not process to start process off. So this then is the language I'm using when I talk about patterning as the basic goings on of the physical world and patterning can be described and measured and so on and so forth.

So then.

The other point that I was making particularly was there in in the spectrum you have the extremes of the spectrum. The sound and the silence, the light in the dark space and solid and I was showing how by the yin yang philosophy of the Chinese how these extremes are not opposites but pose, they go together. They require each other. You know, one in terms of the other. And so in this way, you don't have the world as an opposition of light and darkness, of being a non being in such a way that one of the poles could exist alone.

And either being on on being non being or being because the whole nature of poles is that without both of them that are neither.

And so if we have a parallel universe.

Then.

You don't, as it were, have to worry as if this was something to worry about, that the play, the music of existence might cease forever and ever and ever in that kind of cosmology argument that's now going on. Know there are two dominant theories of cosmology among physicists. One is the steady state theory and the other is the explosion theory. The steady state people want to make out that hydrogen free hydrogen in space is all the time, as it were, coagulated and forming itself into new bodies.

Whereas the explosion theory, people who have the edge of the argument at the moment say there was originally an enormous concentration of energy which blew up and expelled all the galaxies from it, which went floating out.

And the whole thing is gradually dissipating itself, radioactivity until it will reach a state of quiescence.

And of course, if you have a Judeo-Christian mind, which thinks of time in a linear way instead of a circular way, you'll think that's awful because the whole thing is running down. And when it's finished, that'll be it. But you see, I always want to ask the question whether, well, what was it like before the big bang went off in the beginning? We're probably pretty much the state, same state of affairs was when it all petered out in the end. In other words, whatever happened once can always happen again. Given enough time or given enough something or other. So I doubt I'll settle for either the steady state theory or the big bang theory doesn't make much difference, except by way of describing the pattern, how it happens. The question of whether it happens, I always figure that whatever did happen could happen again.

You know, I like to think about myself.

Well, I'm a kind of a funny phenomenon that this universe is doing and it's done me this time. It may be to me again later on, maybe a million years from now, you'll do. Do me again. Not quite the same way, but rather like me near enough to be me. You know, like you play the piano and you play a certain piece and then you stop and the piece is dead. Then you think, well, it's played again. You play the same piece again. It's the same piece, but it's a different playing.

Play the tape recorder. I've got the tape on here. I can play it. Then it stops. Then several days later, we put it on and play it again. It's a little different, probably, but same same process.

And every time the universe plays any one of you, each one of you, it plays as I do, everybody calls himself I, and you feel like your eye just as much as I feel I. That is to say that you are the middle, the sensitive center out of

which everything looks. And you call yourself I. Well, that's my name. And everyone is I. The only trouble about being I is that you can only be one at a time when a child asks, who would I have been if you if my father had been someone else? Mummy. Well, a funny questions children ask. Well, you learn how to be someone in order to be anyone, but every someone is I. And it's all, as it were, the same, I am looking out through different eyes, like you put an electric light inside a black sphere and make holes in the sphere and all the holes are different, but the light at the bottom of it's the same.

Something like that. That's kind of a rough analogy.

But any anyone knows from a physical point of view that every organism.

Is simply.

A pattern of behavior which can't be separated from the pattern of behavior which we call its environment.

It's all one pattern except the one pattern like everyone pattern. Take give me a pattern. And every pattern of these bamboos, there's a pattern and every pattern has wiggles in it.

And subway calls and sub sub wiggles see the main wiggle as the stem. Then the tweet come out as a sub sub wiggle. The leaf comes out as a sub, some wiggle. And if you look into the ether, a sub sub, sub weevils. And that's the way it goes. They all belong to the pattern. It's difficult to to say who's wiggling, what is the stem wiggling the leaves or the leaves wiggle in the stem. Both arguments are equally valid.

The universe is doing me and I'm doing the universe because the universe depends on my optic nerves and all that structure to turn the sun and light wouldn't be light if the wonder the eyes. That's like a hand on a drum. If there's no skin on the drum, there will be no noise.

Takes two to make love, to make an argument and do anything.

That's the annual.

Now let's go through this spectrum or begin to go through it. I'm not going to go all the way through it this afternoon.

You begin at the end of sleep torpor and we'll go as far as number three.

Do you know that sleep is a very mysterious subject? Scientific students of sleep are not yet at all sure what sleep is.

Apparently people need it, but nobody really knows why they need it from a strictly scientific point of view.

And we need we apparently need to dream in sleep also. People who are deprived of dreams get very, very restless and unhappy. But we're not quite sure why we need dreaming. I mean, we've got all sorts of theories, the Freudian and the unions and so on. They think we know they know why we need to dream.

But it hasn't been really rigorously established scientifically why we do or why we need to sleep.

But from a naive point of view, you can say, of course I need to sleep because after I've had a whole day of business and friends and work and so on.

It's just too much. There's too much input. I want to digest it. And while I'm digesting it, I don't want any more input. I don't want any more information. So I want to be turned off.

That's, you know, one of those simple, commonsense things that everybody knows but has not yet been fully explained. So sleep is this marvelous thing that we have, which is a forget a process that is apparently essential to our psychic health.

Every twelve hours or so and. If you don't get it, you start getting worried.

As a matter of fact, insomnia is a thing that is rather curious.

Because if you do get insomnia, the worst thing of all to do is to worry about it.

Invariably, if I can't sleep, I don't try to go to sleep.

I get up and work or do something or I read a very difficult book, especially one that is big and weighs a lot.

This is a good way to go to sleep.

But if you have insomnia, don't try to ever try to go to sleep. Nobody can try to go to sleep. Lots of mothers think they can get their children. And they said, darling, try to go to sleep. And your mother say to you, try to go to sleep. But she wanted to get you out of the way. That was the only reason she said, try to go to sleep. She thought perhaps if she it was good for you and that you ought really to get your sleep.

Like telling some child that it's got to eat its spinach and, you know, the child can start chewing and chewing and chewing on meat or spinach, which tastes of nothing, and it chews it into a absolute hard, stiff pulp. There's just nothing to be done with it except spit it out. You know, they've already extracted by their teeth instead of their stomach all the vital juices of the thing. And all that remains is roughage. And you say to children, you must go to the bathroom after breakfast every day regularly. You must be regular, otherwise your constipated. And that's bad. This is a form of the double bind. No, you are required to do that, which will be good only if it's done voluntarily.

So go try to go to sleep. It is impossible. Sleep has to happen because it's a spontaneous activity and can be helped as we shall see when we come to consider tapas.

But by and large, sleep is a spontaneous activity in as a way of turning yourself off to get away from the bombardment of awareness and forget because forgetting renews.

And that also is a function of all demolitions, of deaths, of destruction, of patterns, of knocking down buildings, of the whole change process in the universe, because we want to do what we've done before.

And so went after a hard day's work where people have been irritating and combative. You go home or you go to the local bar and you down a number of martinis, they turn you off and they put you into a state of near torpor or what is quite correctly and scientifically called this learned and funny word, not curses.

Now, cozies Narcissus, you know, is connected with not curses. It means or reduced consciousness, reduced sensory input.

And the reason why Narcissus is associated with not curses is that Narcissus, when he saw his reflection in the water, didn't know it was himself. And he became so fascinated by this image in the water that he became unaware of everything else.

He got hung up, or, shall we say, to use current slang hooked on his own image, and he didn't know it was his own image. That was the only reason he could get hooked on it.

So Narcissus and now coasts are associated and so not the normal the permissive narcotic in our culture is alcohol and other narcotics like opiates exist. But you must remember that you can only correctly use the word narcotic or something inducing the state of consciousness, which is the topper.

Now you can do it by massage, by relaxation exercises, by hot tubs. Many, many ways of inducing topper.

I mean, you and you are not in top. You're not truly relaxed because you tend to lose muscular tones, which you always retain in true relaxation, but you begin to go like a limp rag. Now there's a place for that in life and it's good as an way of sleep induction for people who have insomnia and are so anxious that they don't allow themselves to be turned off. I would want to say in general a good word for sleep and torpor, because a lot of people are against them who spend ski, who was good, just sort of Saint Paul.

And as much as a misinterpreted in a way to always felt that his life was a war against sleep, that intense light consciousness should conquer darkness. That's a stupid idea to be a human being.

You have to love the light. But you also must trust yourself to the darkness. Be able to let yourself go in the faith that you'll arrive back all in one piece.

I have a friend whose name is Charlotte Selva, and she does the kind of work for which there is no name. She calls it sensory awareness, and one of her experiments is to get a person to lie on the ground.

And simply she says to them, now it's all right. The ground is going to hold you up. So just lie down. And there's nothing else you need to do because the ground is firm and it will hold you. Then she examines the person's body after a while and says, look, do you know what you're doing?

You're trying to hold yourself together as if your skin weren't strong enough to contain you. You're doing this all the time to keep yourself from falling apart.

Why do you do that if you don't hold yourself together? You're just going to go there and disappear. And it's not gonna be right for green jello. No, you won't. In the same way a lot of people wonder why we would wear such ridiculous clothes, especially women.

Men are pretty bad, but women tie the men and do it around the neck. You know, the necktie is a symbol of slavery.

It's a noose to strangle you. But you feel tight that really held in here and held in by the belt. And women wear girdles, hold them in like this. And then the coat that fits your body jacket, you know, put it on and it fits and you're squeezed or you get this tight pants that hug you. And, you know, there are other people, of course, don't know they're there till they're sitting on spikes. Then they really know they're there. And a lot of people make trouble for themselves in order to be able to sit on spikes so that they know they're there. And supposing instead you switch to another kind of clothes, you wear Japanese clothes. I often wear Japanese clothes because they happen to be for men, the most comfortable form of clothing ever devised. There's only one place where it holds you, and that's the belt. But you wear the belt not round your waist, but below your belly, and you wear it rather loose.

Otherwise, the garments are flowing.

They don't interfere with the nature of the cloth because the cloth is woven on erect a linear pattern. The cloth is straight like this. So when you get a Japanese kimono, it folds up instantly for packing. But you try to pack a western man's jacket or a woman's suit jacket. And there's absolutely no way of folding the thing at all. So it always comes out of your suitcase needing to go to the pressing, but you take a kimono and you put it on and it falls exactly according to its own nature around you.

And they're very dignified.

And you feel but you don't feel closed in. Now, that makes some people terribly uncomfortable if they don't feel pinched and pull together. They don't feel dressed and feel this is ongoing around the bathrobe. And a lot of people can't wear a bathrobe beyond a certain hour of the day because they don't feel that they're respectable. I mean, you can perfectly well get up and put yourself into the most beautiful. Any kind of gorgeous bathrobe you want to run around and do your work if you don't have to go to the office. Even if you had to go to the office, they ought to allow you to wear interesting robes. And furthermore, I once asked the Japanese why he didn't wear a kimono anymore.

And he said, you can't run for a bus in a kitchen. Well, it's perfectly true. Less you hoist it up and tied into the belt. You can't. And that's rather undignified.

But the thing is that in this age that is now forthcoming, when we're going to cut down the working hours because of automation. People have got to learn to saunter and dawdle. Otherwise, they'll get into mischief. And so clever forms of clothing, which are supremely comfortable but which require a kind of a sauntering attitude to life, are going to be very important for the future of civilization.

This pitch for the criminal market. But this is all to do with letting yourself go into the earth, into the darkness, as it were, and trusting the world that lies below you as much as you might trust the world that lies above you.

Drop.

Fall freely in space. That's a marvelous sensation. It's like floating. That's why people do skydiving. Because just until they pull that parachute. Now the sensation of flying. Even though they're dropping very fast, they get the sensation, total freedom. That's what everybody's looking for.

So we get that in a way and sleep in the arms of Morpheus.

And the idea is sleep as healing. Some psychiatrists are very keen on the idea of putting their patients by hypnosis and other methods into long, long periods of sleep where they feel completely secure. Looked after. Nothing to worry about.

I have a favorite sleeping place. It's a house on top of the hills and Hollywood. There's a great eucalyptus trees and underneath us there is a deck.

And I like to get a sleeping bag and lie on my back.

Underneath this eucalyptus trees look up at the stars through the shadows of leaves and just go see if there's a marvelous feeling.

Well, now.

We come now to this, the things of sleep, where I will say this one thing about dreaming and about Topper. We know the motto in vino veritas.

In wine, the truth comes out cos it also as a subtle double take.

Meaning all popular sayings have many levels of meaning. And it's a Christian saying in vino veritas belongs to the Western culture. It also means in the wine is the true blood of Christ.

The Catholic mass.

That refers to the fact that life requires death, drinking blood.

But in the census, in vino veritas, the person reveals himself. Lets go of himself, let his unconscious come out when he is drunk or also in sleep, when the dreams come up and show the inner side of things.

You will see in that way that these two states can, in a certain sense, be creative. They let things come up which are normally put down because number three, spectrum, the waking state of what we will call symbolic consciousness is highly guarded. It is the most guarded of all these states.

Now that I want you to understand them, that the ordinary state of consciousness, what you call normal consciousness, is by no means a frank, objective awareness of the real world.

Not by any means at all.

It is a state of highly cultivated.

Hothouse reared.

Special ways of perceiving the world in accordance with symbolic formulae.

And it all depends on your orientation to the physical world as to what you see in it. You know, the story of a tailor who went to see the pope and they asked him what was he like? He said he was a 41.

Or a woman who says to a man, you saw Mrs. So-and-so today. Now, what was she wearing? She had no idea. You didn't notice, but you saw. But she didn't pay attention because you weren't interested in watching out on. But once you got off or whatever it be.

So we notice according to what we are programed or conditioned to notice by our social conditioning, that is to say, our upbringing, our education, our professional needs, our survival needs. So do we notice what's happening? Now, supposing somebody from an entirely different planet came into this room and started looking at us and he wasn't programed to notice the things that we notice, he would ask the most amazing questions about what we are doing. He had noticed that we most of us have standard ways of holding our

hands. Why do why does somebody abuse it like this? Why do some of you sit like this? Why do some of these that like this?

Why don't you do this? Well, not the obvious thing to do with your hands. Just let them hang.

Very few people ever do that because they feel a funny feeling.

They get that they've got a couple of wet fish down here.

They know what to do with them.

Then he'd notice all sorts of funny things about us that we would know never occurred to us to think about.

And he would notice, for example, you might say, well, what color is a human face? You know, the comic strip artists tell you pink or brown.

They do a black outline and then they color the whole face pink. Now for a change, take a real good look at a face and you'll start seeing that dial.

It just doesn't have a particular color. Not only does it depend where the face is in relation to the available light and what it's reflecting, but also it's a patchwork of all kinds of subtle color changes and it's full of funny has and spots and all sorts of things which we are not supposed to see, especially on ladies.

No girls. Men don't care so much if they have a house somewhere. The girls carefully pluck hairs out with tweezers and make them disappear so as to get as smooth the texture as possible. The Japanese go so far as for a beauty to cover herself completely with the white paste so that she's got complete pancake makeup.

Dead weight and the when the Japanese photographer takes a picture of you, you'll never recognize herself because he he works out every wrinkle, every shadow and presents. He was a complete mask because it's inauspicious to have shadows. When a westerner first painted one of the emperors with the shadows showing, they said, but you can't paint the

emperor that way. His face is not dirty. And besides, it's an auspicious day of a shadow fall on the imperial visage.

So you can see shadows. The artist Rembrandt torture to see shadows. Leonardo Torch would receive shadows. But modern painters have discovered that shadows and darkness, shadows and light, shadows of color, shadows are full of vitality. So you'll begin to get a vivid purple shadows.

People say, well, but you don't go round with the Purple Shadow on you, do you?

You mean do you think that a shadow is brown because you haven't ever looked at a shadow? You don't realize that shadows are absolutely vibrant with light. We'll go more into that later when we come to this number seven.

But there it is.

And see the the the the world that we see or think we see is actually not the world at all, but is a selection of things that are in the world, a selection governed by certain symbolic processes, what a man ought to look like, what a woman ought to look like. And we try ourselves to dress and to behave in such a way as we live up to their symbolic requirements that are expected of us.

So then.

We think that's a certain kind of work that is worthy of being done and you ought to be. Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor, doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief, well, whatever it is, and you ought to fit into one of these rose costs. There are innumerable things one might do infinite.

But we we'd like to get classified. We want to know whether you're Republican or whether you're a Democrat, whether you belong to the left wing or to the right wing, whether you are a Christian, a Jew, Baptist, Methodist, whether you are a Mohammed or what you are, just so long as we can get you put into a local compartment, that is to say, into a symbolic classification.

Now, what is the reason for that?

Well, this kind of consciousness here is based on a very peculiar specialization of the human brain, which we call in everyday life conscious attention.

That is the capacity to focus or concentrate awareness.

Upon a what we call any one thing at a time.

It's as if, in other words, conscious attention were a spotlight. And that the rest of awareness were a floodlight.

In other words, every nerve and in your body is receiving input all the time. Is in this sense energized, is aware of everything that comes to its into its periphery.

So you are taking in the totality of your surroundings, but conscious attention is flipping from point to point to point to point like this.

And is making sense out of what it sees by adding it up with memory.

It's an immense advantage from some points of view to be able to have this faculty because it does the same sort of thing for the human organism that Radar does for a ship. That is to say, the function of radar is to scan the surroundings of the ship and watch out for unexpected changes in the environment.

And radar is a scanning process. In other words, it is the beam that goes out and bounces against things and feeds back the bounce to the screen.

So in exactly the same way, consciousness or conscious attention is always scanning the environment and watching out for new eventualities that might be threatening or that might present favorable opportunities for some sort of advancement.

Now, conscious attention has to be programmed as to what to attend to. What is important to look out for so that we say to baby now when it with teaching it language. Watch out for the cars on the street.

Watch out for that dogs. Watch out for this. Watch out for that. This is programing the baby's radar.

But we as a human community have put so much importance and so much psychic investment into our radar that we believe ourselves to be that.

We identify the self with the radar and not with the rest.

So that we get this sort of a situation when I say I. I say I do this, I walk, I talk, I think I run, I hit. But other things, such as the beating of the heart, the breathing of the lungs, the functioning of the glands, the constellation of the shapes of the bones are all defined not as think anything I do, but as something that happens to me just in the same way. When it rains, it happens to me. I don't rain.

But I do want.

And so, in other words, what has happened here is that we have identified ourselves with the IRA.

The point of origination, of conscious attention and with the point of voluntary control. That's me. Anything else happens to me.

So in this way, we have disowned most of ourselves. It's not me. The body you have is merely a vehicle that you go around in like an automobile. So if I would say to some.

Young woman gee, you're beautiful.

She might well reply if she were highly influenced by our culture. Oh, you're so like a man. All you think about is bodies. I may be beautiful, but I got my body from my parents and I want to be admired for myself and not for my chassis.

See, she's a little chauffeur. She declined to say she had disowned herself.

She disowned her body and said it was given to me by my parents. I'm not responsible for it. Or a child in rage can say to his parents. I never asked to be born.

It was you who brought me into this world. And that child doesn't know that when the father was going after the mama and there was just an evil gleam in his eye. That evil gleam in your father's eye was you. Just as it was you. That was the little spammer.

That made it was you that was that fetus.

The justice if if your heart is you, all that was you to.

But you see this waking consciousness in public consciousness ignores that altogether because it sets limits and rather arbitrary limits to what you are. You are just that voluntary center. You are that a beam of consciousness that sweeps over the environment and sees things in series one after another. Especially if you use a language which uses an alphabet, alphabet, spell everything out one after another, and you see, in other words, these sort of words strung together into sentences which build up meanings. Whereas on the other hand, if you work in terms of an idea graphic language, although it's true that an idea graph has parts like words, do the parts of a word always follow each other in this direction, whereas the parts of an idea graph may go in an entirely different direction.

See?

This, which is the Dow in Chinese. I take it in all at once. I need a sentence to translate that word in English.

But it's more of a picture than it is like ordinary words.

And as you grasp all the elements of the picture simultaneously, you see the form all together at once. That is nearer to the way nature exists. Nature things in nature exist all together at once. Everything's happening all together, everywhere, all at once. No. And we say, well, in words, it won't stop for you to describe it. Take too long. By the time you describe it, it is all different.

So.

We do see.

Luckily for us, have an aspect of our organism which is paying attention to all the things we don't notice.

This is how you can walk without stumbling, how you can drive a car downtown and at the same time carry on a conversation with a friend because it is your subconscious, as it were, or whatever you call it, that is taking care of the driving and is watching out for the red and green lights and the other cars. Your while your consciousness is preoccupied with the conversation.

So, however, in a culture where the value of spotlight consciousness is exalted and that is you, then do you see you have an exceedingly great need for state number two.

For Topper, because the spotlight is so bright and you can have too much of it so fast.

And also if you identify yourself with that, only you identify yourself with the troubleshooting aspect of your organism and you become relatively unaware of the amazingly harmonious and happy status of your organism that are going on all the time. And in times you see certain kinds of cultures, certain epochs in history, people emphasize that you've always got to be on the watch and they regard it as very simple to relax into the beautiful, wonderful processes that are going on in us that are harmonious constantly say, to enjoy breathing.

That's a silly thing to do. Most people would say they wouldn't enjoy breathing. What's that going to achieve? This is all goes back to see to this Christian idea, brethren, be sober, be vigilant to your adversary, the devil as a roaring lion, walking about seeking grooming, he may devour whom resists steadfast in the faith.

No to him. Christian does not see them on this holy ground. How the powers of darkness prowl and prowl around Christian often fight them.

And while he is going on all the time. See, you are never safe. Just as there are.

Termites in the basement gnawing away, parasites in your blood.

Probably little or few little cancer cells kicking up somewhere. How does the doctor inspect checkup once every two months? Watch, watch, watch, watch. It's coming. See, it's coming. And you've got to correct it here. Correct it there. Keep everything going. Otherwise, the weeds keep coming in. You don't watch out. The birds are all over the roof. Birds, you know, keep watching human beings. The minute the birds got any idea that a house is really vacant, they're going to move in. Squirrels, rats, everybody is waiting. And so on the spiritual level, there are the demons that just waiting.

So stay away. Don't dare go to sleep. Don't ever relax, because if you do, it will come.

Watch them for and pray.

You never know when it's gonna happen.

So this is the complete identification of man with his troubleshooter.

Just got to be on the watch.

The only difficulty about us is that when you manage to protect yourself so successfully against all the powers of darkness, you reach a point where you become the kind of creature that is no longer worth protecting. It's the same sort of thing that happens. But if to defeat the Nazis, you have to become Nazis. What was the point of the fight? If to defeat the Gestapo and the Secret Service of the red Chinese and all that plot, we have to have a secret police ourselves who are going to be just as bad as those. What what? What is gained? What are you protecting?

See that the biggest farce of all is this. If you want to know the real lowdown on the next war. Join the Air Force and be safe, because the only people who are really going to be protected are the guards. You know, you'll be able to have either be way up there or else you'll be in great vast basements in Nevada, where they've built under mountain airports with all

sorts of oxygen tanks and supplies and things the last forever, because what a farce the whole thing has become.

The original idea of gods and soldiers was to protect the women and the children. Now, what we do is we have the women and children bombed out of existence in the cities, whereas the guards are guarded. So all guarding eventually becomes guarding of guards. It's circles of defense, protecting circles of defense. And in this way, mammals turn into mollusks. A mammal is so constructed you see that the hard stuff is on the inside and the soft stuff on the outside. A mollusk is the other way round with the hard stuff on the outside, the soft stuff on the inside.

Well, nature favors a bit mammals over mollusks because a mammal is more sensitive, more responsive to the.

You go donk on it and it doesn't feel anything, whereas a mammal is really pliable, which is why, of course, in military tactics we abandon Dharma.

The knight in armor was completely helpless once he was on lost as he you see, he wore this armor, but he depended upon the forward rush of the horse and his lance to Brisbane blow through everything. But once you manage to unwholesome. He was a clumsy as thing. He was like a lobster and all you had to do was to knock him down and crack open his shell with a cannon.

So increased mobility was found to be more effective.

So now this watch business watch God always, always be watching to see, as I say, it creates it protects it encourages a style of life which eventually is not worth living because it is like being the great dictator. It is like trying to be God if you are the great dictator and you are in charge of everything. You should read a Hindu book called The Arthur Shuster.

This deals with advice to a man who is a Chakravarty, and that means a turn of the wheel. We would say a big wheel. Who is the supreme ruler?

And it tells him, first of all, that he must not trust anyone. No friends for you, my boy. No intimacies.

Keep your own counsel and especially watch out for women. They have a way of worming secrets out of you for their favors, which you want so much. So don't ever get too close to a woman.

You can have concubines and prostitutes and everything like that to satisfy your physical needs. But don't fall in love and trust no one.

Then arrange it so that everybody around you mistrusts everyone else. You set up what's called a black, a kind of negative Mandela. Mandela has a circle of power. You arrange it that your immediate ministers are at odds with their subordinates. Why? Because if your immediate ministers do anything to betray you, they are subordinates who want to occupy their superior position will sneak on them to you. Then you'll knock off the Grand Vizier and put someone in his place because he is fool enough to want to get up there. But still, then, outside that rank you have another rank of people at odds with those. And so all the way down. Divide and rule. Then you live at the center yourself, and you have a secret passage connecting your innermost center with somewhere down the river where you've got a boat waiting in case anything goes wrong. And on the way out was a stone, which you can remove. And when you remove this key stone, as you escape through your underground passage, the entire palace will collapse. Kill everyone. It gives you architectural instructions how to do this. Then, of course, you have to have poison testers for your food. Eat nothing until someone else has eaten it and see if they drop dead. And then you have to have guards standing beside you always day and night.

But there are other guards secreted behind panels in the wall who are watching the guards guarding.

And so you can't really ever sleep except with one eye open. You can never be like an ordinary inconspicuous individual and take a carefree walk in the park.

Because you have got to be in control 24 hours a day. So do you see how Big Brother? This is a Hindu version of Big Brother is the greatest prisoner of all. He is the captive of his own survival system. He can never go this way. Maybe find it very difficult to go this way. He has to be all the time playing God, playing the personal autocratic monarch of the universe. Now,

you may think this very courageous and so on, but in the end, the game isn't worth the candle.

That's forward.

So always watch it that what you fight for is worth fighting for and that it's something other than fighting for, fighting for because otherwise you start fighting for fighting for fighting for fighting for fighting for fighting.

So these then, in sum, are the advantages and limits of waking consciousness. That it is a version of the world where what is important is what is valuable for survival, where we live for a future where we live.

Always watchful for trouble.

Because death is the thing most of all to be avoided.

But this is a form of life which is always in danger of becoming not worth living and which totally ignores.

A whole world of experience going on all the time around us, which is magical. Gorgeous. And far surpassing in depth and wonder most of the things which ordinary waking consciousness people call pleasures.

Yesterday afternoon, I was working mainly on the contrast between the normal state of waking conscious attention, which was this one, number three and what you might call the generalized awareness of the human organism. And I was making the using the metaphor of conscious attention as a spotlight and the generalized awareness of the organism as a floodlight and showing how by identifying ourselves with the spotlight operation of consciousness and with the vibrant voluntary neuromuscular system we attained to a very partial conception of ourselves and a very partial and symbolic view of the world, that is to say.

We see what we learn to notice and we screen out everything else.

We really don't notice anything that we don't also have a name for. And children are constantly asking when they're learning to talk. What is this and what is that? And you'll notice that children very often point to things

for which we don't have any names and they want to know what it is. For example, we don't like some of the American Indians have a name for dry space. Nor do we have a name for the inside surface of a cylinder. There may be a mathematical term for it, but in ordinary speech, the inside surface of the cylinder doesn't have a name for it except long phrase the inside surface of a cylinder. Nor, for example, do we see any connection between having six toes and pushing aside the branches of a bush to get through. But in an American Indian language, those are the same ideas. It's all based on the idea of V U V the branches to get through. And you asked to your foot.

You have a sixth one being off at the edge.

You see now what you notice. What the way the world seems to you, the way it's logical. Connections seem to depend on whether you have words for it or whether you have symbols for it.

So then what happens is as a result of concentrating on or of using, shall I say, over using over exercising the faculty for conscious attention.

We come to have a sensation of our own existence as beings, definitively separate from the outside world. The world beyond the skin and from most of what goes on in our own bodies.

And this state of affairs we could call alienation when this state of affairs exists all by itself.

But it is not necessary for that state of affairs to exist all by itself. The spotlight consciousness can be supplemented by increasing use of the floodlight consciousness so that it becomes balanced. We assume that the baby, before it is learned conscious attention and before it has learned any words, is all the time using floodlight consciousness. With a little bit of spotlight and therefore would feel as Freud supposed oceanic, that is to say, at one with its surroundings, where later words are used and it is taught to be itself and to construct the outside world.

As society constructs it and conceives it. Then the baby develops a sense of having a separate ego. And this development is brought about by means of a strategist, a stratagem which gives the infant a great deal of confusion.

Because since the baby is given a sense of identity by parents and teachers and relatives and other children, it is unable to resist the pressure put upon it by the social group.

The pressure of a group, even upon an adult, is enormously powerful, much more so on a child.

So the odd thing is that by the commanding pressure of this group, the child is informed that it is free. That is to say that it is an independent agent and an originator of actions for which this separate identity is to be held responsible. And in that you see there is a weird gimmick because the baby is told that it must be free. You are ordered to be free. That is to say, you are required to do actions which will be acceptable only if you do them voluntarily. And this basic contradiction that underlies our sensation of personal existence is the result. Why most people are confused and why there is a nagging sense of frustration underlying all civilized human existence. Because you are trying to solve a self-contradictory and therefore insoluble problem. How to be responsible. You see, the word responsible carries its own contradiction.

It carries freedom.

You are able freely to decide upon your own actions. But you must be responsible. You must do what you're told.

So that paradox creates then the sense of the separate ego, which is, if anything, is a hallucination, a hallucination, because it does not correspond to any kind of scientific facts whatsoever. The separate organism, although separate, although having a clear outline and identity in that sense and although every human character is unique and different from all others.

Nevertheless, every organism goes with its environment in separately and the behavior of organism environment is a single field of behavior. These are the facts as they are seen by physicists, biologists and ecologists.

But our experience, our sensation of our own existence is not in accord with the facts. So what it seems is necessary for us to do is not, as it were, to try

to get rid of the sense of having a separate ego. You can't do that. You can't wash off blood with blood.

And if you try to get rid of it, you actually intensify the hallucination that it exists. As a real thing, but the ego exists in the same way as the equator. That is to say, it is a social institution.

An imaginary boundary which has a certain convenience to it. But when you start mistaking social institutions for physical processes, you are under a hallucination.

So then could we possibly go to a state of consciousness in which without giving up the spotlight? That is to say, the faculty for conscious attention and for constructing symbolic worlds by selection among our sense impressions. Could we do that? Not sort of all by itself in a vacuum, but against the background of more generalized awareness. Because after all, every particular activity, every tracing out of details, as I pointed out yesterday, requires a background. So the background of ordinary attentive consciousness looking at is generalized awareness. And the more you become aware of generalized awareness, the more you realize that you and the external world. Right out to the furthest known galaxies are a single process.

And so when this begins to appear, one moves into state number four, which I have called sensory awareness.

There is a Zen saying.

When looking for the pillow in the dark. The mind is all in the hand. Now, it's very interesting how you can, as it were, shift your mind all over yourself.

Normally one thinks of it as in the head, although for Chinese and Japanese, the center of the mind is always in the center of the chest, which they call Shin and Chinese or choro in Japanese. And that means the heart mind.

And they feel that they think from here we feel, of course, that we think from here and that we have a little man inside our head who is the ego

directed at all. But you can as the saying, you are looking for the pillow in the dark or you're looking for the soap in the bath tub. When all the water's cloudy, the mind is all in the hands.

Now, beyond that, you can very simply get into a state of consciousness where you.

Your mind seems to be all over you.

Where instead of feeling that you are looking at things, you feel rather that you are becoming them.

And the whole external world comes on.

One could only say in a very different way from the usual.

The reason why this can happen is, of course, that all that we feel about the external world is in fact a state of our own bodies. What you are seeing now in front of you is how it feels inside your head in the optical nervous center's. Your brain and all that goes with it is translating whatever there is in the outside world into states of itself called color, shape, weight, texture and so on. So all that you see is you really physically, but also one must add to this that one of the things in the external world is you.

So you are both outside and inside. You are something in nature, but all that you know of nature is you. You'd have to take these two things into consideration simultaneously. So sometimes it might feel as if everything you see is inside your skull.

And the next moment, it might feel that your scholars in the middle of everything. Then the next moment everything is inside you and then you are in the middle of everything you see. Sort of capping process like this.

So in this state.

You find that you less and less discriminate between what is important to be looked at and what is not important to be looked at.

In order to enter this state, the first thing that is necessary is to slow down.

To suspend judgment on what you ought or ought not to be doing.

And here I would say then that I'm describing the initial stage of a process of meditation. And in talking in general about meditation, it is absolutely essential to understand that one cannot meditate correctly if you do it as a preparatory exercise for something else.

Meditation is not. Self-improvement do not enter into it under any such delusions. There is no one to be improved. Meditation is a form of enjoyment. It's a way of digging the universe.

I may put it so slightly, meditation is not meditating on anything. This always bothers Orientals. When somebody says, well, while we do this or that, we meditate. Well, the Western always says, what do you meditate on? An Oriental can't understand that. You don't meditate on anything. Meditation isn't about anything. It isn't like thinking about. It's simply a clarification of consciousness.

And can be about anything or nothing.

And so to enter the state of mind, which is called Janna, which when translated into Japanese becomes Zen, Jonna is a yoga word. The first thing that's necessary is then to slow down and to abandon notions of what it is important to do and what it's not important to do. And instead of closing your eyes, keep them open, keep your ears open, keep all senses open, but don't program them.

That is to say, don't tell them what they're supposed to look at. Let them simply fall upon or let everything that is there to be heard or seen arrive by itself and let the senses work by themselves. That is to say, let your eyes see whatever they want to see, that your ears hear whatever they want to hear. Let your nose smell whatever it wants to smell and let your sense of touch, feel whatever it wants to touch. And in general, let your mind do whatever it wants to do. Of course, as a matter of habit, the mind tends to be incessantly chattering. Words set up constant circuits and there are one skull is full of voices.

They're not always your voice. Your mother's voice. Your father's voice. Your Aunt Matilda's voice. Your teacher's voice is still talking to you. When you think and if you listen very carefully to your thoughts, you will hear other people in your head, because you see you are not you. You are an amazing collection of what George Herbert Mead called the interior eyes. Others. And all this chorus of voices is constantly directing your life and propagandizing you.

You have now to tell them to shut up and try to let thinking, that is to say, interior talking stop. Now you can't force it to shut up. And that is why one of the classical aids to meditation is concentration. To find something to focus the attention on so that the chattering will cease and it should be something interesting, something that is not interesting in the sense that you can think a lot of ideas about it, but something which is enormously fascinating for its purely sensuous aspects.

The female form is not too appropriate for this purpose, nor the male form for women.

If they find that very fascinating because it has so much social junk attached to it, so many associations, so one inclines to choose something like jewelry or a crystal or a flower or a purely abstract play of light patterns or something like that as what is called a support for contemplation, something which you don't need to think about, that which you can look at in rapt. And as you acquire this way of becoming wordlessly interested and fascinated with any focal point of consciousness, you will begin to see as your eyes move that the whole world is like that.

That.

For example, you become aware of the myriads of colors playing around on the floor. This isn't the question are trying to see how many things you can notice. You know, a game that children play is that a tray of assorted objects is displayed for them for one minute and then cupboard and you write down how many things you saw on the tray. It's not like that at all because on any given tray there are infinitely many things and you could never count them all out.

It isn't the point of how many things can you see. The point is like having a clear window to look through instead of a dirty one.

So that the whole of the sense sorry, I am, that is to say, everything seen, tasted, touched and smelled becomes much clearer and none of it as.

As you learn not to think about it. It becomes much richer than it is when you think about it.

And so everything starts to be more real, more alive, more glowing, and you suspend also judgments about things. What is good? What is bad?

And in doing this, you introduce yourself to a fascinating world.

That is why some Indian yogis practice what is called Mona, which is silence, maybe silent somehow for 10 years, some or all their lives, because after you have practiced silence for a month, you get silence in your head as well.

Now, there are dangers to being a monkey when you see the clouds.

You become the cloud. And if you are wondering down a street where there's a riot going on, you're liable to join the riot. Because that's what's happening. You just go with it. So one doesn't enter into mana without a guru and without some kind of a discipline which protects you that were builds a protective wall around your experiment just in the same way as a bird builds a protective wall, the shell round the young chick when it is before it's ready to hatch. So in the ordinary way, therefore, you can't expect a Western person negotiating a high civilization to be a mountain or to be silent all the time but you for the sanity of any Western person involved in this kind of civilization.

It is very important for him indeed to be silent some of the time and I mean silent inside the head. Just as you must stop talking occasionally if you want to hear what anything anybody else has to say. So you must stop thinking in order to find out what there is to think about. If you talk all the time, you will have nothing to talk about except talking. If you think all the time, you will have nothing to think about except thinking.

And so you will exhaust yourself and come to a dead end.

Which is called psychosis.

So for health, it is very important to stop thinking.

Not always so that you find that you get a non-thinking state as background to the thinking state, and this corresponds to floodlight awareness as background or spotlight awareness in Zen Buddhism. The word non-thinking state is called Noonan.

This is Japanese moon and.

No. No.

Nen thought it means thought and it also means blocking.

Having a jerky mind, let's call it that.

So this state I'm describing is the state of Montana of no thought. But it doesn't mean a kind of anti intellectual attitude.

Huckabee in the 17th century, M. writes in one of his poem. He uses the phrase taking hold of the no thought in the midst of thoughts. So that means having a mind that has, in a way, like a mirror dancer. The Chinese, Darwish said the perfect man employs his mind as a mirror. It grasps nothing. It refuses nothing it receives but does not keep.

And so the poem says the wild geese do not intend to cast their reflection. The water has no mind to retain the image.

So it weighs a mind as it then that is has no attachments.

Now, attachment is a word that has associations in English, which do not quite does doesn't quite give the Buddhist feeling for the meaning of the word. But the slang term that we now use a hang up is the right translation for attachment. When you say a person's all hung up or he has a particular hang up, that is the Buddhist meaning of attachment. It means a mental fixation. Or an emotional fixation on some particular pattern of life.

So to get rid of hang ups, one must first get rid of thinking after you've got rid of it completely and have thereby revived the background.

The mirror, as it were, the mirror mind.

Then you can go back to thinking and you can think against the background perfectly comfortably and not get hung up on thinking.

And so in this way, you get an extraordinary feeling of life going on as a single process all the time, which doesn't stick you and it are all one. And it's got all kinds of differentiations within it so that it doesn't become some sort of a formless blur. But it is sort of.

It flows like water, as water has all the patterns in its network of sunlight.

The ripples, so on. So in the same way the world has all this, but it constantly flows because of no hang ups.

So then the royal road to the state is giving up the sense of urgency that you ought to do something, something is required of you.

And understand, for example, that looking at a rubber band on your fingers.

Can be quite as important as anything else you can do.

In other words, being here at this moment and listening to the sound of my voice without paying the slightest attention to what it means can be as important as anything there is in the universe.

Why not? Is the tree outside important? It's beautiful. Is it worth looking at? Why certain? But it's not achieving any great mission in life. She's being a tree, as Emerson said in his essay.

I think on compensation, these roses under my window are not concerned whether they are better than last year's roses, or whether next year's roses will be better than they.

There is simply the rose it lives for today. And that's the point.

When you learn the art of meditation in this way, you will see other people rushing around wildly like chickens with their heads cut off and they think they're going somewhere and they're completely deluded.

They're there and they don't know it. That's why they're rushing around so wildly.

But you, by this means, can begin to learn that you are there now and that the extraordinary thing, as you see the world in this way, especially as you see people in this way and from this point of view, you realize that people are valid natural processes, just like trees and birds and clouds. Now, do you ever criticize a cloud for being badly shaped? Did you ever see patterns in foam make an aesthetic mistake?

Well, no, I'm just doesn't.

There was once an 18th century classicist, one of those people who enjoyed formal gardens and kind of Greek palaces, who criticized the stars for not being symmetrically arranged, but that would never occur to us today. We don't want to see our stars in wretched geometrical patterns.

We love to see the scatter of them and the curious groupings of the sky in a marvelous, irregular order. A marvelous, odorless order, you might call it.

The funny thing about clouds and stars and mountains and all natural outlines is that.

They are beautiful and we know that they have a quality which distinguishes them from being masses when you know a mess when you see it.

But these things don't apparently make Mrs..

So in a way, human beings don't either.

And when you see human life as something that is just the same kind of thing as the shape of a tree or a cloud or like that, you stop judging it.

And you have to know that about yourself. And this is the beginning of everything.

This is the beginning of every kind of wisdom to see that you really don't have to go anywhere.

You don't have to get any better than you are because with all your defects, your selfishness, your neuroses, your sicknesses and everything. Well, fish have neuroses and sicknesses and so on. And so your plants you often see in plants that got bumps on them or some queer little diseases and so on.

And they they they all have those sort of troubles. That's life. But when you realize that you're an authentic projection of the universe, just as you are at this moment, then there's nowhere to go. No need to do anything. And out of that peace comes energy. Real energy instead of phony energy, which is trying to lift yourself up by your own bootstraps. The usual kind of human energy which gets progressively nowhere with more and more business.

Now, beyond this state, there is going to follow another, which I have numbered five. I called it cellular awareness. And I must repeat the fact that I use this word cellular, not in a strictly scientific way, but as a good way of describing the kind of awareness that it is, how it feels from the inside, because it is as if every cell in your body became alive.

Now, you know yourselves, don't talk English.

But they are a very, very subtly and highly organized things.

If you've ever seen a model of a living cell, you've seen the most fantastic object and those cells are engaged in all sorts of activities, but they don't structure the world the way you structure it because they don't use that language.

And so as you get into cellular awareness, you begin to feel rather like the artist who paints in a pointless fashion, that everything is dots, little tiny vortices.

You become aware of the texture of things to an extraordinary degree.

It's almost as if the world had been photographed through a screen which put into the senses a feeling of intense detail as if every one of your nerve ends.

Had was now detected in sending its separate message to the brain.

And so this makes the world looks highly textured.

There are no more such things as blank, green or blank white spaces, all space is rich.

And that is what those painters are representing in doing spaces with dit, dit, dit, dit, dit, dit, the brush like this.

And also, you will notice that certain kinds of painting, particularly as a Persian miniatures, if you look at them, you will see the artist is painting the world as the Arabian Nights describe the secret garden into which Aladdin went, where all the trees were made of jewels and where everything looked as precious as if it had been carved by a master carvers.

And they try with their art to give the impression that the more you look into the background, you see suddenly that the background of a pillar, that the painter hasn't made it white. He has put a design into it in white, but just a slightly different shade of white complex design.

You feel that within the design that is still another design and that it has an infinitely carved, rich texture.

This is this is why Oriental art in general, you find this among the Chinese at a certain period.

You find it constantly in India, you find it in Persia, you find it in the Moorish work and you find it too.

In early Celtic manuscripts like The Book of Kells, the Lindisfarne Gospels and so on. This such fascination with what seems to be a world of infinite detail.

And this, of course, is the world of paradise. This is what all those angels and whatnot are about.

Now, from cellular consciousness, you can pass to what I would call, again, symbolically molecular consciousness. Not that you are going to be aware of molecules.

No. But it is as if suddenly. This is the state which Buddhists are part of, the state, which the Buddhists call such a..

It's as if it can be rather frightening because everything becomes perfectly meetings, people.

Everything that's going on is just jazz, almost electronic. Jazz is a dancing process of energy.

And you feel sort of lost in it. Well. Well, what's supposed to happen? I mean, well, what's it all about? It's just dancing energy.

And you can.

You have to be careful here because this is the danger point in the meditative process, because here you can suddenly get the vision of hell and the vision of hell is that this world is a monstrous mockery, that it is meaningless in the worst sense of that word.

It is just a gyration, a pointless gyration of particles or a wave equals or whatever, which is tormenting itself.

It keeps itself going on with a certain kind of hope in order that it may eventually destroy things. And then you see the horror of biology as the mutual eating society. What a ghastly conception it all is. And everything is phony. People say they are people, but they're not. They're just robots. Everything is made of plastic or enamel tin. Everything is just buzz.

That's a danger you see here.

But if this happens to you and you get the feeling that everything is pointless, everything is just mechanical buzz. What you do is what an Arab

does in a sandstorm. He knows there is no possibility of conquering the sandstorm.

So he kneels down sort of in a fetal position and takes his world noose and covers himself completely and waits.

Until the storm is over. If he gets covered by sand, it is usually porous enough to admit some error breathing or in the same way as an ocean liner in a typhoon.

They just turn off the engines and drift is the only thing to do.

So in the same way, if you ever get into this particular kind of psychic horrors.

Just let it be.

And it will resolve itself.

And it's important to go through that state in a way important to realize that you don't know anything, you don't know what it's all about. You don't understand the universe.

It's all incomprehensible words and systems were just a way of whistling in the dark. We all whistled in the dark together and agreed that we had the same whistle. And that was great. But we really don't know anything. Anybody who opposes us is an authority about anything at all. Business making an authoritative noise.

And he may be able to make some remarkable demonstrations, for example, by interfering with diseases in various ways. We can make people healthy for a time until we can't make them healthy anymore.

This may be a good thing. It may not be a good thing.

It might be best not to interfere with nature, but simply to let human beings alone and regulate by a kind of in unnatural homeostasis their own population level. And let's let it happen. There is no way of proving

conclusively that our way of dealing with these things is better than doing nothing.

But life is, in a way, an experiment all the time. One's whole existence, the very shape of one's body is just coming on the sea. Come on, somehow. And so one way is this. We all come together, come on together, looking like each other and having certain common characteristics. We'll look at a snake skin. Every scale is rather like the other and it's all coming on together.

So you suddenly see that there is no particular reason why you should be this way rather than that, that everybody is putting on a good show, a big act.

And if you're not ready for that, if you're not educated to the point where you can understand that situation, you may get very nervous.

You say, well, everybody always wants to know what am I supposed to do?

So this is a common question. What am I supposed to do? How am I supposed to feel? I'm not an authority. I want someone to convince me that the way I'm doing it the right way. But don't you realize whenever you accept authority, you accept it on your authority?

You say I believe the Bible because why do you believe the Bible?

Because it says Jesus says in the Bible that we should believe the Bible nobility.

It's all. It's your opinion that that is an opinion to be accepted.

It's on your own authority. You create the power of your own teacher and you create the power of your own government. That's the saying the people get swapped. Government deserves.

And if you don't like it and you don't overthrow it, well, then that's your problem. But always you see authorities springs from you. So. So also does the way you define yourself, you accepted society. And its suggestions

always rather tacitly, but you did so here in this amazing moment of seeing the world as a big act, as a big buzz, as jazz doing this.

This this is this is this is this is this is this is this. It's all vibration.

And you see absolutely no compelling reason why it should be that way rather than any other way.

Well, if you don't panic, you see them. Then you get into the domain that Buddhists call such a..

It is just as it is.

Now, if it's a big act, who's doing it? Who is the actor?

What what lies behind all this jazz? That's the big question.

And it is through asking that question that we moved from six to seven.

Into the state that I called late.

Because when you become aware of energy jazzing this way and that way, and on top of this, you have already, don't forget, become aware that you and the outside world are a single energy system.

Then what is it?

Do you realize, for example. I do not exist to I at all unless there's something else that's other. And that immediately is the clue to the fact that itself and other polar, they go together. How did they go together? All right. Put it the other way around. What would you do if you were God?

If you were the works, in other words, if you were this whole capacity for patterning energy, what would you do? Well, first of all, have to draw the line somewhere and then proceed.

You'd have to make a difference.

Because if something makes it doesn't make a difference, it doesn't matter, does it? So if you want to make matter, you've got to make a difference.

Well, if you take that along and you try all the amazing differences that can be tried and you differentiate this from that and so on and so forth, among all the possibilities of being God, you will eventually arrive at what you're doing now.

To be it just this sort of circumstance, because this will be one of the infinitely many things to do. With certain restrictions on you. Which, of course, you tacitly originated because you wouldn't know where you were without them. Then you suddenly see with this astounding clarity that the the energy may symbolize itself to you as a sensation of intense light. You see, our understandings have a way of representing themselves to us in sensuous imagery. We say when very happy I was walking on air, you could have knocked me down with a feather. He saw the light. Everything became clear. Are you transparent? Now, these are not necessarily meant literally, but in intense cases of insight.

There is a literal sensory feeling corresponding to the inside. And when something becomes utterly clear in a way that is emotionally and intellectually overwhelming.

You are liable to have the feeling of intense light inside your head, or sometimes a feeling that everything looks transparent as if it were glass. But it's still there. You don't actually see through it.

Don't see the pattern on the chair behind somebodies head, but they look transparent because things have become clear and it has become at this point a light shattering lay clear that everything is it the light, the energy coming on at you in different ways and you are coming on at it and it's all one coming on.

You can see that light is the basic component of black things. There is nowhere that isn't light. And if you can't see it, you can hear it.

It comes on at you in all kinds of disguises.

So here you see its tabling, here it's handling and in here it's revolting, it's dancing, all sorts of patterns and Europe.

Now.

As I said, this may clothe itself, this comprehension in the sensation of vivid light as being the ultimate component of the might say the very inside stream of the nerve.

Reduce it all down to what it is fundamentally. That's why when you blow up the atom, you get this light because it's all locked in it.

But then simultaneously, you remember how I described yesterday the fellow who gets to the hub of the wheel and gets his piece there. Then he gets energy and then he goes out to the circumference again. Well, then you see that there really is no difference, not fundamentally between this state of illumination and what we call number three or ordinary everyday consciousness.

You suddenly realize that the way things are now in the perfectly ordinary life are the same thing as the late.

Which is sort of undifferentiated and overwhelmingly brilliant. The same energy that seems to you light in that state, pure light. Then you understand is just what you're looking at. That sitting in this room, you are sitting back in the middle of the beatific vision.

Only we have we were taught before then to sort of put down the world by saying, well, this is prosaic, ordinary, everyday life.

And we were sitting in a lecture room and on sort of funny chairs, which as perches for the human body.

And, you know, having a lecture on very ordinary matter of fact.

And you see from this point of view, there's nothing ordinary about it at all. While we so the Zen poem. Supernatural power, a marvelous activity, drawing water, carrying wood.

Well, now I want a deal this afternoon with a troublesome aspect of the whole problem of the transformation of consciousness.

Which has received during the past few years and even more during the past few months.

An enormous amount of publicity.

And that is, of course, the connection between alterations of consciousness and development of mystical states of awareness with drugs.

And the first thing we have to do in considering a question of this kind is to clean up our semantics.

First of all, I want to say a little bit about artificial and natural. Because there are certain contexts in which the word natural means good and artificial means bad.

And I, for the life of me, I cannot get to the bottom of this.

Because nothing is more artificial than the distinction between the artificial and the natural.

The bird's nest is as artificial as a house. So is a business. Everything done by artifice is artificial, I suppose. And yet if you look as the Chinese do at art as a work of nature, you wonder what all this means. Artificiality, in one sense is acting with skill or with art. It means in Latin, *factum* is from the root *facere* to make ours artists. Artifact what is made by art. So a sculpture, painting, in fact, anything well and skillfully made as an artifact or a work of art. Doesn't have to be fine art to be a shoe, a dress or cooking pot, anything. In fact, our museums are stocked with the everyday objects of the ancients, which we consider works of art.

I don't know whether in the future there will stop museums with aluminum saucepans and things like that. It remains to be seen.

But then the artificial also has a secondary sense of something that looks too much as if it were a work of art.

What we call affected, studied or contrived. When you get what looks like a drinking glass made of glass and you suddenly find out it's made of plastic, you'll get a feeling of the artificial and second sense something pretending to be what it isn't. Something that lacks what you expected. The cool heavy quality of a glass and suddenly it's featherweight and has no substance to it. Or when a person behaves in an artificial way, you feel they are awkward about it. They are putting it on and what they are putting on at you is entirely different from what they feel underneath. Then you say their behavior is contrived or artificial. And I suppose we could use the word artificial this way to mean that to have a kind of a bad sense. So then that arises the troublesome question.

Is there any difference between natural and artificial ways of taking transformations of consciousness which lead you to great insights and understandings? And this is, of course, comparable to the problem of travel. It is natural to walk. You are endowed with legs. Is it unnatural to ride a horse, to take a carriage, to drive an automobile, to take a jet plane? Is that artificial or is it an extension of human capacity in the same way as a bird's nest? That's a very difficult question to decide if you have time. Of course, it's fun to drive to the East Coast. Practically no one bothers to walk nowadays. That would be very abnormal. But of course, if you drive or even take a bicycle, you do see the country and you are aware of the great transition that you're making from one coast to another.

But you sure can't swim to Tokyo. If you're going to go there at all, you acquire, you require at least the artificiality of the boat, and the Pacific is a big, big, empty bunch of water and one bit as much like another unless you landed an island. So you may as well take the plane. There you are in 13 hours. What a difference from the day when they drifted across by the currents, took sailing boats.

Well, you could say when they got there, they really knew they were there. Nowadays, traveling by jet is simply like going inside an elevator. You get the say, whereas the elevator, if it goes too fast, goes down from the 10th floor to the first. And you feel your stomach has been left on the. Traveling by jet, you are apt to feel that your psyche hasn't caught up with you and left it back in New York. And here you are in the higher the times all

different. And it's earlier in the day than practically when you started and you feel sort of this arranged, but all the same. Would it be reasonable to argue that you ought not to travel by jet planes, that you should leave and proceed in a proper, slow manner? Of course, the people who can't afford to travel by jet will tell you so that their way is obviously more natural than yours, and that you are cheating when you take the jet.

You're a wretched capitalist or something, but you see, this is an internal debate goes on and on and on and is a kind of one upmanship.

The real question is, of course, if you take a jet plane to the Orient, what are you going to do when you get there?

That's the real question. Are you going to go to all the best European style or American style hotels and visit Japan as if you were inside a glass case?

That would be pretty artificial because after all, you could just sit home and see color movies for all that goes.

And I do take her people to Japan on and off and some of them like to get mixed up in the life of the country. But some of them absolutely want to be wrapped in cellophane and hygienic.

They can't stand the idea of eating Japanese food. A Japanese bathtub as deplorable as for a Japanese toilet. It is unspeakable because they are so rigid and adaptable that they won't learn new ways of doing things. So it does make a difference whether even if everybody goes by Jet, how they relate themselves to the new environment when they get there. That's the important question. And that depends on whether they're adaptable personalities or rigid personalities.

How stuck they are. How how their identity is glued to certain ways of behaving. There are some people who, unless they have a certain same kind of breakfast every day, are just not themselves.

I remember I used to eat at the lunch counter in England, where an extremely square young man was often there at the same time I was, and he would invariably order three small beef sandwiches. This place specialized

in rather small sandwiches, and he ordered everyday three beef and a glass of beer. And if it had ever changed, he would have had a complete psychic upheaval.

But now the same the question of the jet plane and as to say the technical means of arriving somewhere is in a way parallel to the question. Will you travel in these states of consciousness by.

There are many ways of doing it.

You see that are the methods of meditation, some of which are quite difficult and take a very long time.

They are like walking or do what want to have technical help, that is to say.

What about the chemistry of the matter? Do these states of consciousness correspond to various states of chemistry? Now, in traditionally spiritual people in our culture are horrified at this idea because everything to do with chemistry is labeled artificial. In the bad sense.

As if somehow or other anything achieved by chemical change isn't real. But it is somehow synthetic.

Like plastic glass instead of real glass or like synthetic vitamin C instead of vitamin C derived from rose hips or wonder bread instead of real bread.

But this isn't so easily solved.

The word drug to begin with is an alarm word, except in certain contexts. Nobody is alarmed when they see the notice drugstore. That's folksy and natural and longs as part of our life. Pharmacy is a little more threatening. Actually, a drugstore is OK. But when you say about somebody, he takes drugs. You are a pretty dreadful.

That sounds. It's got the idea of drug equal dope.

And as everybody knows, a dope fiend is a character with circles under his eyes who lies around all day in a kind of stupor, experiencing inner fantasies and bliss, probably sexual and all sorts of weird things going on.

And he is in a frightful state where he depends on taking more and more of this stuff and he gets increasingly dependent on it.

And oh my. That's terrible.

Cause some of one's best friends are alcoholics.

There is a little difference being in status from being a dope fiend, although an alcoholic, of course, can lie around and do nothing for hours and hours and just drink and get more and more dependent on it and have to drink more and more in order to keep going. I mean, you get to feel guilty about it. He has to drink more in order to stop his sense of guilt hurting because he finds out he can't stop. So he has to go on some kind of a status symbol in being alcoholic.

It goes with the culture and it's a mildly approved sin.

People can boast about alcohol, how much they can drink, what fun. It was the drunk we had the other night. And you can get away with it.

The Chinese and the Japanese have absolutely no sense of guilt whatsoever in connection with imbibing alcohol.

They are known among people who use other chemicals as juices, and they are amazing. You see a party of Japanese businessmen going down the street night, all with their arms around each other's necks and swaying across the street and singing. Nobody bothers. They're quite harmless. They're not going to fight anybody. The police don't care.

There they are. Everyone says it's all right. They're happy.

The great Chinese poets are full of references to the joys of getting gloriously drunk and then writing poetry. There was one famous Zen monk who used to get very drunk, and then he had soak his hair in Sumi ink and splash it all over a piece of paper, and then he'd wash it out and look at this thing that he had done, and he would do a Rorschach blot on it until this thing became a landscape.

Then all you'd have to do was to touch his brush to certain points. And what's this land magnificent landscape would appear.

But he had to get to just the right degree of drunkenness to let go and slosh this paper with his inky hair.

I was one day talking with a Zen priest who a student of mine several years ago, and he said, I had a letter from my teacher this morning.

Oh, I said, that's interesting. How is he? Oh, he's fine. But he said he's very drunk. He drank too much. I said, this is your teacher. He goes entertains ideas. And my Zen teacher. He said, he riven mountain where? Very cool. The only way to keep wandering socket.

And so nobody has any any any feeling about it that it's bad, but it.

It is a drug and it is a narcotic. In the strict sense of the word of one that in quantity will induce not coasts or torpor, even sleep.

So you see, the word drug, though, isn't normally applied to alcohol.

If somebody says the doctor says to a patient, are you taking any drugs at this time?

The patient thinks that C, penicillin or whatever, you know, sleeping pills, barbiturates and says, no, no, I'm not taking any drugs.

Forgot to mention alcohol because that doesn't come. Not recognized as a drug. So you see how loaded the word drug is.

So if we want to keep our conversation clean, we don't use it. There's too many double takes and funny associations. We say instead, chemical. Nice, neutral word.

So you see them. There are states of consciousness that correspond to chemistry.

Here we get another difficulty.

There is a certain prejudice going with the word chemical to say that life. To talk about biochemistry as if life were explainable entirely in terms of chemistry or controllable in terms of chemistry seems to be a put down to life. There are many. It's it's it's much within the culture that we live in that mine should always triumph of the matter. This is why Christian science is so popular in the United States and all kinds of so-called metaphysical things, divine science, religious science, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. All concentrate over, think positively and all will be well. Keep your thoughts pure and clean and strong and always look on the better side of things. And then the physical world money and all that sort of thing will take care of itself. And if it doesn't, well, be happy just the same mind over matter. This is a great thing in America.

But it's impossible to practice because one is also material.

If you could perfectly practice mind over matter, of course you should abstain from eating and not be dependent on this murdering business that we all have to do in order to stay alive. You should certainly renounce aspirin. You shouldn't take vitamins, their chemicals and in a sense, drugs, coffee, tea, all that. That's very wicked. And of course, don't drink wine.

When Italian people are asked to specify what they spend on liquor, food, etc., they always list the wine under food. Liquor means strong drink because they consider wine as healthy, normal, everyday drink that everybody naturally has. And the French would think of it the same way.

You see how culturally relative these ideas are. Depending on what you're used to and how you're used to classifying things.

But you see the chemistry, the chemistry of things.

Is simply a certain way of describing what happens. You can describe anything from a chemical point of view. In other words, you take an oil painting by a great master and it there is a chemical description of it possible and musical composition can be described in terms of the physics of sound and accurately measured in those terms. But the only thing is that the language of chemistry is rather clumsy when you are trying to explain what the artist was attempting to convey through his painting.

And the language is the physics of sound is rather clumsy when you're trying to explain the intentions of Mozart.

And from some points of view, also, the language of biochemistry was clumsy when you are attempting to discuss the nature of various intellectual or spiritual insights.

But nevertheless, there is a chemical aspect to all spiritual things. Just as for every photograph, whether it be a photograph of a great saint or a striptease artist in the newspaper, there is at the basis of all of them that grid, which is necessary for reproducing a photograph at all.

So let's not be too snobbish about our relationship to processes that have chemical and physical descriptions attached to them.

Even the Catholic Church.

Admits there are such things as sacraments.

And that through the physical agency of water, a person may be given the grace of baptism and through the physical agencies of bread and wine, he may partake of the body and blood of Christ.

Using physical means to a spiritual end.

And I always detect in people who want to make mind entirely superior to matter, matters completely subordinate to mind a certain kind of spiritual pride. Which in Christianity is the most insufferable of sins. G.K. Chesterton used to recommend as a spiritual exercise, putting your head on the ground and looking between your legs so that you could see everything as if it were hanging from the earth.

Everything dependent on the earth dependent means in Latin, hanging down, hanging from. And this is a good point of view.

Because you see, as I may have indicated in the seminar, I think it is in this, people who are too spiritual are like wine or drink, which is pure alcohol, it

has no body. And people who are too material are like Grenadines. It's a soft, sweet drink with no bite, no spirit.

And we have to follow the middle way. So therefore, there are chemicals which bring about changes of consciousness. Which can be.

In my opinion, aides to the meditation process.

I remember a Chinese doused philosopher once said to me, when you start meditating, you should have a few drinks.

It will increase your progress by about six months.

That's a dangerous attitude and it's a very Chinese attitude. That may be true for Chinese people. I will, I will. I don't. I don't like to work that way myself.

But when it comes to what can be done with the type of chemicals that have been called psychedelic. That is a very meaningless word.

That means nothing at all in Greek except perhaps soul destroying. But it is meant to mean mind manifesting.

I call them psychotropic, which, although it is a very vague term, just means consciousness or mind changing. Of course, all the narcotics are psychotropic. They change. The mind is very difficult to find a word for those chemicals that have to do with these states. But there are in a way, these certain ones to be considered.

And we can say they are roughly form into three types because the cannabis or Indian hemp there is masculine.

And psilocybin. And then as LSD.

These are the principal ones that are under discussion today. And over here, of course, you see in this demand we have alcohol.

Opiates. And I suppose barbiturates.

In other words, the true narcotics.

Well, now.

In the use of any of these substances. There are three factors to be considered or what is called more strictly three variables.

One is the chemical itself.

Two is the setting in which it is used. This the surrounding circumstances, both physical and social.

And three, the set and the set means the attitude and character of the person using them as background. What he brings to it.

And because there are three variables, it's impossible to say of any one of these chemicals that they are specific in what they do. And so in a way, everybody has to speak for himself because he speaks of what happens in the set and setting in which he uses them. But some generalizations can be made. All things being more or less equal. But you always have to take it with a certain grain of salt and with certain reservations.

So what we're talking about them is the alteration of consciousness, which these things will do pretty much of themselves. And then over and above that. What they will do given the optimal set and setting.

Now, from my point of view, I do not know and nobody really knows whether any of these chemicals are specifically therapeutic. There have been in the past therapeutic uses of cannabis or Indian hemp. Old I looked at a British materia medica dated 1918 and there were all sorts of ways in which this was then prescribed. But there is no conclusive evidence that these are specific chemicals to be given for specific ailments. And normally you see when a physician prescribes a drug of a chemical of any kind, he feels that he is only justified in introducing the subject into the human system for purposes of healing a specific disease. With the exception, perhaps of vitamins, which are he feels our health builders and could, as a matter of cost, be taken as dietary supplements. In that case, he is using these chemicals as diet rather than medicine. There is an important

difference you see between medicine and diet. Medicine is for a specific occasion, diet for a regular occasion. And if it is medicine, it is important, too, that you do not become hooked on medicine. One of the most important differences between the practice of a physician and the practice of a clergyman is that a physician is trying to get rid of his patients as fast as possible. He wants to cure them and send them away so that the medicine can be stopped and they don't have to come to his office or hospital anymore. Whereas a clergyman is trying to get you hooked on the medicine. He wants you to continue to come to church to pay your pledge to be there every Sunday and become a regular member or disciple of the congregation.

It's rather funny.

So many, many centuries ago, the physician and the priest to the same person, they had an argument at one point and they split because the physicians became more and more empirical in their approach. And the priests became more scholastic. The difference between a scholastic and an empiricist is that the scholastic knows everything that is written in the book, and he takes his idea of truth from the books and serves as a very ancient and venerable book like the Bible or the Vedas or the Confucian classics. The Scholastic looks for all truth in their pages.

He does not look outside for just the same reason that the theologians would not look through Galileo's telescope because they said, well, if it agrees with what is in the Bible, we do not need to look through it. If it does doesn't agree with what's in the Bible, it must be the work of the devil. But increasingly, physicians began to take an empirical point of view, which was opposed to the scholastic and the theological, and therefore priest and physician could not be the same person. But this has had unfortunate results in that it has impoverished both professions. If somebody is seriously disturbed in mind today and he goes to a clergyman, the clergyman will immediately send him to a psychiatrist. Because no clergyman today feels except perhaps a few Catholic priests, that he has the power to cast out demons. When did you last year of somebody being exorcised? So in other words, the club most clergy do not believe in their religion. They do not have any sense that they possess any true power anymore. And so instead

they send you to some psychiatrist. Now, this is not true by any means of all psychiatrist, but as I find it is true of most psychiatrist and especially those who are the residents and the permanent staff of mental hospitals.

The moment a patient there begins to talk about religion, they know he's crazy because of religion from the point of view of the philosophy of science at the end of the nineteenth century, which was the birth time of psychoanalysis and of a great deal of modern psychiatry. It was the fashion then to regard all religious beliefs as purely superstitious. And that philosophy has carried down to the present day. There are some awkward alliances between psychiatrists and clergymen. And there is a thing called pastoral psychology or pastoral psychotherapy. There are psychiatrist teaching in theological schools. But the arrangement between them is unhappy or has been because especially when you say, well, a lot of people's troubles are due to their sexual repressions. You take a Freudian standpoint about that. Well, the church can't agree with you because the church is a sexual regulation society above all else, whatever. Otherwise, it pretends sexual irregularity is about the only thing you can get kicked out of the church for.

So then the doctor, the physician feels out of role when he prescribes medicine. There being no disease.

He doesn't like to do that in the same way the doctor is shoved out of role when a patient is certainly dying and nothing will help.

He is not allowed by his ethic to administer some painless death pill to the patient, but instead it is much worse than that.

He often feels obliged to keep the patient alive as long as possible. In a state of suspended animation on the ends of all sorts of tubes.

Feeling very uncomfortable and miserable because although, however, he may be doped up against actual physical pain, all the family's savings are going away, and the great difficulty drags on and on and on. And furthermore, the general hospital attitude to a dying patient is one of absolute falsehood. To say you're coming on, you'll be all right. Maybe a couple of weeks from now and all the friends come and say, cheer up. Oh,

boy. The things are not so bad as they seem. They don't add very probably they're much worse. But there there's a complete failure to face death as an important event.

And that is not the physician's fault. It is that a very complex thing. His role has been socially defined in such a way that he is out of role in these emergencies as he is out of role when it comes to using chemicals for something other than the curing of disease.

Now, in my own opinion, these particular chemicals look as if they are not going to be therapeutic agents, agents, but research tools. Just as you magnify your senses with a telephone which enables you to hear for thousands of miles with television, which enables you to see for thousands of miles over the telescope, over the microscope, which enables you to see things totally invisible to the naked eye. May I ask whether these things are bad artificiality? Whether it is really wrong to use telephones, television, microscopes, telescopes? Is that bad?

Well, if it's all right to use a microscope outside your skin.

Here it is, a brass gadget with lenses in it. It is all right if it's outside your skin. Couldn't it be all right to use an instrument inside your skin, which would do a kind of magnification process from within the nervous system, provided that this does not seriously damage you? I suppose you can ruin your eyesight by using microscopes.

But if it's not damaging and if you handle it expertly, anybody can have fun looking through a microscope and see all the little things go wiggle, wiggle and see the jazz go by. But if you happen to have biological or chemical knowledge, then a microscope is an extremely useful tool, as is the telescope to an astronomer or to a navigator.

So I regard these substances as instruments for investigation of the nature of consciousness. Which require careful use because like all things that take you into unfamiliar realms, all exploring is dangerous. It's dangerous to explore outer space. It was dangerous to settle the West because there you encountered wild Indians. In this sort of situation, you don't encounter wild Indians, but you encounter psychoses. And that is always dangerous, of

course. And you might get into a psychosis, especially if you were predisposed to do so in the first place.

But just because something is dangerous doesn't mean at all that we shouldn't do it. It's dangerous to practice yoga. You can go crazy with that. Lots of people have it's probably less dangerous to practice yoga than to drive on the freeway. It's probably safer to take a ride by plane than to practice yoga or to take LSD. But certainly LSD is not so unsafe as to drive your car on the freeway or even around town.

So assuming the responsible use of these substances, really things can be done with them.

So let's consider the possibilities of each of these three groups that I've put up here. I am going to show that normally speaking, what they will do and how far they will go of themselves.

This one cannabis will of itself go about this far.

In other words, it will add the dimension of the sensory consciousness to the symbolic.

Pretty much of itself, and obvious incidentally, is commonly known as marijuana and it is a non habit forming chemical.

Which has a usually calming but sensory alerting and intensifying effect, which is perfectly harmless if not used in very large quantities.

And practically every medical authority who's ever published anything on it agrees with this position.

It does not lead to anything except itself unless it so happens that somebody is selling it to you who really wants to sell you heroin.

Then he will try to tempt you.

Say are sincere.

Come on, try some real good stuff. See? And there a kids say to take heroin, but heroin belongs over here and moves in this direction.

It's a narcotic.

Cannabis belongs on this side of symbolic consciousness, moves in this direction.

These two masculine and psilocybin will of themselves take you about that far.

Into what I described in this morning session, then various characteristics of what I call the cellular consciousness, both of them are curious in respect that of course, you know, that masculine is the same as peyote. It is a distilled synthetic which corresponds to the active the main active principles in the peyote cactus and is used by the Indians of the Southwest for a religious sacrament. They are. That is the Native American Church, which is a Christian Indian church, which has a very good reputation as a kind of a law abiding, pleasant people.

The characteristic symptomatology of both these substances this incidentally is psilocybin is also from the Southwest.

That is a synthetic of the active principle of certain mushrooms that are to be found principally in the state of war. Harker But actually along the whole west coast of America, as far north as Vancouver. The Mushroom psilocybin Mexicana Heim is the principal ones so used. And likewise here again, this mushroom which is called Tail Canal or the flesh of God, is taken for religious purposes in a sacramental way. Both of these, as I would say, have a general atmosphere about them, which is rather earthy. They go extraordinarily well with the vegetative world. They bring to life one's vision of nature and water and plants and sky in an extraordinary way. On the other hand, LSD has a more. I can only call it electronic feel about it. I don't know why, but the possibility of LSD by itself is to get to about here. And all that I described as the molecular kind of consciousness. LSD is produced from wheat, ergot from first of all life surging acid, which is derived from wheat. Good. And then refined into a very complex molecule

diet. Ethyl am I'd of Lysacek acid and the dye AFL made in particular is number 25. So it's LSD 25 as the normal.

Correct. Initials for it.

The peculiarity of this substance is what? A lot will be done by a little. It is given in microgram doses.

Now a microgram is a millionth, not a millionth of a gram thousandths. An a milligram is a thousandth of a gram, the millionth of a ground. And that you can't see vitamin B 12 is also given in my micrograms.

And as little as 75 or even 50 micrograms will produce the characteristic effects of LSD in most human subjects. 100 will certainly do it. I would say any dosage over 200 involves risks. And so when irresponsible experimentation involves people vying with each other as to how much they've taken and they start to go up towards a thousand that they've been just plain stupid mean who knows? Like sitting around them, man and a great drunk and betting on whether you could demolish a whole quart of whiskey in an hour. Well, what a ridiculous thing to do. I mean, that's like trying to land a jet aircraft on the freeway is just stupid. And so one always feels that in the use of these things that they have the same sort of dangers that high powered things of any kind have rifles or automobiles or planes and therefore that the use of them should be licensed. The question is, we don't know quite how to license them because we don't know who is really qualified to decide. This is one of the most problematic things of the whole of our technological advance. Who is to decide? Because you seem to be a qualified expert on any of these subjects. It isn't enough to be a psychiatrist alone. It isn't enough to be a psycho pharmacologist. That is to say, one who specifically studies the biochemistry of the neurology of these substances. The psychiatrist should also have some knowledge of religion, of sociology, of mythology, of you might say, mythology, including symbols and all that sort of thing. Those that should go along with it. And you see, we don't yet train a class of person who has all these disciplines at his disposal.

And so every trained class of person who belongs in a particular category. Minister, psychiatrist, pharmacologist, all feel it a bit of a disadvantage and

therefore reluctant to assume responsibility for this kind of investigation. But you see, the trouble is, he's one of those things you can't get out of. Somebody has got to assume responsibility for it because it's happening. All these things are being used and nothing is going to stop their use. You can't prohibit LSD, at least you can write it down in the books that it is prohibited and you could tell the police to stop it. But why? The police are harassed enough with enough jobs as it is. Why send them on a task considerably more difficult than looking for needles in a haystack? LSD can be disguised so as to appear like almost anything.

It can be made into gun for envelopes. It can be disguised as Kleenex or blotting paper or peanut butter or honey or just anything you choose. And so it is. So my nude, it is tasteless. It has no odor. So there is no way whatsoever of concealing this. It is the perfect secret weapon. It is the perfect elixir. You know, the thing that is the mystery and therefore, it can induce. It's fantastic paranoia.

Not only it's so funny when you read some of the alarmist notices written about LSD from people who have never taken it. They read just as if they had taken it and then had a bad trip because they've got paranoia. They see it on all sides everywhere. This menace creeping in, in the marmalade, in the drinking water.

You know, to just drop a pound of it in the local reservoir, the whole town's turned on.

So like the general in Dr. Strangelove who is objecting to the communist plot to put fluoride into the water and destroy our natural juices, similar personalities are terrified that there's a big communist bloc of something or other to circulate LSD to undermine the youth of America and make them all peaceable so that they won't fight.

Well, that's not the way to handle things. All these things are best when they're out in the open.

And then when we can have no paranoia about it, no hiding things as it is, supposing a group of students who are not out for kicks, incidentally, kicks as a way of putting down young people. That's not taking them seriously. If

you want to put down the young people and say they're only out for kicks, you have no business sending them to fight wars in Vietnam, which is a very responsible undertaking. So if a group of kids in college decide that they, for serious reasons of religious or personal investigation, want to take LSD, it would be very sensible of them to ask a psychiatrist to come over and sit with them for the day, and they would each put up enough money to pay him for his time, but they are not allowed to do so. That would be illegal. It would be illegal for the psychiatrist to take part in such a thing. That's the kind of nonsense you get to. So that what happens instead is that crime takes over and organized crime hasn't really moved into LSD yet because there aren't been enough enthusiastic graduate chemistry students who would manufacture it. And they're idealists and they only want to make a relatively small amount of money on it. And they want to turn everybody on. They want to turn on the president, the United States, the president of the Russian republic and everybody. They want to get high on LSD to make them see things.

And here lie the dangers that the only way of getting LSD at the moment is on the black market. Genuine researchers cannot get it right now. Now, black market LSD is liable to be loaded with many other things, especially if it comes from the syndicate. It is apt to be spiked with heroin so as to get you hooked. Other people mix it with amphetamines to scoop up the effects.

Then also the idealistic graduate student may give you a larger dose than you thought you were buying. And so it's twice what it says on the bottle. And since there is no control over the quality of manufacture, it is as bad as the state of affairs in prohibition when people were drinking highly deleterious bathtub gin. Nobody in his senses will take black market LSD.

You don't know what you're getting.

So by comparison with black market LSD, these other materials are not nearly so dangerous if taken in moderation. This really isn't dangerous at all.

It's just that probably if people smoked it, it would give the liquor industry a bit too much competition for comfort.

So they're now each of these I've drawn a characteristic limit point where I said it will take you of itself. But then with a little push. If you've got the background and the initiative and the what what have you. The training, you can take each one of them further. In fact, you can take even this one right the way through to here. And this. Likewise.

But you see, there's a corresponding effort or whatever you want to call it, involved in each case.

And you see, generally speaking, their effects are everything that I described under the terms of sensory consciousness, the sense of being time slowed down, being at one with the full physical environment, finding enormous delight and significance in what would ordinarily be called insignificant or unimportant patterns. The tones of people's voice, the fantastic vibrations of musical instrument that different qualities of texture and so on is very much emphasized here, which is why this is a favorite chemical among musicians. Here one goes into this very much the utter fascination of the microscopic world, of texture, of the splendor of nature. I picked up with the using masculine a rotten log about so long, so thick with fungus on it, you know, that kind of shelf like fungus that grows. And in the state of masculine, this looked like a piece of jewelry, a great big thing made of ebony and ivory. And heaven only knows what all of it looked as if it had been my nuclear carved by a man like Cellini.

It looked like a superb work of art instead of just a rotten old log. With LSD.

The same initial sort of effects, but with it is apt to go for a while.

A kind of a strange sensory jazz.

Walls start to breathe, to waver ripple. Supposing you see something like.

Let's take a sea urchins shell.

You can look at it and all the nipples on it start to wiggle.

Not only to your eyes, but also to a sense of touch.

Meanwhile, the shell breathe in and out with the nipples wiggling on it and you wonder now what's the reason for that? Is this a hallucination? What's going on?

You know, it's obviously the effect of the chemical, but I begin to wonder about this because I have tried to establish why they wiggle. And I find if I hold my eyes quite still on a certain point, they stop wiggling. But if I in the normal way, let my eyes drift hither and yon over the thing, it wiggles.

So I begin to think, well, after all, my eyes are gelatinous and my brain is a pretty gooey mass of stuff. Maybe that thing is seen in the eye and on the soft surface of the retina actually do wiggle a bit. Only we learn not to see that.

After all, when birds walk. Have you ever watched? When a bird walks, its head goes like this.

Now if you do that, you'll get your landscape going. You see. But obviously, surely birds don't permanently live in a landscape that goes like this when they walk. In other words, they screen that out and they make a constant. So likewise. We've learned socially that all these lines in this room are straight. They're not wiggly. They're made of a solid substance. And they don't wiggle. Well, maybe they do in our in our eyes only we've learned to ignore that. Just as we can see, I don't have binocular vision. And so if I look at something, I should be seeing it double. But I don't because I repress psychologically. One of the eyes I can be either.

But I've simply repressed that information so that I see like anybody else. So these changes are rather strange. And not only do colors become intensely vivid, but songs boomed through them.

And then you get to a point where you can see light in terms of sound, in terms of shape, all the senses seem to be one sense, fundamentally a kind of fundamental sense of touch that you touch light with your eyes, you touch sound with your ears. You touch wood with your fingers. You touch gas with your nose. And you touch taste essences with your tongue.

But it's all one touch. And then beyond that, you get into something else.

When the sensory jazz wears off, the effect seems to go to deeper levels of one's mind. And I would say for me, the most startling property of all these three chemicals in their varying ways is that they substitute for either or fit thinking and feeling both AMD. That is to say, they facilitate polar feeling and thinking. You see, according to a staff psychology, our normal attentive consciousness is captured by the figure rather than the background, by the moving rather than the stationary enclosed figures with clear outline against the background. When your attention in such a way that you see the figure and ignore the background if on an empty blackboard.

I draw this figure and say to an audience, What is it? Most people will say It is a circle. It is a ball. It is a desk. Very few people will suggest that I have drawn a hole in a wall, you see, because attention goes here.

But you realize obviously you couldn't see the figure without any background. Now you find you can reverse the tension between figure and ground fairly easily. You see this either as a ball or as a hole in the wall. But it's difficult to see it as both in the same way, you know, that figure of two faces in profile which are about to kiss each other and they are a black silhouette. But the area between the profiles forms a white chalice. Now it's very difficult to see simultaneously kissing faces and white chalice. You tend to see one or the other because the two images are incompatible unless perhaps you form the concept of it as a loving cup. Then you may be able to see both because what you see depends to a large extent on the concept that you're using. If, for example, you have a concept of number which goes one to three many, then you can never know that a table has four corners. You haven't got the number for it has many corners because it's a one above three. Anything above three is many.

So there's no difference in concept between a table with Four Corners or a table with 20.

For those primitive kind of earth musicians. So then polar thinking becomes characteristic of all of these in here and increasingly felt that the inside goes with the outside.

In the same way that the back goes with the front, that you go with your circumstances.

It isn't that you are pushed around by them as a puppet, but that you and your circumstances, you and your environment are all the real you. That's what you're doing. And so you experience, even though the circumstances may not be what would ordinarily be called harmonious. That is to say, pleasant circumstances.

You realize that there is an unbreakable harmony between your behavior and the behavior of the external world. And so this polarity becomes very important, but it can scare the wits out of you. And this is a danger point.

If you say now, then all right. If inside goes without side, likewise good goes with bad.

As I said before, you wouldn't know you were law abiding people unless there were some criminals around to compare yourselves with. By comparison, you know that you're law abiding. Well, now you begin to worry.

If God goes with dad, who's in charge around here, who.

Who's to say what's right if, after all, everything works out in the end, if anything goes. And therefore, you can start to get worried. How will I know? What will I depend on in myself that I will behave in what is considered a sane way at the next moment? Will I suddenly be overcome with a passion to kill somebody in Ireland and in this way, not knowing which end is up because everything is so relative? It feels as if you when you put your foot, your psychic foot upon what you hope to be firm ground, the ground immediately collapses and you find yourself freely falling in space. And this is terrifying. You are afloat. You are in the floating world. You are in the relative universe in which there is nothing to hang on to because the only thing that might be valuable unto is you.

In other words, suddenly the eternal rock, the firm foundation upon which the Saints of the Lord is supposed to build the rock of ages in which you're supposed to be able to hide yourself. All that has gone and it seems at first that there is nothing, nothing, nothing to cling to.

And so the sweat can fall from you until you say, well, that's really the way it always was.

When I was born, I was kicked off the edge of a precipice. And I've been consoling myself all this time by hugging to a big chunk of rock that fell off with me. But, you know, there is no security. And if you go with it, you see and you don't try to fight and to find something to cling to, it's all right. Then you discover that the void that you were so frightened of is the clear light. This thing.

That it isn't empty in the ordinary sense of the word at all. But once you let go of your clinging, that is all you let go of. There's no you to let go of. Really, all the thing to do is stop clinging. Because that's what that does is bunch you all up. It's like going around like this.

For the totally paranoid thinking, what's gonna to happen?

Oh, come on, loosen up. You can't do anything if your hands are tied up here all the time holding on to yourself. You know, you're trying to get armor, pulling up your own belt and try to lift yourself off the ground this way. You never get anywhere, but when you let go. Then there's the possibility of doing something. Well, I hope that people will get some sense about these things and that those of us who are interested in their responsible use will be able to use them responsibly and through that be able to educate the public into a sane behavior with these things, just as we are able, to some extent, to educate the public to behave sensibly with automobiles and whiskey.

We haven't done too good a job, but at any rate, we do make a try out.

Nature of Consciousness

I find it a little difficult to say what the subject matter of this seminar is going to be, because it's too fundamental to give it a title. I'm going to talk about what there is. Now, the first thing, though, that we have to do is to get our perspectives with some background about the basic ideas that, as Westerners living today in the United States, influence our everyday

common sense, our fundamental notions about what life is about. And there are historical origins for this, which influence us more strongly than most people realize. Ideas of the world which are built into the very nature of the language we use, and of our ideas of logic, and of what makes sense altogether.

And these basic ideas I call myth, not using the word 'myth' to mean simply something untrue, but to use the word 'myth' in a more powerful sense. A myth is an image in terms of which we try to make sense of the world. Now, for example, a myth in a way is a metaphore. If you want to explain electricity to someone who doesn't know anything about electricity, you say, well, you talk about an electric current. Now, the word 'current' is borrowed from rivers. It's borrowed from hydrolics, and so you explain electricity in terms of water. Now, electricity is not water, it behaves actually in a different way, but there are some ways in which the behavior of water is like the behavior of electricity, and so you explain it in terms of water. Or if you're an astronomer, and you want to explain to people what you mean by an expanding universe and curved space, you say, 'well, it's as if you have a black balloon, and there are white dots on the black balloon, and those dots represent galaxies, and as you blow the balloon up, uniformly all of them grow farther and farther apart. But you're using an analogy—the universe is not actually a black balloon with white dots on it.

So in the same way, we use these sort of images to try and make sense of the world, and we at present are living under the influence of two very powerful images, which are, in the present state of scientific knowledge, inadequate, and one of the major problems today are to find an adequate, satisfying image of the world. Well that's what I'm going to talk about. And I'm going to go further than that, not only what image of the world to have, but how we can get our sensations and our feelings in accordance with the most sensible image of the world that we can manage to conceive.

All right, now—the two images which we have been working under for 2000 years and maybe more are what I would call two models of the universe, and the first is called the ceramic model, and the second the fully automatic model. The ceramic model of the universe is based on the book of Genesis, from which Judaism, Islam, and Christianity derive their basic picture of the

world. And the image of the world in the book of Genesis is that the world is an artifact. It is made, as a potter takes clay and forms pots out of it, or as a carpenter takes wood and makes tables and chairs out of it. Don't forget Jesus is the son of a carpenter. And also the son of God. So the image of God and of the world is based on the idea of God as a technician, potter, carpenter, architect, who has in mind a plan, and who fashions the universe in accordance with that plan.

So basic to this image of the world is the notion, you see, that the world consists of stuff, basically. Primordial matter, substance, stuff. As parts are made of clay. Now clay by itself has no intelligence. Clay does not of itself become a pot, although a good potter may think otherwise. Because if you were a really good potter, you don't impose your will on the clay, you ask any given lump of clay what it wants to become, and you help it to do that. And then you become a genius. But the ordinary idea I'm talking about is that simply clay is unintelligent; it's just stuff, and the potter imposes his will on it, and makes it become whatever he wants.

And so in the book of Genesis, the lord God creates Adam out of the dust of the Earth. In other words, he makes a clay figurine, and then he breathes into it, and it becomes alive. And because the clay become informed. By itself it is formless, it has no intelligence, and therefore it requires an external intelligence and an external energy to bring it to life and to bring some sense to it. And so in this way, we inherit a conception of ourselves as being artifacts, as being made, and it is perfectly natural in our culture for a child to ask its mother 'How was I made?' or 'Who made me?' And this is a very, very powerful idea, but for example, it is not shared by the Chinese, or by the Hindus. A Chinese child would not ask its mother 'How was I made?' A Chinese child might ask its mother 'How did I grow?' which is an entirely different procedure from making. You see, when you make something, you put it together, you arrange parts, or you work from the outside in, as a sculpture works on stone, or as a potter works on clay. But when you watch something growing, it works in exactly the opposite direction. It works from the inside to the outside. It expands. It burgeons. It blossoms. And it happens all of itself at once. In other words, the original simple form, say of a living cell in the womb, progressively complicates

itself, and that's the growing process, and it's quite different from the making process.

But we have thought, historically, you see, of the world as something made, and the idea of being—trees, for example— constructions, just as tables and houses are constructions. And so there is for that reason a fundamental difference between the made and the maker. And this image, this ceramic model of the universe, originated in cultures where the form of government was monarchical, and where, therefore, the maker of the universe was conceived also at the same time in the image of the king of the universe. 'King of kings, lords of lords, the only ruler of princes, who thus from thy throne behold all dwellers upon Earth.' I'm quoting the Book of Common Prayer. And so, all those people who are oriented to the universe in that way feel related to basic reality as a subject to a king. And so they are on very, very humble terms in relation to whatever it is that works all this thing. I find it odd, in the United States, that people who are citizens of a republic have a monarchical theory of the universe. That you can talk about the president of the United States as LBJ, or Ike, or Harry, but you can't talk about the lord of the universe in such familiar terms. Because we are carrying over from very ancient near-Eastern cultures, the notion that the lord of the universe must be respected in a certain way. People kneel, people bow, people prostrate themselves, and you know what the reason for that is: that nobody is more frightened of anybody else than a tyrant. He sits with his back to the wall, and his guards on either side of him, and he has you face downwards on the ground because you can't use weapons that way. When you come into his presence, you don't stand up and face him, because you might attack, and he has reason to fear that you might because he's ruling you all. And the man who rules you all is the biggest crook in the bunch. Because he's the one who succeeded in crime. The other people are pushed aside because they—the criminals, the people we lock up in jail—are simply the people who didn't make it.

So naturally, the real boss sits with his back to the wall and his henchmen on either side of him. And so when you design a church, what does it look like? Catholic church, with the alter where it used to be—it's changing now, because the Catholic religion is changing. But the Catholic church has the alter with it's back to the wall at the east end of the church. And the alter is

the throne and the priest is the chief vizier of the court, and he is making abeyance to the throne, but there is the throne of God, the alter. And all the people are facing it, and kneeling down. And a great Catholic cathedral is called a basilica, from the Greek 'basilikos,' which means 'king.' So a basilica is the house of a king, and the ritual of the church is based on the court rituals of Byzantium.

A Protestant church is a little different. Basically the same. The furniture of a Protestant church is based on a judicial courthouse. The pulpit, the judge in an American court wears a black robe, he wears exactly the same dress as a Protestant minister. And everybody sits in these boxes, there's a box for the jury, there's a box for the judge, there's a box for this, there's a box for that, and those are the pews in an ordinary colonial- type Protestant church. So both these kinds of churches which have an autocratic view of the nature of the universe decorate themselves, are architecturally constructed in accordance with political images of the universe. One is the king, and the other is the judge. Your honor. There's sense in this. When in court, you have to refer to the judge as 'your honor.' It stops the people engaged in litigation from losing their tempers and getting rude. There's a certain sense to that.

But when you want to apply that image to the universe itself, to the very nature of life, it has limitations. For one thing, the idea of a difference between matter and spirit. This idea doesn't work anymore. Long, long ago, physicists stopped asking the question 'What is matter?' They began that way. They wanted to know, what is the fundamental substance of the world? And the more they asked that question, the more they realized they couldn't answer it, because if you're going to say what matter is, you've got to describe it in terms of behavior, that is to say in terms of form, in terms of pattern. You tell what it does, you describe the smallest shapes of it which you can see. Do you see what happens? You look, say, at a piece of stone, and you want to say, 'Well, what is this piece of stone made of?' You take your microscope and you look at it, and instead of just this block of stuff, you see ever so many tinier shapes. Little crystals. So you say, 'Fine, so far so good. Now what are these crystals made of?' And you take a more powerful instrument, and you find that they're made of molecules, and then you take a still more powerful instrument to find out what the molecules are

made of, and you begin to describe atoms, electrons, protons, mesons, all sorts of sub-nuclear particles. But you never, never arrive at the basic stuff. Because there isn't any.

What happens is this: 'Stuff' is a word for the world as it looks when our eyes are out of focus. Fuzzy. Stuff—the idea of stuff is that it is undifferentiated, like some kind of goo. And when your eyes are not in sharp focus, everything looks fuzzy. When you get your eyes into focus, you see a form, you see a pattern. But when you want to change the level of magnification, and go in closer and closer and closer, you get fuzzy again before you get clear. So everytime you get fuzzy, you go through thinking there's some kind of stuff there. But when you get clear, you see a shape. So all that we can talk about is patterns. We never, never can talk about the 'stuff' of which these patterns are supposed to be made, because you don't really have to suppose that there is any. It's enough to talk about the world in terms of patterns. It describes anything that can be described, and you don't really have to suppose that there is some stuff that constitutes the essence of the pattern in the same way that clay constitutes the essence of pots. And so for this reason, you don't really have to suppose that the world is some kind of helpless, passive, unintelligent junk which an outside agency has to inform and make into intelligent shapes. So the picture of the world in the most sophisticated physics of today is not formed stuff—potted clay—but pattern. A self-moving, self-designing pattern. A dance. And our common sense as individuals hasn't yet caught up with this.

Well now, in the course of time, in the evolution of Western thought. The ceramic image of the world ran into trouble. And changed into what I call the fully automatic image of the world. In other words, Western science was based on the idea that there are laws of nature, and got that idea from Judaism and Christianity and Islam. That in other words, the potter, the maker of the world in the beginning of things laid down the laws, and the law of God, which is also the law of nature, is called the 'loggos.?,.' And in Christianity, the loggos is the second person of the trinity, incarnate as Jesus Christ, who thereby is the perfect exemplar of the divine law. So we have tended to think of all natural phenomena as responding to laws, as if, in other words, the laws of the world were like the rails on which a streetcar or

a tram or a train runs, and these things exist in a certain way, and all events respond to these laws. You know that limerick,

There was a young man who said 'Damn, For it certainly seems that I am A creature that moves In determinate grooves. I'm not even a bus, I'm a tram.'

So here's this idea that there's kind of a plan, and everything responds and obeys that plan. Well, in the 18th century, Western intellectuals began to suspect this idea. And what they suspected was whether there is a lawmaker, whether there is an architect of the universe, and they found out, or they reasoned, that you don't have to suppose that there is. Why? Because the hypothesis of God does not help us to make any predictions. Nor does it— In other words, let's put it this way: if the business of science is to make predictions about what's going to happen, science is essentially prophecy. What's going to happen? By examining the behavior of the past and describing it carefully, we can make predictions about what's going to happen in the future. That's really the whole of science. And to do this, and to make successful predictions, you do not need God as a hypothesis. Because it makes no difference to anything. If you say 'Everything is controlled by God, everything is governed by God,' that doesn't make any difference to your prediction of what's going to happen. And so what they did was drop that hypothesis. But they kept the hypothesis of law. Because if you can predict, if you can study the past and describe how things have behaved, and you've got some regularities in the behavior of the universe, you call that law. Although it may not be law in the ordinary sense of the word, it's simply regularity.

And so what they did was got rid of the lawmaker and kept the law. And so they conceived the universe in terms of a mechanism. Something, in other words, that is functioning according to regular, clocklike mechanical principles. Newton's whole image of the world is based on billiards. The atoms are billiard balls, and they bang each other around. And so your behavior, every individual around, is defined as a very, very complex arrangement of billiard balls being banged around by everything else. And so behind the fully automatic model of the universe is the notion that reality itself is, to use the favorite term of 19th century scientists, blind energy. In

say the metaphysics of Ernst Hegel, and T.H. Huxley, the world is basically nothing but energy—blind, unintelligent force. And likewise and parallel to this, in the philosophy of Freud, the basic psychological energy is libido, which is blind lust. And it is only a fluke, it is only as a result of pure chances that resulting from the exuberance of this energy there are people. With values, with reason, with languages, with cultures, and with love. Just a fluke. Like, you know, 1000 monkeys typing on 1000 typewriters for a million years will eventually type the Encyclopedia Britannica. And of course the moment they stop typing the Encyclopedia Britannica, they will relapse into nonsense.

And so in order that that shall not happen, for you and I are flukes in this cosmos, and we like our way of life—we like being human—if we want to keep it, say these people, we've got to fight nature, because it will turn us back into nonsense the moment we let it. So we've got to impose our will upon this world as if we were something completely alien to it. From outside. And so we get a culture based on the idea of the war between man and nature. And we talk about the conquest of space. The conquest of Everest. And the great symbols of our culture are the rocket and the bulldozer. The rocket—you know, compensation for the sexually inadequate male. So we're going to conquer space. You know we're in space already, way out. If anybody cared to be sensitive and let outside space come to you, you can, if your eyes are clear enough. Aided by telescopes, aided by radio astronomy, aided by all the kinds of sensitive instruments we can devise. We're as far out in space as we're ever going to get. But, y'know, sensitivity isn't the pitch. Especially in the WASP culture of the United States. We define manliness in terms of aggression, you see, because we're a little bit frightened as to whether or not we're really men. And so we put on this great show of being a tough guy. It's completely unnecessary. If you have what it takes, you don't need to put on that show. And you don't need to beat nature into submission. Why be hostile to nature? Because after all, you ARE a symptom of nature. You, as a human being, you grow out of this physical universe in exactly the same way an apple grows off an apple tree.

So let's say the tree which grows apples is a tree which apples, using 'apple' as a verb. And a world in which human beings arrive is a world that peoples. And so the existence of people is symptomatic of the kind of

universe we live in. Just as spots on somebody's skin is symptomatic of chicken pox. Just as hair on a head is symptomatic of what's going on in the organism. But we have been brought up by reason of our two great myths—the ceramic and the automatic—not to feel that we belong in the world. So our popular speech reflects it. You say 'I came into this world.' You didn't. You came out of it. You say 'Face facts.' We talk about 'encounters' with reality, as if it was a head-on meeting of completely alien agencies. And the average person has the sensation that he is a someone that exists inside a bag of skin. The center of consciousness that looks out at this thing, and what the hell's it going to do to me? You see? 'I recognize you, you kind of look like me, and I've seen myself in a mirror, and you look like you might be people.' So maybe you're intelligent and maybe you can love, too. Perhaps you're all right, some of you are, anyway. You've got the right color of skin, or you have the right religion, or whatever it is, you're OK. But there are all those people over in Asia, and Africa, and they may not really be people. When you want to destroy someone, you always define them as 'unpeople.' Not really human. Monkeys, maybe. Idiots, maybe. Machines, maybe, but not people.

So we have this hostility to the external world because of the superstition, the myth, the absolutely unfounded theory that you, yourself, exist only inside your skin. Now I want to propose another idea altogether. There are two great theories in astronomy going on right now about the origination of the universe. One is called the explosion theory, and the other is called the steady state theory. The steady state people say there never was a time when the world began, it's always expanding, yes, but as a result of free hydrogen in space, the free hydrogen coagulates and makes new galaxies. But the other people say there was a primordial explosion, an enormous bang billions of years ago which flung all the galaxies into space. Well let's take that just for the sake of argument and say that was the way it happened.

It's like you took a bottle of ink and you threw it at a wall. Smash! And all that ink spread. And in the middle, it's dense, isn't it? And as it gets out on the edge, the little droplets get finer and finer and make more complicated patterns, see? So in the same way, there was a big bang at the beginning of things and it spread. And you and I, sitting here in this room, as complicated human beings, are way, way out on the fringe of that bang. We

are the complicated little patterns on the end of it. Very interesting. But so we define ourselves as being only that. If you think that you are only inside your skin, you define yourself as one very complicated little curlique, way out on the edge of that explosion. Way out in space, and way out in time. Billions of years ago, you were a big bang, but now you're a complicated human being. And then we cut ourselves off, and don't feel that we're still the big bang. But you are. Depends how you define yourself. You are actually—if this is the way things started, if there was a big bang in the beginning— you're not something that's a result of the big bang. You're not something that is a sort of puppet on the end of the process. You are still the process. You are the big bang, the original force of the universe, coming on as whoever you are. When I meet you, I see not just what you define yourself as—Mr so-and- so, Ms so-and-so, Mrs so-and-so—I see every one of you as the primordial energy of the universe coming on at me in this particular way. I know I'm that, too. But we've learned to define ourselves as separate from it.

And so what I would call a basic problem we've got to go through first, is to understand that there are no such things as things. That is to say separate things, or separate events. That that is only a way of talking. If you can understand this, you're going to have no further problems. I once asked a group of high school children 'What do you mean by a thing?' First of all, they gave me all sorts of synonyms. They said 'It's an object,' which is simply another word for a thing; it doesn't tell you anything about what you mean by a thing. Finally, a very smart girl from Italy, who was in the group, said a thing is a noun. And she was quite right. A noun isn't a part of nature, it's a part of speech. There are no nouns in the physical world. There are no separate things in the physical world, either. The physical world is wiggly. Clouds, mountains, trees, people, are all wiggly. And only when human beings get to working on things—they build buildings in straight lines, and try to make out that the world isn't really wiggly. But here we are, sitting in this room all built out of straight lines, but each one of us is as wiggly as all get-out.

Now then, when you want to get control of something that wiggles, it's pretty difficult, isn't it? You try and pick up a fish in your hands, and the fish is wiggly and it slips out. What do you do to get hold of the fish? You

use a net. And so the net is the basic thing we have for getting hold of the wiggly world. So if you want to get hold of this wiggle, you've got to put a net over it. A net is something regular. And I can number the holes in a net. So many holes up, so many holes across. And if I can number these holes, I can count exactly where each wiggle is, in terms of a hole in that net. And that's the beginning of calculus, the art of measuring the world. But in order to do that, I've got to break up the wiggle into bits. I've got to call this a specific bit, and this the next bit of the wiggle, and this the next bit, and this the next bit of the wiggle. And so these bits are things or events. Bit of wiggles. Which I mark out in order to talk about the wiggle. In order to measure and therefore in order to control it. But in nature, in fact, in the physical world, the wiggle isn't bitted. Like you don't get a cut-up fryer out of an egg. But you have to cut the chicken up in order to eat it. You bite it. But it doesn't come bitten.

So the world doesn't come thinged; it doesn't come evented. You and I are all as much continuous with the physical universe as a wave is continuous with the ocean. The ocean waves, and the universe peoples. And as I wave and say to you 'Yoo-hoo!' the world is waving with me at you and saying 'Hi! I'm here!' But we are consciousness of the way we feel and sense our existence. Being based on a myth that we are made, that we are parts, that we are things, our consciousness has been influenced, so that each one of us does not feel that. We have been hypnotized, literally hypnotized by social convention into feeling and sensing that we exist only inside our skins. That we are not the original bang, just something out on the end of it. And therefore we are scared stiff. My wave is going to disappear, and I'm going to die! And that would be awful. We've got a mythology going now which is, as Father Maskell.?, put it, we are something that happens between the maternity ward and the crematorium. And that's it. And therefore everybody feels unhappy and miserable.

This is what people really believe today. You may go to church, you may say you believe in this, that, and the other, but you don't. Even Jehovah's Witnesses, who are the most fundamental of fundamentalists, they are polite when they come around and knock on the door. But if you REALLY believed in Christianity, you would be screaming in the streets. But nobody does. You would be taking full- page ads in the paper every day. You would

be the most terrifying television programs. The churches would be going out of their minds if they really believed what they teach. But they don't. They think they ought to believe what they teach. They believe they should believe, but they don't really believe it, because what we REALLY believe is the fully automatic model. And that is our basic, plausible common sense. You are a fluke. You are a separate event. And you run from the maternity ward to the crematorium, and that's it, baby. That's it.

Now why does anybody think that way? There's no reason to, because it isn't even scientific. It's just a myth. And it's invented by people who want to feel a certain way. They want to play a certain game. The game of god got embarrassing. The idea of God as the potter, as the architect of the universe, is good. It makes you feel that life is, after all, important. There is someone who cares. It has meaning, it has sense, and you are valuable in the eyes of the father. But after a while, it gets embarrassing, and you realize that everything you do is being watched by God. He knows your tiniest innermost feelings and thoughts, and you say after a while, 'Quit bugging me! I don't want you around.' So you become an atheist, just to get rid of him. Then you feel terrible after that, because you got rid of God, but that means you got rid of yourself. You're nothing but a machine. And your idea that you're a machine is just a machine, too. So if you're a smart kid, you commit suicide. Camus said there is only one serious philosophical question, which is whether or not to commit suicide. I think there are four or five serious philosophical questions. The first one is 'Who started it?' The second is 'Are we going to make it?' The third is 'Where are we going to put it?' The fourth is 'Who's going to clean up?' And the fifth, 'Is it serious?'

But still, should you or not commit suicide? This is a good question. Why go on? And you only go on if the game is worth the gamble. Now the universe has been going on for an incredible long time. And so really, a satisfactory theory of the universe has to be one that's worth betting on. That's very, it seems to me, elementary common sense. If you make a theory of the universe which isn't worth betting on, why bother? Just commit suicide. But if you want to go on playing the game, you've got to have an optimal theory for playing the game. Otherwise there's no point in it. But the people who coined the fully automatic theory of the universe

were playing a very funny game, for what they wanted to say was this: all you people who believe in religion—old ladies and wishful thinkers— you’ve got a big daddy up there, and you want comfort, but life is rough. Life is tough, as success goes to the most hard-headed people. That was a very convenient theory when the European and American worlds were colonizing the natives everywhere else. They said ‘We’re the end product of evolution, and we’re tough. I’m a big strong guy because I face facts, and life is just a bunch of junk, and I’m going to impose my will on it and turn it into something else. I’m real hard.’ That’s a way of flattering yourself.

And so, it has become academically plausible and fashionable that this is the way the world works. In academic circles, no other theory of the world than the fully automatic model is respectable. Because if you’re an academic person, you’ve got to be an intellectually tough person, you’ve got to be prickly. There are basically two kinds of philosophy. One’s called prickles, the other’s called goo. And prickly people are precise, rigorous, logical. They like everything chopped up and clear. Goo people like it vague. For example, in physics, prickly people believe that the ultimate constituents of matter are particles. Goo people believe it’s waves. And in philosophy, prickly people are logical positivists, and goo people are idealists. And they’re always arguing with each other, but what they don’t realize is neither one can take his position without the other person. Because you wouldn’t know you advocated prickles unless there was someone advocating goo. You wouldn’t know what a prickle was unless you knew what a goo was. Because life isn’t either prickles or goo, it’s either gooey prickles or prickly goo. They go together like back and front, male and female. And that’s the answer to philosophy. You see, I’m a philosopher, and I’m not going to argue very much, because if you don’t argue with me, I don’t know what I think. So if we argue, I say ‘Thank you,’ because owing to the courtesy of your taking a different point of view, I understand what I mean. So I can’t get rid of you.

But however, you see, this whole idea that the universe is nothing at all but unintelligent force playing around and not even enjoying it is a putdown theory of the world. People who had an advantage to make, a game to play by putting it down, and making out that because they put the world down they were a superior kind of people. So that just won’t do. We’ve had it.

Because if you seriously go along with this idea of the world, you're what is technically called alienated. You feel hostile to the world. You feel that the world is a trap. It is a mechanism, it is electronic and neurological mechanisms into which you somehow got caught. And you, poor thing, have to put up with being put into a body that's falling apart, that gets cancer, that gets the great Siberian itch, and is just terrible. And these mechanics—doctors—are trying to help you out, but they really can't succeed in the end, and you're just going to fall apart, and it's a grim business, and it's just too bad. So if you think that's the way things are, you might as well commit suicide right now. Unless you say, 'Well, I'm damned. Because there might really be after all eternal damnation. Or I identify with my children, and I think of them going on without me and nobody to support them. Because if I do go on in this frame of mind and continue to support them, I shall teach them to be like I am, and they'll go on, dragging it out to support their children, and they won't enjoy it. They'll be afraid to commit suicide, and so will their children. They'll all learn the same lessons.'

So you see, all I'm trying to say is that the basic common sense about the nature of the world that is influencing most people in the United States today is simply a myth. If you want to say that the idea of God the father with his white beard on the golden throne is a myth, in a bad sense of the word 'myth,' so is this other one. It is just as phony and has just as little to support it as being the true state of affairs. Why? Let's get this clear. If there is any such thing at all as intelligence and love and beauty, well you've found it in other people. In other words, it exists in us as human beings. And as I said, if it is there, in us, it is symptomatic of the scheme of things. We are as symptomatic of the scheme of things as the apples are symptomatic of the apple tree or the rose of the rose bush. The Earth is not a big rock infested with living organisms any more than your skeleton is bones infested with cells. The Earth is geological, yes, but this geological entity grows people, and our existence on the Earth is a symptom of this other system, and its balances, as much as the solar system in turn is a symptom of our galaxy, and our galaxy in its turn is a symptom of a whole company of other galaxies. Goodness only knows what that's in.

But you see, when, as a scientist, you describe the behavior of a living organism, you try to say what a person does, it's the only way in which you

can describe what a person is, describe what they do. Then you find out that in making this description, you cannot confine yourself to what happens inside the skin. In other words, you cannot talk about a person walking unless you start describing the floor, because when I walk, I don't just dangle my legs in empty space. I move in relationship to a room. So in order to describe what I'm doing when I'm walking, I have to describe the room; I have to describe the territory. So in describing my talking at the moment, I can't describe it as just a thing in itself, because I'm talking to you. And so what I'm doing at the moment is not completely described unless your being here is described also. So if that is necessary, in other words, in order to describe MY behavior, I have to describe YOUR behavior and the behavior of the environment, it means that we've really got one system of behavior. Your skin doesn't separate you from the world; it's a bridge through which the external world flows into you, and you flow into it.

Just, for example, as a whirlpool in water, you could say because you have a skin you have a definite shape you have a definite form. All right? Here is a flow of water, and suddenly it does a whirlpool, and it goes on. The whirlpool is a definite form, but no water stays put in it. The whirlpool is something the stream is doing, and exactly the same way, the whole universe is doing each one of us, and I see each one of you today and I recognize you tomorrow, just as I would recognize a whirlpool in a stream. I'd say 'Oh yes, I've seen that whirlpool before, it's just near so-and-so's house on the edge of the river, and it's always there.' So in the same way when I meet you tomorrow, I recognize you, you're the same whirlpool you were yesterday. But you're moving. The whole world is moving through you, all the cosmic rays, all the food you're eating, the stream of steaks and milk and eggs and everything is just flowing right through you. When you're wiggling the same way, the world is wiggling, the stream is wiggling you.

But the problem is, you see, we haven't been taught to feel that way. The myths underlying our culture and underlying our common sense have not taught us to feel identical with the universe, but only parts of it, only in it, only confronting it—aliens. And we are, I think, quite urgently in need of coming to feel that we ARE the eternal universe, each one of us. Otherwise

we're going to go out of our heads. We're going to commit suicide, collectively, courtesy of H-bombs. And, all right, supposing we do, well that will be that, then there will be life making experiments on other galaxies. Maybe they'll find a better game.

Well now, in the first session this afternoon, I was discussing two of the great myths or models of the universe, which lie in the intellectual and psychological background of all of us. The myth of the world as a political, monarchical state in which we are all here on sufferance as subject to God. In which we are MADE artifacts, who do not exist in our own right. God alone, in the first myth, exists in his own right, and you exist as a favor, and you ought to be grateful. Like your parents come on and say to you, 'Look at all the things we've done for you, all the money we spent to send you to college, and you turn out to be a beatnik. You're a wretched, ungrateful child.' And you're supposed to say, 'Sorry, I really am.' But you're definitely in the position of being on probation. This arises out of our whole attitude towards children, whereby we don't really acknowledge that they're human. Instead, when a child comes into the world, and as soon as it can communicate in any way, talk language, you should say to a child, 'How do you do? Welcome to the human race. Now my dear, we are playing a very complicated game, and we're going to explain the rules of it to you. And when you have learned these rules and understand what they are, you may be able to invent better ones. But in the meantime, this is the thing we're doing.'

Instead of that, we either treat a child with a kind of with a kind of 'blah-blah-blah' attitude, or 'coochy-coochy-coochie,' y'know? and don't treat the thing as a human being at all—as a kind of doll. Or else as a nuisance. And so all of us, having been treated that way, carry over into adult life the sense of being on probation here. Either the god is somebody who says to us 'coochy-coochy-coochie,' or 'blah-blah-blah.' And that's the feeling we carry over. So that idea of the royal god, the king of kings and the lord of lords which we inherit from the political structures of the Tigris-Euphrates cultures, and from Egypt. The Pharaoh, Amenhotep IV is probably, as Freud suggested, the original author of Moses' monotheism, and certainly the Jewish law code comes from Hammurabi in Chaldea. And these men

lived in a culture where the pyramid and the ziggurat—the ziggurat is the Chaldean version of the pyramid, indicating somehow a hierarchy of power, from the boss on down. And God, in this first myth that we've been discussing, the ceramic myth is the boss, and the idea of God is that the universe is governed from above.

But do you see, this parallels—goes hand in hand with the idea that you govern your own body. That the ego, which lies somewhere between the ears and behind the eyes in the brain, is the governor of the body. And so we can't understand a system of order, a system of life, in which there isn't a governor. 'O Lord, our governor, how excellent is thy name in all the world.'

But supposing, on the contrary, there could be a system which doesn't have a governor. That's what we are supposed to have in this society. We are supposed to be a democracy and a republic. And we are supposed to govern ourselves. As I said, it's so funny that Americans can be politically republican—I don't mean republican in the party sense—and yet religiously monarchical. It's a real strange contradiction.

So what is this universe? Is it a monarchy? Is it a republic? Is it a mechanism? Or an organism? Because you see, if it's a mechanism, either it's a mere mechanism, as in the fully automatic model, or else it's a mechanism under the control of a driver. A mechanic. If it's not that, it's an organism, and an organism is a thing that governs itself. In your body there is no boss. You could argue, for example, that the brain is a gadget evolved by the stomach, in order to serve the stomach for the purposes of getting food. Or you can argue that the stomach is a gadget evolved by the brain to feed it and keep it alive. Whose game is this? Is it the brain's game, or the stomach's game? They're mutual. The brain implies the stomach and the stomach implies the brain, and neither of them is the boss.

You know that story about all the limbs of the body. The hand said 'We do all our work,' the feet said 'We do our work,' the mouth said 'We do all the chewing, and here's this lazy stomach who just gets it all and doesn't do a thing. He didn't do any work, so let's go on strike.' And the hands refused to carry, the feet refused to walk, the teeth refused to chew, and said 'Now we're on strike against the stomach.' But after a while, all of them found

themselves getting weaker and weaker and weaker, because they didn't realize that the stomach fed them.

So there is the possibility then that we are not in the kind of system that these two myths delineate. That we are not living in a world where we ourselves, in the deepest sense of self, are outside reality, and somehow in a position that we have to bow down to it and say 'As a great favor, please preserve us in existence.' Nor are we in a system which is merely mechanical, and which we are nothing but flukes, trapped in the electrical wiring of a nervous system which is fundamentally rather inefficiently arranged. What's the alternative? Well, we could put the alternative in another image altogether, and I'll call this not the ceramic image, not the fully automatic image, but the dramatic image. Consider the world as a drama. What's the basis of all drama? The basis of all stories, of all plots, of all happenings—is the game of hide and seek. You get a baby, what's the fundamental first game you play with a baby? You put a book in front of your face, and you peek at the baby. The baby starts giggling. Because the baby is close to the origins of life; it comes from the womb really knowing what it's all about, but it can't put it into words. See, what every child psychologist really wants to know is to get a baby to talk psychological jargon, and explain how it feels. But the baby knows; you do this, this, this and this, and the baby starts laughing, because the baby is a recent incarnation of God. And the baby knows, therefore, that hide and seek is the basic game.

See, when we were children, we were taught '1, 2, 3,' and 'A, B, C,' but we weren't set down on our mothers' knees and taught the game of black and white. That's the thing that was left out of all our educations, the game that I was trying to explain with these wave diagrams. That life is not a conflict between opposites, but a polarity. The difference between a conflict and a polarity is simply—when you think about opposite things, we sometimes use the expression, 'These two things are the poles apart.' You say, for example, about someone with whom you totally disagree, 'I am the poles apart from this person.' But your very saying that gives the show away. Poles. Poles are the opposite ends of one magnet. And if you take a magnet, say you have a magnetized bar, there's a north pole and a south pole. Okay, chop off the south pole, move it away. The piece you've got left creates a new south

pole. You never get rid of the south pole. So the point about a magnet is, things may be the poles apart, but they go together. You can't have the one without the other. We are imagining a diagram of the universe in which the idea of polarity is the opposite ends of the diameter, north and south, you see? That's the basic idea of polarity, but what we're trying to imagine is the encounter of forces that come from absolutely opposed realms, that have nothing in common. When we say of two personality types that they're the poles apart. We are trying to think eccentrically, instead of concentrically. And so in this way, we haven't realized that life and death, black and white, good and evil, being and non-being, come from the same center. They imply each other, so that you wouldn't know the one without the other.

Now I'm not saying that that's bad, that's fun. You're playing the game that you don't know that black and white imply each other. Therefore you think that black possibly might win, that the light might go out, that the sound might never be heard again. That there could be the possibility of a universe of pure tragedy, of endless, endless darkness. Wouldn't that be awful? Only you wouldn't know it was awful, if that's what happened. The point that we all forget is that the black and the white go together, and there isn't the one without the other. At the same time, you see, we forget, in the same way as we forget that these two go together.

The other thing we forget, is that self and other go together, in just the same way as the two poles of a magnet. You say 'I, myself; I am me; I am this individual; I am this particular, unique instance.' What is other is everything else. All of you, all of the stars, all of the galaxies, way, way out into infinite space, that's other. But in the same way as black implies white, self implies other. And you don't exist without all that, so that where you get these polarities, you get this sort of difference, that what we call explicitly, or exoterically, they're different. But implicitly, esoterically, they're one. Since you can't have the one without the other, that shows there's a kind of inner conspiracy between all pairs of opposites, which is not in the open, but it's tacit. It's like you say 'Well, there are all sorts of things that we understand among each other tacitly, that we don't want to admit, but we do recognize tacitly there's a kind of secret between us boys and girls,' or whatever it may be. And we recognize that. So, tacitly, all of you really

inwardly know—although you won't admit it because your culture has trained you in a contrary direction—all of you really inwardly know that you as an individual self are inseparable from everything else that exists, that you are a special case in the universe. But the whole game, especially of Western culture, is to conceal that from ourselves, so that when anybody in our culture slips into the state of consciousness where they suddenly find this to be true, and they come on and say 'I'm God,' we say 'You're insane.'

Now, it's very difficult—you can very easily slip into the state of consciousness where you feel you're God; it can happen to anyone. Just in the same way as you can get the flu, or measles, or something like that, you can slip into this state of consciousness. And when you get it, it depends upon your background and your training as to how you're going to interpret it. If you've got the idea of god that comes from popular Christianity, God as the governor, the political head of the world, and you think you're God, then you say to everybody, 'You should bow down and worship me.' But if you're a member of Hindu culture, and you suddenly tell all your friends 'I'm God,' instead of saying 'You're insane,' they say 'Congratulations! At last, you found out.' Because their idea of god is not the autocratic governor. When they make images of Shiva, he has ten arms. How would you use ten arms? It's hard enough to use two. You know, if you play the organ, you've got to use your two feet and your two hands, and you play different rhythms with each member. It's kind of tricky. But actually we're all masters at this, because how do you grow each hair without having to think about it? Each nerve? How do you beat your heart and digest with your stomach at the same time? You don't have to think about it. In your very body, you are omnipotent in the true sense of omnipotence, which is that you are able to be omni-potent; you are able to do all these things without having to think about it.

When I was a child, I used to ask my mother all sorts of ridiculous questions, which of course every child asks, and when she got bored with my questions, she said 'Darling, there are just some things which we are not meant to know.' I said 'Will we ever know?' She said 'Yes, of course, when we die and go to heaven, God will make everything plain.' So I used to imagine on wet afternoons in heaven, we'd all sit around the throne of grace

and say to God, 'Well why did you do this, and why did you do that?' and he would explain it to us. 'Heavenly father, why are the leaves green?' and he would say 'Because of the chlorophyll,' and we'd say 'Oh.' But in the Hindu universe, you would say to God, 'How did you make the mountains?' and he would say 'Well, I just did it. Because when you're asking me how did I make the mountains, you're asking me to describe in words how I made the mountains, and there are no words which can do this. Words cannot tell you how I made the mountains any more than I can drink the ocean with a fork. A fork may be useful for sticking into a piece of something and eating it, but it's of no use for imbibing the ocean. It would take millions of years. In other words, it would take millions of years, and you would be bored with my description, long before I got through it, if I put it to you in words, because I didn't create the mountains with words, I just did it. Like you open and close your hand. You know how you do this, but can you describe in words how you do it? Even a very good physiologist can't describe it in words. But you do it. You're conscious, aren't you. Don't you know how you manage to be conscious? Do you know how you beat your heart? Can you say in words, explain correctly how this is done? You do it, but you can't put it into words, because words are too clumsy, yet you manage this expertly for as long as you're able to do it.'

But you see, we are playing a game. The game runs like this: the only thing you really know is what you can put into words. Let's suppose I love some girl, rapturously, and somebody says to me, 'Do you REALLY love her?' Well, how am I going to prove this? They'll say, 'Write poetry. Tell us all how much you love her. Then we'll believe you.' So if I'm an artist, and can put this into words, and can convince everybody I've written the most ecstatic love letter ever written, they say 'All right, ok, we admit it, you really do love her.' But supposing you're not very articulate, are we going to tell you you DON'T love her? Surely not. You don't have to be Heloise and Abyla to be in love. But the whole game that our culture is playing is that nothing really happens unless it's in the newspaper. So when we're at a party, and it's a great party, somebody says 'Too bad we didn't bring a camera. Too bad there wasn't a tape recorder. And so our children begin to feel that they don't exist authentically unless they get their names in the papers, and the fastest way to get your name in the paper is to commit a

crime. Then you'll be photographed, and you'll appear in court, and everybody will notice you. And you're THERE. So you're not there unless you're recorded. It really happened if it was recorded. In other words, if you shout, and it doesn't come back and echo, it didn't happen. Well that's a real hangup. It's true, the fun with echos; we all like singing in the bathtub, because there's more resonance there. And when we play a musical instrument, like a violin or a cello, it has a sounding box, because that gives resonance to the sound. And in the same way, the cortex of the human brain enables us when we're happy to know that we're happy, and that gives a certain resonance to it. If you're happy, and you don't know you're happy, there's nobody home.

But this is the whole problem for us. Several thousand years ago, human beings devolved the system of self-consciousness, and they knew, they knew.

There was a young man who said 'though

It seems that I know that I know,

What I would like to see

Is the I that sees me

When I know that I know that I know.'

And this is the human problem: we know that we know. And so, there came a point in our evolution where we didn't guide life by distrusting our instincts. Suppose that you could live absolutely spontaneously. You don't make any plans, you just live like you feel like it. And you say 'What a gas that is, I don't have to make any plans, anything. I don't worry; I just do what comes naturally.'

The way the animals live, everybody envies them, because look, a cat, when it walks—did you ever see a cat making an aesthetic mistake. Did you ever see a badly formed cloud? Were the stars ever misarranged? When you watch the foam breaking on the seashore, did it ever make a bad pattern? Never. And yet we think in what we do, we make mistakes. And we're

worried about that. So there came this point in human evolution when we lost our innocence. When we lost this thing that the cats and the flowers have, and had to think about it, and had to purposely arrange and discipline and push our lives around in accordance with foresight and words and systems of symbols, accountancy, calculation and so on, and then we worry. Once you start thinking about things, you worry as to if you thought enough. Did you really take all the details into consideration? Was every fact properly reviewed? And by jove, the more you think about it, the more you realize you really couldn't take everything into consideration, because all the variables in every decision are incalculable, so you get anxiety. And this, though, also, is the price you pay for knowing that you know. For being able to think about thinking, being able to feel about feeling. And so you're in this funny position.

Now then, do you see that this is simultaneously an advantage and a terrible disadvantage? What has happened here is that by having a certain kind of consciousness, a certain kind of reflexive consciousness—being aware of being aware. Being able to represent what goes on fundamentally in terms of a system of symbols, such as words, such as numbers. You put, as it were, two lives together at once, one representing the other. The symbols representing the reality, the money representing the wealth, and if you don't realize that the symbol is really secondary, it doesn't have the same value. People go to the supermarket, and they get a whole cartload of goodies and they drive it through, then the clerk fixes up the counter and this long tape comes out, and he'll say '\$30, please,' and everybody feels depressed, because they give away \$30 worth of paper, but they've got a cartload of goodies. They don't think about that, they think they've just lost \$30. But you've got the real wealth in the cart, all you've parted with is the paper. Because the paper in our system becomes more valuable than the wealth. It represents power, potentiality, whereas the wealth, you think oh well, that's just necessary; you've got to eat. That's to be really mixed up.

So then. If you awaken from this illusion, and you understand that black implies white, self implies other, life implies death—or shall I say, death implies life—you can conceive yourself. Not conceive, but FEEL yourself, not as a stranger in the world, not as someone here on sufferance, on probation, not as something that has arrived here by fluke, but you can

begin to feel your own existence as absolutely fundamental. What you are basically, deep, deep down, far, far in, is simply the fabric and structure of existence itself. So, say in Hindu mythology, they say that the world is the drama of God. God is not something in Hindu mythology with a white beard that sits on a throne, that has royal prerogatives. God in Indian mythology is the self, 'Satchitananda.' Which means 'sat,' that which is, 'chit,' that which is consciousness; that which is 'ananda' is bliss. In other words, what exists, reality itself is gorgeous, it is the fullness of total joy. Wowee! And all those stars, if you look out in the sky, is a firework display like you see on the fourth of July, which is a great occasion for celebration; the universe is a celebration, it is a fireworks show to celebrate that existence is. Wowee.

And then they say, 'But, however, there's no point in just sustaining bliss.' Let's suppose you were able, every night, to dream any dream you wanted to dream, and that you could for example have the power to dream in one night 75 years worth of time. Or any length of time you wanted to have. And you would, naturally, as you began on this adventure of dreams, fulfill all your wishes. You would have every kind of pleasure you could conceive. And after several nights of 75 years of total pleasure each, you would say 'Well, that was pretty great. But now let's have a surprise. Let's have a dream which isn't under control, where something is going to happen to me that I don't know what it's going to be.' And you would dig that, and come out of it and say 'That was a close shave, now wasn't it?' Then you would get more and more adventurous, and you would make further and further gambles as to what you would dream, and finally you would dream where you are now. You would dream the dream of the life that you are actually living today. That would be within the infinite multiplicity of the choices you would have. Of playing that you weren't God. Because the whole nature of the godhead, according to this idea, is to play that he's not. The first thing that he says to himself is 'Man, get lost,' because he gives himself away. The nature of love is self-abandonment, not clinging to oneself. Throwing yourself out, for instance as in basketball; you're always getting rid of the ball. You say to the other fellow 'Have a ball.' See? And that keeps things moving. That's the nature of life.

So in this idea, then, everybody is fundamentally the ultimate reality. Not God in a politically kingly sense, but God in the sense of being the self, the deep-down basic whatever there is. And you're all that, only you're pretending you're not. And it's perfectly OK to pretend you're not, to be perfectly convinced, because this is the whole notion of drama. When you come into the theater, there is an arch, and a stage, and down there is the audience. Everybody assumes their seats in the theater, gone to see a comedy, a tragedy, a thriller, whatever it is, and they all know as they come in and pay their admissions, that what is going to happen on the stage is not for real. But the actors have a conspiracy against this, because they're going to try and persuade the audience that what is happening on the stage IS for real. They want to get everybody sitting on the edge of their chairs, they want you terrified, or crying, or laughing. Absolutely captivated by the drama. And if a skillful human actor can take in an audience and make people cry, think what the cosmic actor can do. Why he can take himself in completely. He can play so much for real that he thinks he really is. Like you sitting in this room, you think you're really here. Well, you've persuaded yourself that way. You've acted it so damn well that you KNOW that this is the real world. But you're playing it. As well, the audience and the actor as one. Because behind the stage is the green room, offscene, where the actors take off their masks. Do you know that the word 'person' means 'mask'? The 'persona' which is the mask worn by actors in Greco-Roman drama, because it has a megaphone-type mouth which throws the sound out in an open-air theater. So the 'per'—through—'sona'—what the sound comes through—that's the mask. How to be a real person. How to be a genuine fake. So the 'dramatis persona' at the beginning of a play is the list of masks that the actors will wear. And so in the course of forgetting that this world is a drama, the word for the role, the word for the mask has come to mean who you are genuinely. The person. The proper person. Incidentally, the word 'parson' is derived from the word 'person.' The 'person' of the village. The 'person' around town, the parson.

So anyway, then, this is a drama, and what I want you to is— I'm not trying to sell you on this idea in the sense of converting you to it; I want you to play with it. I want you to think of its possibilities. I'm not trying to prove it, I'm just putting it forward as a possibility of life to think about. So then, this means that you're not victims of a scheme of things, of a mechanical

world, or of an autocratic god. The life you're living is what YOU have put yourself into. Only you don't admit it, because you want to play the game that it's happened to you. In other words, I got mixed up in this world; I had a father who got hot pants over a girl, and she was my mother, and because he was just a horny old man, and as a result of that, I got born, and I blame him for it and say 'Well that's your fault; you've got to look after me,' and he says 'I don't see why I should look after you; you're just a result.' But let's suppose we admit that I really wanted to get born, and that I WAS the ugly gleam in my father's eye when he approached my mother. That was me. I was desire. And I deliberately got involved in this thing. Look at it that way instead. And that really, even if I got myself into an awful mess, and I got born with syphilis, and the great Siberian itch, and tuberculosis in a Nazi concentration camp, nevertheless this was a game, which was a very far out play. It was a kind of cosmic masochism. But I did it.

Isn't that an optimal game rule for life? Because if you play life on the supposition that you're a helpless little puppet that got involved. Or you played on the supposition that it's a frightful, serious risk, and that we really ought to do something about it, and so on, it's a drag. There's no point in going on living unless we make the assumption that the situation of life is optimal. That really and truly we're all in a state of total bliss and delight, but we're going to pretend we aren't just for kicks. In other words, you play non-bliss in order to be able to experience bliss. And you can go as far out in non-bliss as you want to go. And when you wake up, it'll be great. You know, you can slam yourself on the head with a hammer because it's so nice when you stop. And it makes you realize how great things are when you forget that's the way it is. And that's just like black and white: you don't know black unless you know white; you don't know white unless you know black. This is simply fundamental.

So then, here's the drama. My metaphysics, let me be perfectly frank with you, are that there the central self, you can call it God, you can call it anything you like, and it's all of us. It's playing all the parts of all being whatsoever everywhere and anywhere. And it's playing the game of hide and seek with itself. It gets lost, it gets involved in the farthest-out adventures, but in the end it always wakes up and comes back to itself. And when you're ready to wake up, you're going to wake up, and if you're not

ready you're going to stay pretending that you're just a 'poor little me.' And since you're all here and engaged in this sort of enquiry and listening to this sort of lecture, I assume you're all in the process of waking up. Or else you're pleasing yourselves with some kind of flirtation with waking up which you're not serious about. But I assume that you are maybe not serious, but sincere, that you are ready to wake up.

So then, when you're in the way of waking up, and finding out who you are, you meet a character called a guru, as the Hindus say 'the teacher,' 'the awakener.' And what is the function of a guru? He's the man that looks you in the eye and says 'Oh come off it. I know who you are.' You come to the guru and say 'Sir, I have a problem. I'm unhappy, and I want to get one up on the universe. I want to become enlightened. I want spiritual wisdom.' The guru looks at you and says 'Who are you?' You know Sri-Ramana-Maharshi, that great Hindu sage of modern times? People used to come to him and say 'Master, who was I in my last incarnation?' As if that mattered. And he would say 'Who is asking the question?' And he'd look at you and say, go right down to it, 'You're looking at me, you're looking out, and you're unaware of what's behind your eyes. Go back in and find out who you are, where the question comes from, why you ask.' And if you've looked at a photograph of that man—I have a gorgeous photograph of him; I look by it every time I go out the front door. And I look at those eyes, and the humor in them; the lilting laugh that says 'Oh come off it. Shiva, I recognize you. When you come to my door and say 'I'm so-and-so,' I say 'Ha-ha, what a funny way God has come on today.'"

So eventually—there are all sorts of tricks of course that gurus play. They say 'Well, we're going to put you through the mill.' And the reason they do that is simply that you won't wake up until you feel you've paid a price for it. In other words, the sense of guilt that one has. Or the sense of anxiety. It's simply the way one experiences keeping the game of disguise going on. Do you see that? Supposing you say 'I feel guilty.' Christianity makes you feel guilty for existing. That somehow the very fact that you exist is an affront. You are a fallen human being. I remember as a child when we went to the serves of the church on Good Friday. They gave us each a colored postcard with Jesus crucified on it, and it said underneath 'This I have done for thee. What doest thou for me?' You felt awful. YOU had nailed that

man to the cross. Because you eat steak, you have crucified Christ. Mythra. It's the same mystery. And what are you going to do about that? 'This I have done for thee, what doest thou for me?' You feel awful that you exist at all. But that sense of guilt is the veil across the sanctuary. 'Don't you DARE come in!' In all mysteries, when you are going to be initiated, there's somebody saying 'Ah-ah-ah, don't you come in. You've got to fulfill this requirement and that requirement, THEN we'll let you in.' And so you go through the mill. Why? Because you're saying to yourself 'I won't wake up until I deserve it. I won't wake up until I've made it difficult for me to wake up. So I invent for myself an elaborate system of delaying my waking up. I put myself through this test and that test, and when I convince myself it's sufficiently arduous, THEN I at last admit to myself who I really am, and draw aside the veil and realize that after all, when all is said and done, I am that I am, which is the name of god.'

And when it comes to that's really rather funny they say in Zen when you attain Satori nothing is left to you at that moment but to have a good laugh. But naturally all masters, Zen masters, yoga masters, every kind of master, puts up a barrier... and says to you, he simply plays your own game. You know we say anybody who goes to a psychiatrist ought to have his head examined. Because you when you go to a psychiatrist, you define yourself as somebody who ought to have his head examined. Same way, the Zen masters say anybody who studies Zen or comes to a Zen master ought to be given thirty blows of the stick. Because he was stupid enough to pose the question that he had a problem. But you're the problem. You put yourself in this situation. So it's a question fundamentally do you define yourself as a victim of the world or as the world? You can define yourself, you see, if you if you identify you with what you call the voluntary system of the nerves and say "only that's me" and that's really a rather limited amount of my total performance, what I do voluntarily. Then you've designed yourself as the victim in the game. And so you are able to feel that life was a trap, something else whether it was God or whether it was fate or whether it was the big mechanism the system, imposed this on you. And you can say "poor little me." But you can equally well and with just as much as justification define yourself not only as what you do voluntarily but also what you do involuntarily that's you too- do you beat your heart or don't you? Or does it just happen to you? And if you define yourself as the works then nobody's

imposing on you. You're not a victim, you're doing it. Of course you can't explain how you do it in words, because words are too clumsy. And it'd take too long to say, you'd get bored with it. But actually, then you can say, with gusto: "I am responsible, for this life, whether comedy or tragedy. I did it." And it seems to me that that is a basis for behavior and going on which is more fundamentally joyous and profitable and great than defining ourselves as miserable victims, or sinners, or what have you.

In last night's session, I was discussing an alternative myth to the Ceramic and Fully Automatic models of the universe, I'll call the Dramatic Myth. The idea that life as we experience it is a big act, and that behind this big act is the player, and the player, or the self, as it's called in Hindu philosophy, the Atman, is you. Only you are playing hide and seek, since that is the essential game that is going on. The game of games. The basis of all games, hide and seek. And since you're playing hide & seek, you are deliberately, although you can't admit this—or won't admit it—you are deliberately forgetting who you really are, or what you really are. And the knowledge that your essential self is the foundation of the universe, the 'ground of being' as Tillich calls it, is something you have that the Germans call a hintengedanken. A hintengedanen is a thought way, way, way in the back of your mind. Something that you know deep down but can't admit.

So, in a way, then, in order to bring this to the front, in order to know that is the case, you have to be kidded out of your game. And so what I want to discuss this morning is how this happens. Although before doing so, I must go a little bit further into the whole nature of this problem.

You see, the problem is this. We identify in our experience a differentiation between what we do and what happens to us. We have a certain number of actions that we define as voluntary, and we feel in control of those. And then over against that, there is all those things that are involuntary. But the dividing line between these two is very inarbitrary. Because for example, when you move your hand, you feel that you decide whether to open it or to close it. But then ask yourself how do you decide? When you decide to open your hand, do you first decide to decide? You don't, do you? You just decide, and how do you do that? And if you don't know how to do it, is it voluntary or involuntary? Let's consider breathing. You can feel that you

breath deliberately; you don't control your breath. But when you don't think about it, it goes on. Is it voluntary or involuntary?

So, we come to have a very arbitrary definition of self. That much of my activity which I feel I do. And that then doesn't include breathing most of the time; it doesn't include the heartbeats; it doesn't include the activity of the glands; it doesn't include digestion; it doesn't include how you shape your bones; circulate your blood. Do you or do you not do these things? Now if you get with yourself and you find out you are all of yourself, a very strange thing happens. You find out that your body knows that you are one with the universe. In other words, the so-called involuntary circulation of your blood is one continuous process with the stars shining. If you find out it's YOU who circulates your blood, you will at the same moment find out that you are shining the sun. Because your physical organism is one continuous process with everything else that's going on. Just as the waves are continuous with the ocean. Your body is continuous with the total energy system of the cosmos, and it's all you. Only you're playing the game that you're only this bit of it. But as I tried to explain, there are in physical reality no such thing as separate events.

So then. Remember also when I tried to work towards a definition of omnipotence. Omnipotence is not knowing how everything is done; it's just doing it. You don't have to translate it into language. Supposing that when you got up in the morning, you had to switch your brain on. And you had to think and do as a deliberate process waking up all the circuits that you need for active life during the day. Why, you'd never get done! Because you have to do all those things at once. That's why the Buddhists and Hindus represent their gods as many-armed. How could you use so many arms at once? How could a centipede control a hundred legs at once? Because it doesn't think about it. In the same way, you are unconsciously performing all the various activities of your organism. Only unconsciously isn't a good word, because it sounds sort of dead. Superconsciously would be better. Give it a plus rather than a minus.

Because what consciousness is is a rather specialized form of awareness. When you look around the room, you are conscious of as much as you can notice, and you see an enormous number of things which you do not notice.

For example, I look at a girl here and somebody asks me later ‘What was she wearing?’ I may not know, although I’ve seen, because I didn’t attend. But I was aware. You see? And perhaps if I could under hypnosis be asked this question, where I would get my conscious attention out of the way by being in the hypnotic state, I could recall what dress she was wearing.

So then, just in the same way as you don’t know—you don’t focus your attention—on how you make your thyroid gland function, so in the same way, you don’t have any attention focused on how you shine the sun. So then, let me connect this with the problem of birth and death, which puzzles people enormously of course. Because, in order to understand what the self is, you have to remember that it doesn’t need to remember anything, just as you don’t need to know how you work your thyroid gland.

So then, when you die, you’re not going to have to put up with everlasting non-existence, because that’s not an experience. A lot of people are afraid that when they die, they’re going to be locked up in a dark room forever, and sort of undergo that. But one of the interesting things in the world is—this is a yoga, this is a realization—try and imagine what it will be like to go to sleep and never wake up. Think about that. Children think about it. It’s one of the great wonders of life. What will it be like to go to sleep and never wake up? And if you think long enough about that, something will happen to you. You will find out, among other things, it will pose the next question to you. What was it like to wake up after having never gone to sleep? That was when you were born. You see, you can’t have an experience of nothing; nature abhors a vacuum. So after you’re dead, the only thing that can happen is the same experience, or the same sort of experience as when you were born. In other words, we all know very well that after other people die, other people are born. And they’re all you, only you can only experience it one at a time. Everybody is I, you all know you’re you, and wheresoever all being exist throughout all galaxies, it doesn’t make any difference. You are all of them. And when they come into being, that’s you coming into being.

You know that very well, only you don’t have to remember the past in the same way you don’t have to think about how you work your thyroid gland, or whatever else it is in your organism. You don’t have to know how to

shine the sun. You just do it, like you breath. Doesn't it really astonish you that you are this fantastically complex thing, and that you're doing all this and you never had any education in how to do it? Never learned, but you're this miracle? The point of it is, from a strictly physical, scientific standpoint, this organism is a continuous energy with everything else that's going on. And if I am my foot, I am the sun. Only we've got this little partial view. We've got the idea that 'No, I'm something IN this body.' The ego. That's a joke. The ego is nothing other than the focus of conscious attention. It's like the radar on a ship. The radar on a ship is a troubleshooter. Is there anything in the way? And conscious attention is a designed function of the brain to scan the environment, like a radar does, and note for any troublemaking changes. But if you identify yourself with your troubleshooter, then naturally you define yourself as being in a perpetual state of anxiety. And the moment we cease to identify with the ego and become aware that we are the whole organism, we realize first thing how harmonious it all is. Because your organism is a miracle of harmony. All these things functioning together. Even those creatures that are fighting each other in the blood stream and eating each other up. If they weren't doing that, you wouldn't be healthy.

So what is discord at one level of your being is harmony at another level. And you begin to realize that, and you begin to be aware too, that the discords of your life and the discords of people's lives, which are a discord at one level, at a higher level of the universe are healthy and harmonious. And you suddenly realize that everything you are and do is at that level as magnificent and as free of any blemish as the patterns in waves. The markings in marble. The way a cat moves. And that this world is really OK. Can't be anything else, because otherwise it couldn't exist. And I don't mean this in a kind of Pollyanna Christian Science sense. I don't know what it is or why it is about Christian Science, but it's prissy. It's got kind of a funny feeling to it; came from New England.

But the reality underneath physical existence, or which really is physical existence—because in my philosophy there is no difference between the physical and the spiritual. These are absolutely out-of-date catagories. It's all process; it isn't 'stuff' on the one hand and 'form' on the other. It's just pattern— life is pattern. It is a dance of energy. And so I will never invoke

spooky knowledge. That is, that I've had a private revelation or that I have sensory vibrations going on a plane which you don't have. Everything is standing right out in the open, it's just a question of how you look at it. So you do discover when you realize this, the most extraordinary thing that I never cease to be flabbergasted at whenever it happens to me. Some people will use a symbolism of the relationship of God to the universe, wherein God is a brilliant light, only somehow veiled, hiding underneath all these forms as you look around you. So far so good. But the truth is funnier than that. It is that you are looking right at the brilliant light now that the experience you are having that you call ordinary everyday consciousness—pretending you're not it—that experience is exactly the same thing as 'it.' There's no difference at all. And when you find that out, you laugh yourself silly. That's the great discovery.

In other words, when you really start to see things, and you look at an old paper cup, and you go into the nature of what it is to see what vision is, or what smell is, or what touch is, you realize that that vision of the paper cup is the brilliant light of the cosmos. Nothing could be brighter. Ten thousand suns couldn't be brighter. Only they're hidden in the sense that all the points of the infinite light are so tiny when you see them in the cup they don't blow your eyes out. See, the source of all light is in the eye. If there were no eyes in this world, the sun would not be light. So if I hit as hard as I can on a drum which has no skin, it makes no noise. So if a sun shines on a world with no eyes, it's like a hand beating on a skinless drum. No light. YOU evoke light out of the universe, in the same way you, by nature of having a soft skin, evoke hardness out of wood. Wood is only hard in relation to a soft skin. It's your eardrum that evokes noise out of the air. You, by being this organism, call into being this whole universe of light and color and hardness and heaviness and everything.

But in the mythology that we sold ourselves on at the end of the 19th century, when people discovered how big the universe was, and that we live on a little planet in a solar system on the edge of the galaxy, which is a minor galaxy, everybody thought, 'Uuuuugh, we're really unimportant after all. God isn't there and doesn't love us, and nature doesn't give a damn.' And we put ourselves down. But actually, it's this funny little microbe, tiny thing, crawling on this little planet that's way out somewhere, who has the

ingenuity, by nature of this magnificent organic structure, to evoke the whole universe out of what otherwise would be mere quanta. There's jazz going on. But you see, this ingenious little organism is not merely some stranger in this. This little organism, on this little planet, is what the whole show is growing there, and so realizing it's own presence. Does it through you, and you're it.

When you put a chicken's beak on a chalk line, it gets stuck; it's hypnotized. So in the same way, when you learn to pay attention, and as children you know how all the teachers were in class: 'Pay attention!!' And all the kids stare at the teacher. And we've got to pay attention. That's putting your nose on the chalk line. And you got stuck with the idea of attention, and you thought attention was Me, the ego, attention. So if you start attending to attention, you realize what the hoax is. That's why in Aldous Huxley's book 'Island,' the Roger had trained the myna birds on the island to say 'Attention! Here and now, boys!' See? Realize who you are. Come to, wake up!

Well, here's the problem: if this is the state of affairs which is so, and if the conscious state you're in this moment is the same thing as what we might call the Divine State. If you do anything to make it different, it shows that you don't understand that it's so. So the moment you start practicing yoga, or praying or meditating, or indulging in some sort of spiritual cultivation, you are getting in your own way.

Now this is the Buddhist trick: the buddha said 'We suffer because we desire. If you can give up desire, you won't suffer.' But he didn't say that as the last word; he said that as the opening step of a dialogue. Because if you say that to someone, they're going to come back after a while and say 'Yes, but now I'm desiring not to desire.' And so the buddha will answer, 'Well at last you're beginning to understand the point.' Because you can't give up desire. Why would you try to do that? It's already desire. So in the same way you say 'You ought to be unselfish' or to give up you ego. Let go, relax. Why do you want to do that? Just because it's another way of beating the game, isn't it? The moment you hypothesize that you are different from the universe, you want to get one up on it. But if you try to get one up on the universe, and you're in competition with it, that means you don't

understand you ARE it. You think there's a real difference between 'self' and 'other.' But 'self,' what you call yourself, and what you call 'other' are mutually necessary to each other like back and front. They're really one. But just as a magnet polarizes itself at north and south, but it's all one magnet, so experience polarizes itself as self and other, but it's all one. If you try to make the south pole defeat the north pole, or get the mastery of it, you show you don't know what's going on.

So there are two ways of playing the game. The first way, which is the usual way, is that a guru or teacher who wants to get this across to somebody because he knows it himself, and when you know it you'd like others to see it, too. So what he does is, he gets you into being ridiculous harder and more assiduously than usual. In other words, if you are in a contest with the universe, he's going to stir up that contest until it becomes ridiculous. And so he sets you such tasks as saying— Now of course, in order to be a true person, you must give up yourself, be unselfish. So the lord steps down out of heaven and says 'The first and great commandment is `Thou shalt love the lord thy god.' You must love me.' Well that's a double-bind. You can't love on purpose. You can't be sincere purposely. It's like trying not to think of a green elephant while taking medicine.

But if a person really tries to do it—and this is the way Christianity is rigged—you should be very sorry for your sins. And though everybody knows they're not, but they think they ought to be, they go around trying to be penitent. Or trying to be humble. And they know the more assiduously they practice it, the phonier and phonier the whole thing gets. So in Zen Buddhism, exactly the same thing happens. The Zen master challenges you to be spontaneous. 'Show me the real you.' One way they do this getting you to shout. Shout the word 'moo.' And he says 'I want to hear YOU in that shout. I want to hear your whole being in it.' And you yell your lungs out and he says 'Pfft. That's no good. That's just a fake shout. Now I want to hear absolutely the whole of your being, right from the heart of the universe, come through in this shout.' And these guys scream themselves hoarse. Nothing happens. Until one day they get so desperate they give up trying and they manage to get that shout through, when they weren't trying to be genuine. Because there was nothing else to do, you just had to yell.

And so in this way—it's called the technique of *reductio ad absurdum*. If you think you have a problem, and you're an ego and you're in difficulty, the answer the Zen master makes to you is 'Show me your ego. I want to see this thing that has a problem.' When Bodhidharma, the legendary founder of Zen, came to China, a disciple came to him and said 'I have no peace of mind. Please pacify my mind.' And Bodhidharma said 'Bring out your mind here before me and I'll pacify it.' 'Well,' he said, 'when I look for it, I can't find it.' So Bodhidharma said 'There, it's pacified.' See? Because when you look for your own mind, that is to say, your own particularized center of being which is separate from everything else, you won't be able to find it. But the only way you'll know it isn't there is if you look for it hard enough, to find out that it isn't there. And so everybody says 'All right, know yourself, look within, find out who you are.' Because the harder you look, you won't be able to find it, and then you'll realize it isn't there at all. There isn't a separate you. Your mind is what there is. Everything. But the only way to find that out is to persist in the state of delusion as hard as possible. That's one way. I haven't said the only way, but it is one way.

So almost all spiritual disciplines, meditations, prayers, etc, etc, are ways of persisting in folly. Doing resolutely and consistently what you're doing already. So if a person believes that the Earth is flat, you can't talk him out of that. He knows it's flat. Look out the window and see; it's obvious, it looks flat. So the only way to convince him it isn't is to say 'Well let's go and find the edge.' And in order to find the edge, you've got to be very careful not to walk in circles, you'll never find it that way. So we've got to go consistently in a straight line due west along the same line of latitude, and eventually when we get back to where we started from, you've convinced the guy that the world is round. That's the only way that will teach him. Because people can't be talked out of illusions.

There is another possibility, however. But this is more difficult to describe. Let's say we take as the basic supposition—-which is the thing that one sees in the experience of *satori* or awakening, or whatever you want to call it—that this now moment in which I'm talking and you're listening, is eternity. That although we have somehow conned ourselves into the notion that this moment is ordinary, and that we may not feel very well, we're sort of vaguely frustrated and worried and so on, and that it ought to be changed.

This is it. So you don't need to do anything at all. But the difficulty about explaining that is that you mustn't try and not do anything, because that's doing something. It's just the way it is. In other words, what's required is a sort of act of super relaxation; it's not ordinary relaxation. It's not just letting go, as when you lie down on the floor and imagine that you're heavy so you get into a state of muscular relaxation. It's not like that. It's being with yourself as you are without altering anything. And how to explain that? Because there's nothing to explain. It is the way it is now. See? And if you understand that, it will automatically wake you up.

So that's why Zen teachers use shock treatment, to sometimes hit them or shout at them or create a sudden surprise. Because it is that jolt that suddenly brings you here. See, there's no road to here, because you're already there. If you ask me 'How am I going to get here?' It will be like the famous story of the American tourist in England. The tourist asked some yokel the way to Upper Tuddenham, a little village. And the yokel scratched his head and he said 'Well, sir, I don't know where it is, but if I were you, I wouldn't start from here.'

So you see, when you ask 'How do I obtain the knowledge of God, how do I obtain the knowledge of liberation?' all I can say is it's the wrong question. Why do you want to obtain it? Because the very fact that you're wanting to obtain it is the only thing that prevents you from getting there. You already have it. But of course, it's up to you. It's your privilege to pretend that you don't. That's your game; that's your life game; that's what makes you think you're an ego. And when you want to wake up, you will, just like that. If you're not awake, it shows you don't want to. You're still playing the hide part of the game. You're still, as it were, the self pretending it's not the self. And that's what you want to do. So you see, in that way, too, you're already there.

So when you understand this, a funny thing happens, and some people misinterpret it. You'll discover as this happens that the distinction between voluntary and involuntary behavior disappears. You will realize that what you describe as things under your own will feel exactly the same as things going on outside you. You watch other people moving, and you know you're doing that, just like you're breathing or circulating your blood. And

if you don't understand what's going on, you're liable to get crazy at this point, and to feel that you are god in the Jehovah sense. To say that you actually have power over other people, so that you can alter what you're doing. And that you're omnipotent in a very crude, literal kind of bible sense. You see? A lot of people feel that and they go crazy. They put them away. They think they're Jesus Christ and that everybody ought to fall down and worship them. That's only they got their wires crossed. This experience happened to them, but they don't know how to interpret it. So be careful of that. Jung calls it inflation. People who get the Holy Man syndrome, that I suddenly discover that I am the lord and that I am above good and evil and so on, and therefore I start giving myself airs and graces. But the point is, everybody else is, too. If you discover that you are that, then you ought to know that everybody else is.

For example, let's see in other ways how you might realize this. Most people think when they open their eyes and look around, that what they're seeing is outside. It seems, doesn't it, that you are behind your eyes, and that behind the eyes there is a blank you can't see at all. You turn around and there's something else in front of you. But behind the eyes there seems to be something that has no color. It isn't dark, is isn't light. It is there from a tactile standpoint; you can feel it with your fingers, but you can't get inside it. But what is that behind your eyes? Well actually, when you look out there and see all these people and things sitting around, that's how it feels inside your head. The color of this room is back here in the nervous system, where the optical nerves are at the back of the head. It's in there. It's what you're experiencing. What you see out here is a neurological experience. Now if that hits you, and you feel sensuously that that's so, you may feel therefore that the external world is all inside my skull. You've got to correct that, with the thought that your skull is also in the external world. So you suddenly begin to feel 'Wow, what kind of situation is this? It's inside me, and I'm inside it, and it's inside me, and I'm inside it.' But that's the way it is.

This is the what you could call transaction, rather than interaction between the individual and the world. Just like, for example, in buying and selling. There cannot be an act of buying unless there is simultaneously an act of selling, and vice versa. So the relationship between the environment and the

organism is transactional. The environment grows the organism, and in turn the organism creates the environment. The organism turns the sun into light, but it requires there be an environment containing a sun for there to be an organism at all. And the answer to it simply is they're all one process. It isn't that organisms by chance came into the world. This world is the sort of environment which grows organisms. It was that way from the beginning. The organisms may in time have arrived in the scene or out of the scene later than the beginning of the scene, but from the moment it went BANG! in the beginning, if that's the way it started, organisms like us are sitting here. We're involved in it.

Look here, we take the propagation of an electric current. I can have an electric current running through a wire that goes all the way around the Earth. And here we have a power source, and here we have a switch. A positive pole, a negative pole. Now, before that switch closes, the current doesn't exactly behave like water in a pipe. There isn't current here, waiting, to jump the gap as soon as the switch is closed. The current doesn't even start until the switch is closed. It never starts unless the point of arrival is there. Now, it'll take an interval for that current to get going in its circuit if it's going all the way around the Earth. It's a long run. But the finishing point has to be closed before it will even start from the beginning. In a similar way, even though in the development of any physical system there may be billions of years between the creation of the most primitive form of energy and then the arrival of intelligent life, that billions of years is just the same thing as the trip of that current around the wire. Takes a bit of time. But it's already implied. It takes time for an acorn to turn into an oak, but the oak is already implied in the acorn. And so in any lump of rock floating about in space, there is implicit human intelligence. Sometime, somehow, somewhere. They all go together.

So don't differentiate yourself and stand off and say 'I am a living organism in a world made of a lot of dead junk, rocks and stuff.' It all goes together. Those rocks are just as much you as your fingernails. You need rocks. What are you going to stand on?

What I think an awakening really involves is a re-examination of our common sense. We've got all sorts of ideas built into us which seem

unquestioned, obvious. And our speech reflects them; its commonest phrases. 'Face the facts.' As if they were outside you. As if life were something they simply encountered as a foreigner. 'Face the facts.' Our common sense has been rigged, you see? So that we feel strangers and aliens in this world, and this is terribly plausible, simply because this is what we are used to. That's the only reason. But when you really start questioning this, say 'Is that the way I have to assume life is? I know everybody does, but does that make it true?' It doesn't necessarily. It ain't necessarily so. So then as you question this basic assumption that underlies our culture, you find you get a new kind of common sense. It becomes absolutely obvious to you that you are continuous with the universe.

For example, people used to believe that planets were supported in the sky by being imbedded in crystal spheres, and everybody knew that. Why, you could see the crystal spheres there because you could look right through them. It was obviously made of crystal, and something had to keep them up there. And then when the astronomers suggested that there weren't any crystal spheres, people got terrified, because then they thought the stars would fall down. Nowadays, it doesn't bother anybody. They thought, too, when they found out the Earth was spherical, people who lived in the antiquities would fall off, and that was scary. But then somebody sailed around the world, and we all got used to it, we travel around in jet planes and everything. We have no problem feeling that the Earth is globular. None whatever. We got used to it.

So in the same way Einstein's relativity theories—the curvature of the propagation of light, the idea that time gets older as light moves away from a source, in other words, people looking at the world now on Mars, they would be seeing the state of the world a little earlier than we are now experiencing it. That began to bother people when Einstein started talking about that. But now we're all used to it, and relativity and things like that are a matter of common sense today. Well, in a few years, it will be a matter of commonsense to many people that they're one with the universe. It'll be so simple. And then maybe if that happens, we shall be in a position to handle our technology with more sense. With love instead of with hate for our environment.

Education for Nonentity

Throughout Asia and Europe, Americans have the undeserved reputation of the most materialistic civilization that ever existed. The undeserved reputation, because never was their culture so completely unmaterialistic. I define a materialist as a person who loves material, and who reverences it, and who delights in using it to its best advantage. And if you will examine the system of education which most of our children are compelled to pass, you will discover that it imparts no knowledge whatsoever of any kind of materialistic competence. Our education is exclusively bookish, and is designed on the whole to train people to be bureaucrats, bankers clerks, insurance salesman, teachers, and we hope intellectuals. It is a curious thing but in its weak moments, it admits that there are a lot of people going through the scheme who really never qualify for graduate school. Or for college. And for these it must provide rather regretfully some courses which train them for other things. It's always a joke among Europeans that in American colleges you can take get an A.B. you can get credits towards an AB for courses in basket-weaving. And this isn't really so funny as it looks, because when it is the ideal that sort of everyone should go through college if possible. You have to adjust to facts. You can't have a nation, you can have a society, in which everyone is always occupied in intellectual and computational pursuits. A few people have to be around who know how to handle the material world in a gracious way. And for these people we provide only regretfully, as an afterthought. The people who might otherwise be dropouts in high school. Should be given some courses which would prepare them for trades in carpentry, metallurgy, even perhaps auto mechanics. Furniture makers. Cooks. And so on.

But as a rule because these kinds of education in the academic world are provided only with regret. They are provided in the slovenly fashion. We do not, we simply do not relate to the material world. And we are increasing lacking, in any kind of competence, in handling physical matter, except in such far out cases as people who make jet aircraft, and certain very sophisticated types of scientific instruments, where it is absolutely necessary that there be the highest degree of mastery. Aside from that, because of the lack of material competence, it is simply astonishing that the

wealthiest nation on earth, simply does not know how to enjoy itself. In a material and obvious way.

Now, you would think, if you were just an ordinary kind of horse-sense kind of person, that the richest nation on earth, would have a whale of a good time. Even though doing a factory job, that when the hours of work are over, that people would go home, with all the money that they earn, which makes them princes, by comparison with the Indians and Chinese. That they would go home to fantastic banquets, marvelous orgies, and riotous pleasure all the night through. It would just simply be common sense to people who do not suffer from the Protestant Ethic. But in fact, what happens is this. That we've got life strictly divided into two categories: work and play. Whack on the home is something that you do. To get money paid to do it because so much work is so deplorably boring that nobody wants to do it so they'll pay someone else to do it instead. So while you do it you watch the clock. You put in your hours, and then you get money for having done it, and then you're supposed to go home and enjoy yourself and have fun. Well what do you do? You get home, and instead of having fun, the main thing is to watch T.V.. And to me is an electronic reproduction of existence, which is cut off from you by a glass wall. It has no smell. If you're very rich, it has color. But you are as in a zoo, where you look at something beyond the bar, it says Do not touch. You cannot touch it you cannot mingle with it, you merely witness it in a passive way, and while you do this, you are served a TV dinner, which is something that was originally animal and vegetable, that has been frozen so as to deprive it of almost any taste at all. And it has been warmed over, and you eat it, not because you enjoy eating it but because it's good for you. It enables you to continue living, because it has been carefully studied and it has it exactly the right amount of calories, carbohydrates and vitamins and many of such preparations are served. You can take the scientific formula that's the thing for you which it contains. It tastes of nothing whatsoever and you while you watch this show going on. You may wash it down with a soft drink, its vaguely alcoholic, called beer. And in the meantime you're absorbed by the spectacle going on in front of you in which you do not participate. And it goes on long enough to be tired enough to go to sleep. This is supposed to be a life of pleasure.

Generally speaking we really are not materialistic all. We don't love material. We hate it. And we are devoted to the cause of converting it as fast as possible into junk and poison gas. We are not people who love time, which is one of the measurements of material, and space, which is another we want to abolish it. We want to get as fast as possible from one place to another to get rid of space and to get rid of time. And the result of this is of course, that as we get rid of space and time as we make all places almost immediately accessible by jet aircraft, all places become the same place. So naturally, the tourist is beguiled into taking a holiday in, somewhere else. The palm tree and so on. They'll make it like. That of course it isn't. Honolulu is the same place as Koney Island. Atlantic City. Tokyo just the same. It is simply an extension of Los Angeles one of the suburbs. Because the faster you can get from place to place, the more you have conquered the limitations of time and space everywhere is the same place. So. The Differences between people, the things that we want to see when we go to foreign places are increasingly. Except something provided enough for the entertainment of tourists to deceive them into the idea that they really did get somewhere else.

You look at another aspect of this. One of the basic things about material existence is of course eating food. And as I just indicated. In the case of the TV dinner, we eat food that is good for us. You know, it's always said that the French eat with gusto but the British eat apologetically. And we've inherited the British tradition. We eat in a way...it's rather animal to eat. It's a little vulgar that you have to stick it down into your stomach and it passes through your chest and intestines, and so on that's. It means after all that you're an animal, and not simply an angel. And therefore, there should be a good reason for the vulgar act, and the good reason is that it's healthy. And therefore when you, really, ideally, it should all be concentrated into a pill so that you wouldn't have to waste time valuable time over me but taking the necessary ingredients for a rather shameful fact that we have to exist in physical bodies, and get rid of it.

And so therefore, when you study in general the art of cooking in the United States, from coast to coast, it is pretty poor. It is not something that has done out of love, but something that is done out of. And so, we are great adepts in what I will call eating the menu instead of the dinner. The dinner

itself is thrown together you know, it's simply a job. All sorts of people have a certain amount of professional training cook, not because they like cooking but because it's a job through which you can make money. Money which is perfectly abstract and inedible. This is a fallacy you see, this division between work and play, that anybody who regards being a cook in a restaurant, which is something which is simply a job that you have to do you know to make money and therefore can go out and have fun in something else besides cooking has been absolutely deluded. He has been persuaded to spend a very substantial part of his life doing something which he hates doing in order that he may earn the wherewithal to do what is really fun later on. And this, insofar as our education is oriented towards. Training people for jobs. This is the colossal fallacy. The only jobs working at, are those which you thoroughly enjoy. And it is possible to enjoy sorrily say in a restaurant. You are allowed to take delight in it, and to reverence the fishm the flour, the vegetables, the fruit, which are provided for you to work with.

But as things stand what happens is exactly the reverse. You go into a restaurant, which probably has colored photographs on it. And it says something like this. Filet of Colorado Mountain Trout. Fried to a delicate golden brown in bread crumbs. Garnished with fresh garden peas. French fried potato wedge. The last time I encountered this, it was a restaurant where they had the nerve to keep an open kitchen. And when I saw the so-called filet of Colorado Mountain Trout. Incidentally this was in Wyoming. It was a severe rectangle of some off-white substance, which rattle when it hit the griddle.

You know, the whole thing was completely mechanical, because there was in this process absolutely no love for the work itself. The cook in other words was wasting his precious time in life by going through the motions of being in order to get money for enjoyment. Now, the thing that has to be understood fundamentally in the process of education for life. Money is an abstraction. It cannot of itself by any pleasure whatsoever. Because all pleasures involves skill and love. Enough love to discipline yourself to enjoy the pleasure. I live in, as I told you in the introduction, in Sausalito, which is a lovely waterfront town north of San Francisco. We have a law. With pleasure craft. Sailing boats, motor cruisers, which for the most part

nobody ever except cocktail party. People go out because sailing is a difficult craft. These boats were advertised as something you want to have to enjoy yourself, but when you got them couldn't enjoy yourself unless you knew how to sail have time to do that because you were so busy making money. So all these boats stand around, and nobody really enjoys them at all. Because they won't take the trouble. Having been persuaded that money is wealth.

Taken another case of this delusion. You can make a lot of money say, in the grocery business, by turning out shoddy products in excellent packages. You cheat on the weight and you cheat on the quality. You make more and more money. Fine, but when you've got it what are you going to buy with it? Other people's shoddy products. We have cars with built-in obsolescence which are nothing but toy rocket ships. We have, as I said, various kinds of foodstuffs, which are increasingly lacking. We have houses which are made of ticky tacky. We have entertainment in which there is no participation. You're not allowed to join, you just watch.

We are busily fouling our own nest. Have you smelt the air today in this town? It all smells of some kind of funny acid . And these is supposed to be people who are rich and wealthy and know how to enjoy themselves. It's a farce. And to some extent, the reason for this farce is the whole education process.

I want to look at this, but I want to look at it from the standpoint of bringing up children in this culture and the whole structure and nature of the family. That's where that's where the puzzle begins. Have you noticed that over many years, a large number of the jokes in most of our popular magazines where they print cartoons, have to do with father as a clown. Take Dagwood in the comic strip. The incompetence of dad, who is always some kind of a idiot. Whereas mom has to handle the real problems in the family and is therefore the realist in the picture. Dad is a clown. Why?

Because he goes away to a mysterious place called the office factory. In which the family as such have no part and. He brings back a thing called money and they want to see that. Now you can get it. Just so long as you bring it back because they're not interested in what you do. When you come back from the various rat races in which you are engaged making money,

you're supposed to be a good pal to the children, play with them. Off to your wife and appreciate what she's done. They have no interest in what you do. They couldn't care less. And furthermore, you as a father. You as a mother. Are expected to live for your children. Americans have a sense of guilt because they have not done right by their children trying to do right by their children. They always family haven't quite succeeded somehow. We are child centered families, constantly feeling guilty because we haven't brought them up. Now for we call in every kind of specialist an expert in the Pfizer to tell us what we should do with our children. The difficulty is that the family as an institution is not surviving in industrial culture it is an institution designed for an agrarian.

The family was built around the farm, where the children worked on the phone and understood and were brought up into the interest of the small shop or the workshop, such as you find in an agrarian culture. It's fascinating to notice today the transition from agrarian to industrial culture in a country like Japan where it's been extremely rapid. Let's take the craft of carpentry in Japan. The Japanese have been some of the best carpenters in the world, absolutely marvelous, knowing how to make the most complex joinery constructions without even using a blueprint, doing it by feel and by eye. In order to train a person to do this kind of carpentry he has to begin to learn when he's seven years old. But as it is now, because Japan is transferred to being an industrial culture you may not bring up your child in your profession as a carpenter you have to send the child to school, where you can learn to be an insurance salesman.

The child gets through school, get through high school. When the child gets out is not interested in carpenter it's interested in girls. As the final round of that for a while and then get married and then again to learn the carpenters trade and it's too late to be anything but somebody who follows the blueprint. Therefore this marvelous craft which the Japanese cultivated for centuries is being lost. For what? I know many carpenters in the United States today who take enormous pride in their work. Who love to produce a beautifully finished object made of wood. But they cannot find jobs. Because no employer can afford that time for his workman to finish a product. It has to be turned out looking good on the surface with a sort of veneer and varnish. But anything thrown in on the underside, so I don't

wear out and they have to do another one so nobody has any satisfaction in the job.

And the reason is that that the family no longer holds together, because the family...the man in the family has to go away and it has absolutely no relation to his living relationship with his wife and his children. Therefore, naturally, he's regarded as a clown. When he comes home, he's not really a very good pal to his children. Because the children would find a real relationship with their father by joining in his work with him. Every little child wants to join his parents while they work. They go into the kitchen they would much rather play with the pots and pans and anything else they want to help they naturally want to join in but they cannot and therefore instead of being allowed to join in. With their parents they are given propitiatory objects called toys. You may have a toy store you may have toys dolls and pretend that you may not actually be baby because it might be an accident.

So the children are propitiated with every kind of fake plastic things that every adult is suppose to use. Especially those real adults, that go out and fight the wars, you know, then they have a plastic gun. Now the children are not satisfied with this, they are absolutely frustrated because these toys fall apart and they don't really work they don't know what's expected of. The child they're not real and it's. Christmas Day when you think about Christmas Day in the average family. After the children of their fake presents which were dolled up to look as if they were the treasures of princes. And they get the plastic toys and they find everything doesn't work. And by time for Christmas screaming tantrum. Because they know inwardly they're being insulted, they're not allowed to participate in the real world. Doodeedoodeedo. You don't really count.

And so as the whole educational process continues, they are educated for unreality, for nonentity, because they are being progressively fooled....You see, it works like this. You know this story of a donkey who has a carrot suspended in front of it, and it's attached to a stick which is a donkey's collar. So it can always chase it but never catch it. So this is what we do. We send a child into kindergarten. And make him literate, more or less. Run Spot Run, and all that. And then, the inducement is, if you learn this, you

get into first grade. And wowee, if you do this, you'll get into second grade, and so it's kind of a come-on.

You'll go through the step-by-step educational process, and there's going to be a big event, and when you get out of grade school you'll go to high school. And you're going to get step-by-step through high school because there's a thing coming! Got to college Whew, made it that far. And step by step you go on and you get to graduate school. If you're smart at this point, you'll stay there. But if you don't go into graduate school so you can just stay in the academic scheme of things, you get into business. That's getting out into the world, that's graduation. See now you're really, you're an adult. Well then the first thing is you get into a sales meeting, they're going to say is get that quota. And if you make that quota, they're going to give you a higher quota. And that thing at the end of the line, it's there. The thing that all the advertisers say, by the time you earn this and get that, you're going to the get the right kind of car, the right kind of speedboat, trackbot, the right kind of clothes and everything. The right kind of drinks and you'll be there. So you work along at this, and you're earnest. Finally here forty five you end up as vice president of the company. I've arrived. I'm there. But I feel vaguely cheated because I feel just the same as I've always felt. I haven't caught up with the thing I've promised. We've got a program for you. Just right when you're sixty five you'll be able to drop what you really want to do. By that time you're not interested. Prostate trouble, bad teeth. You're just falling apart, because you ate all the stuff that you make with. To make money if the money goes nowhere absolutely.

So you know you end up feeling cheated, and the reason the simply this. That education regarding the process of preparation. For something which never happens now is going to happen. But it was you were always getting prepared for life. A real education is an entirely different thing. Education in the real sense is not preparation for life it is actually living. It is the child participating in adult concerns. And doing it now and realizing that the point of the process in which the child is engaged is not to prepare the child for the future but to enjoy doing today. Because the whole point is that there is no point whatsoever in making plans for the future, except people who are capable of living in the present. If you are not capable of living in the present, plans are useless, because when those plans come to fruition, you

will be incapable of enjoying them. Don't worry, if you're not capable of living in the present, don't make any plans. If you are capable of living in the present then some plans may be useful, because they will produce something which you can enjoy and take part in. But it seems to me that the absolute point of any educational system that has any worth whatsoever is the progressive allowing of children to participate in activities that adults consider real and important. And that should begin very early. Instead of saying to children, no, you go away and play while we do what's important, let them in on what we consider important at once. This is very difficult in what we call the child-centered family. If you see, you regard what you do in life as not say your profession, your vocation, your job, if you regard that merely as a means to an end supposing you are making money in a factory producing something worthless and trashy, but it pays. And you justify this on the grounds that it will give you money to bring up your children to do something better than you are doing, you are fooling yourself. Because your child will copy you. And if you exist simply to bring up your children for something better than you have, then your children will do nothing but exist to bring up their children to do something better than they have. And [they] will always be frustrated. If on the other hand, you are doing something in life you have a vocation, a work which you're doing which you are really interested in and which you feel really enjoy. And it's this that you live for, and not for your children then your children will catch your enthusiasm. And they in turn will find something that they can live for and be really interested in, and in turn their children will become interested. But we are unfortunately a culture, because we always have the sense of we have, we do everything possible we can for the good of the children. You should not live for your children. You should live for your own good, and then your children will learn, from your own example, how to live.

So then, education then is a progressive letting children in to adult life. Not a preparation. The whole idea of preparation should be discarded. There is simply increased participation in what we are doing. I have just come from a very primitive area where the educational system is sloppy, thank goodness. I watch builders at work, and their wonderfully skillful with brick. And here are the older men working on a house. And the little boys running errands while they help. And they feel one with their fathers. Dad isn't some obscure being off there, who they occasionally meet in the

evening, and who does something completely mysterious, and who is supposed to chum up with them on a completely play basis. What is dad? And he plays about something. About the mousey and the teddy-bear. And having done that he's done his duty, he's satisfied his penance. For having had them. But these so-called primitive Mexicans, have their children working with them. I'm not speaking of Mexico City, and the great industrial slums of Mexico. I'm speaking of a very far out. I'm not. In a curious competence, and curious wisdom. Little men who can be trusted to do all kinds of things. But you see we are abandoning all responsibility for our children by sending them to be educated by other people. Lying. Around. Like you. Somehow haven't done right by our children, and we want to give them the best that we have. The whole trouble. With. The idea. In the Christian location that's the thing you're really. Not sure. If you really have that with you, the children will catch it from you. will actually. Be inspired by joining. The problem is you see, that in industrial culture, there are very few opportunities to bring about that state of affairs. Imagine going to the bank bringing your children along with you to peek over the counter while you hand out the cash. Put in the checks. In any important thing we do, get rid of our children. We get a babysitter. When we going to have fun in the evening at the babysitter and keep the children out of it, for heaven sakes. And this is simply symbolic of the fact that children are utterly excluded from real life. They're put in these completely artificial schools. Where they learn to be cerebral and merely literate. They learn nothing of the the fundamental art of handling matter. What are the fundamental arts that we need in this life if we are to become if we are to enjoy ourselves? We need good food, well-cooked. Isn't that fundamental? You will have to eat all you need to. Go. But you if you don't live to eat, the food that you need won't be very nutritive to enable you to live well. Take any trouble. It looks when you get. Materials you've got some onions you've got some fish you've got a slice of beef. You can cook that probably unless you love it. All those are dead creatures which have died in your honor. What are you going to do about that? The only way to deal respectfully with a creature that has died in your honor is to give it an honorable cookie. The dead cow you are eating is becoming you, and the least you can do for it is to let it enjoy itself as you. Are for. In the kitchen and you are a priest at that altar. And you should reverence that that gorgeous thing. Look at a beautiful mackerel. At the supermarket. You've

got this thing it's a living being dying to give you life the best thing you can do for it is very loyal and you should. See that it's exactly right people have no idea how to cook fish in this country, they cook it till it's dry and tasteless, because they don't watch it. To the exact moment when it's right. That's cooking is regarded as a troll something to. Do. With the kitchen most kitchens are like bathrooms you know you go to the bathroom clean up excrete and so on which is sort of. The way the kitchens also whitewashed places with white refrigerators and white washing machines white sinks. Look like surgeries or bathrooms. I have always found a formula, wherever you find a colorless kitchen, you will find tasteless food. The real life. There's a great. Bubble and everybody gathers around with eager appetites while they watch out that's going to be just great everybody just sitting around the fire began. And instead of having. The power. From the kitchen. Actually the lady of the house ready to go rushing around. The kitchen. And everybody would gather. Nothing. Except a very few. Calls.

So on the average, across everything just measure everything. You have the right amount. In the other camp. Everybody just. Wants another important thing in life of material. And material who thinks that the material. Was there for great deal of trouble but he has a house. Together. By. Design to be very. Very much. Like that. If you like to live in the you want to live in. In the flat areas there are four design a house which is appropriate to a. House which will not disturb which will fit in with the contours of nature and the vegetation of nature that already exists which is what you want to live in and enjoy and. Take another important aspect of material life. Looked at the furniture and. You know it's. Really one of the things that we suffer from that we have too much. We have these enormous cultural. Look like they were going to place. Over stuff months. And. All kinds of. Stuff too. Because it's simply. Thrown together by people who didn't like doing. Much better have a very few pieces of furniture made by an artist to enjoy making the top drop thrown together and is it always invariably advertised in what it is and causes frustration bitterness and disappointment in the sense of having been cheated. Draws. And we have an amazing pretentious bed. There is possible to move around when it comes to moving house great weight and inconvenience. Unlike practical material such as Japanese we know how to sleep. From the point of view of material. That's. Coming from. Don't know. Some exceptions on the West like. I'm wearing the.

Violation of the nature of cloth. That's the. Law. Great stuff which will. Actually. Be made. To prevent. The way without making it so that. The. Human Body. Which is not in the nature of pop culture Hang on let me just. Shaped in this way it doesn't. Violate the nature of thought. And if it does not come. Let's take for example trousers. Designed for women. Women look. Very uncomfortable. But we. Abstract. Kinds of complicated. Everything to make it sound. And. Rightly. So that if you want. To day five. From. Mexico. Well. Absolutely. By magnificent. People. Joining. Here. And we. Don't joy. To enjoy what's the point of going around. What else. Fundamental material. Everybody ought to know about. Love me. That's very fundamental. This is something that our children. Through hearsay. Or through a few courses in hygiene in high school which. Are facts about nothing of the art. And this is picked up in a sloppy way because we're. I mean here is the real deal in this culture where we say we are material. In fact what happened. Everything to do with. Sexuality. Is regarded as fundamentally. Associated toys. And therefore. Something basically prohibited. By. Man brought up in the W A P culture. That it's really supposed to be fun and so they sort of snicker about. It's always on the side something. That you don't really enjoy unless you feel it's dirty. You're doing something you're not supposed to then it's kind of fun and so there's a perpetual hypocrisy about the whole thing. And no one ever I mean the most the most than the most reprehensible thing you do in this culture is to come out say with a book. On the love. Which would be comparable to a book. On the. Show. Every. Possible in the contract between. Approach. But. It's all right so long. It's all right so long. As the moment it's something. We. Show we are not. Do not. Do not love. So as a result we have a culture which instead of being. Struck. Which for example confuses money with wealth You know the situation. But you don't count. It getting along. Not perhaps because you thought you were paying too much for what you. Found. But instead you got that caught. Up with the real world. You know. Not mentioning how much of it is fake but. That is your. Stuff you're going to live on and it's in your car and you're going to go away with it you lost the money.

So you know the abstract thing, the amount of money. That is more important than the actual situation. So likewise going back to the subject. Of. The way things look the way. It. Is much more important than what you.

Look at the figure fashionable. Done in such a fashion way. Take it off and. Then a kind of a letdown. In other words. The point down that I'm trying to get out while we are providing ourselves on being material. We have not mastered it. Except. Engineering dimension where we really have done a good job a jet plane is a remarkable triumph. Even though polishes distance even though it makes every place the same as every other place it is a self triumph of material. But in the fundamental life. Raising children in love making the biggest material incompetence. Ever exist. Because we are. Abstract that of how it looks rather than how it. How it appears rather than how it tastes. And so I would think what I'm saying is that we need an education. Which brings us back. To nature in the sense not. The law. But our being focused on the material. And knowing that is where you live and what you do. To be completely relate to the physical natural material or whatever you want to call it here and now. You know that's the only place you don't live anywhere else. And to be able to live richly and fully in that situation instead of constantly preparing. For something else. Altogether. I think this means. The easing of the school. Throwing a lot of it back on. The school system is a huge baby. And then but that in turn requires that parents be in a position to take care of their children. As if they're engaged in occupation which necessarily take them away. What does that go back to in the line of cause. It goes back to the fact that people are engaged in occupation. Which simply make money. And which they do not really enjoy and which they do not really live with. And that is why among young people today under twenty five. Corp. Job hunters I mean you know people who are looking for bright Talent Corp going around our colleges having increasingly difficult for the right of the student the less they want to get involved in the traditional kind of corporate life. Because that takes them away. From any work. Which will involve the participation of. The woman they love.

So people are looking for ways of living. Whereby they don't live fragmented abstract, work life that is completely cut off from the rest of truly. So we are facing a very. In which young people want to return. And even. Make very little money. It will at least have the satisfaction. Of being an actual relationship with the real world in which we live. I don't know. What it. Will be very disruptive. We know. That are by far better by far contact.

Ecological Awareness

When I talk in academic and scientific circles about mystical experience, I have to be very careful of my terminology. And so I alter the phrase ‘mystical experience’ and call it ‘ecological awareness’ because it really amounts to the same thing. But the terminology is much more acceptable in the scholarly environment because, after all, mysticism is a dirty word associated with mist and vagueness. On the other hand, there is this difficulty that—in our universities today—ecology has not quite come of age as a science, although its importance is vastly recognized. Ecology—being the science which studies the relationship between organisms and their environments—is a multi-disciplinary science and, therefore, its existence on any campus today runs afoul of departmental politics.

You notice, you see, that all our universities are based on the idea that there are departments of knowledge. And if you trace the history of universities over several centuries, you will see that the classification of departments keeps changing. There was a time in the Middle Ages when, for example, theology was the queen of the sciences and, therefore, had high rank as a department—as today the department of physics or chemistry would have—but now it has almost completely disappeared. There is a department of—yes, maybe—of the history of religions, which occupies an obscure set of rooms in the philosophy building or something like that, which is way off at the edge of the campus. But you cannot keep these departments fixed because, as between, say, biology and physics, we develop a science of biophysics. As between biology and chemistry, we develop a science of biochemistry. As between physics and mathematics, we get mathematical physics. As between physics and astronomy, we get astrophysics. And the formations keep changing, and this has very difficult political consequences for the simple reason that the faculty members and chairmen of departments are jealous of their positions. And they’re always apt to say—when these new hybrid departments start out—that these people are dabblers. In other words, they should get a thorough grounding in biology, zoology, botany, bacteriology, and all those separate departments before they should dare venture into such a thing as ecology, which involves all those different sciences and more.

What is not generally understood, however, is a most peculiar thing, and very difficult to explain. In the academic world—you know how students have to go through prerequisite courses? They're supposed to take this before they take that. Well, it's been found out, increasingly, that this is completely unnecessary. That, for some reason, as time goes on, students develop the ability to absorb bodies of knowledge for which it was thought they had no prerequisites. In the same way as—let's say, in the childhood of anybody now aged roughly fifty—it was very difficult to understand Einstein's Theory of Relativity, and you always had to have a demonstration on a blackboard, and all sorts of diagrams. But now young people get this idea instantly, they have no difficulty in absorbing it anymore than we had difficulty in absorbing the notion that the Earth was spherical. We were no longer embarrassed. Our common sense was no longer offended by the thought that people living in the Antipodes would be hanging upside down. In this sort of way, common sense, a feeling for knowledge, adjusts itself. And more and more it becomes obvious that there have to be ways of linking together the departments of knowledge. It's almost as if the established departments—like physics, chemistry, history, anthropology, and so on—were like huge paving stones, and it's always between the paving stones that the little things begin growing. So the growing edge is in the interstices between the departments.

Now, therefore, ecology becomes of absolutely primary importance in the modern world because, as so many of us have often said, Western man is equipped with technical powers such as have not been seen in known history, and is using those powers to alter his environment, but doing it in a way and in a spirit that may, instead of altering the environment, merely destroy it; what I call "Los Angelization instead of civilization" is taking over, and we are fouling our own nest. And, therefore, I approach this whole matter because of my interest in the Chinese and Japanese philosophy of nature, wherein there is not this sense of hostility between the human organism and its environment, but rather a sense of being one with it and collaborating with it. And thus it's been my particular interest to see in what way this Far Eastern attitude to nature—based originally on the philosophy of Taoism—is applicable in a technological civilization. Because there is one school of thought that says, "Of course, we've got to press technological progress as far as possible," and we, therefore, get a

proliferation of so-called growing communities, which are very evident here in California and remind some of us of the growth of cancer cells rather than the growth of anything of a biologically healthy nature. And this is called progress, and people say you can't stop progress. Don't be sentimental! And, on the other hand, there are the people who really do want to stop this. And I find that—to some considerable extent among young people who are, shall I say, digging the drop-out scene—there is a very definite wish to, as it were, join the American Indians, to get rid of concrete, to go back to green grass. As Gary Snyder put it the other day: “When you want to go from Sausalito to Big Sur, don't take the freeway. Don't even take the side roads. Find an old trail and walk it. Because the journey will be worth taking then.” And he feels, for example, that all the state park rangers should busy themselves with opening up trails so that more and more young people can walk, and have stations a day's walk apart where they can rest for the night, or where there are congenial farmers and friendly people with homes who will accommodate them. And so we will set up, as it were, a whole network of communications and culture entirely apart from the freeways and the suburban subtopia that sprawls all over the place. Because, like any good Indian—American Indian, that is—they sit around waiting and watching because they know that one of these days this whole industrial civilization is just going to disappear into gas and will leave them as they were in the beginning. You see, these are two completely extreme points of view. And I want to explore, rather, the possibility that there is a middle way: that technology is not a purely unnatural manifestation, that it is a perfectly proper development of human capacities, but that it has to be used in the right spirit and with the right care in such a way that we do not disturb, irremediably, what are called the balances of nature.

The idea that there are balances of nature, that no species, for example, should get so out of hand as to become top species and really dominate all the others—as human beings are trying to do—goes back, of course, to the fundamental Chinese notion of nature as the balancing of two forces, called the yang and the yin—or, in Japanese, inyo. The whole of the Book of Changes—which is a very, very ancient text fundamental to Chinese ways of thinking and to Chinese logic—is based on an analysis of the processes of nature in terms of the relative balancing of these forces. Perhaps “forces”

is not quite the right word. It is—you see—obvious to a Taoist, to Buddhists, to Hindus, that this universe is a single system of energy, but there is no way of defining and putting your finger on that particular one energy. And even energy is not quite the right word to use because energy indicates something in motion, and we do not know or realize motion except in relation to stillness and vice versa. So, whatever energy-stillness is, fundamentally, cannot be thought about, defined, or talked about in any way. It is basic to everything that we both experience and don't experience. It bears somewhat the same relation to our everyday life as the diaphragm in a loudspeaker bears to all the sounds that you hear on the radio. Every sound—of the human voice, of all kinds of musical instruments, of airplanes, of automobiles, and so on—anything you can hear on the radio is actually the vibration of a diaphragm. But the radio does not proclaim this fact. The announcer does not come on first thing in the morning and say, "All the sounds that you will hereafter hear are vibrations of a diaphragm, including this sound, and not the actual wind in musical instruments and human vocal cords." No, because wherever any circumstance is constant, we tend—in the course of time—to ignore it. We rule it out of all practical politics because it is basic to everything. It's as in an equation: when you get two terms that are identical on either side of the equation, you can just cancel them out. They make no difference. But, in a way, this is a very difficult point because, obviously, it is highly important that the diaphragm be there because otherwise there wouldn't be any voices or music. And yet, the diaphragm as such makes no difference to the distinctions between voices, and musical instruments, and so on. From a logical point of view, it is absolutely meaningless to talk about anything which is common to everything, which is the substratum, or ground, of being.

But the categories of logic do not embrace all knowledge. And it is possible for human beings, once again, to become aware in a certain way of this substratum. Not, however, as an object—not as something you can take out and look at—but nevertheless to be very strongly and almost sensuously aware of it and, in so doing, regain a new sense of one's own identity, one's own being: not as one of many things, one little event among many events that are all coming and going and temporary, but a sense of one's actual self as being this single energy field—which can't be, however, defined or identified—and, through realizing that, to take away the frantic anxiety that

we have to secure ourselves as separate organisms, and to fight with other organisms, and play these elaborate games of one-upmanship, and—above all—to overcome the anxiety which leads us to regard nature itself as our enemy that has to be conquered and subjugated.

I shall, of course, return in later sessions to the nature of this realization, but I only want to say in passing that there's a very peculiar thing about it, namely, that the realization I'm speaking of is not something like a belief. It is not an idea for the simple reason that the fundamental energy of the universe cannot be embraced in an idea. It cannot be embraced in a concept, in a form of words, in an explanation, because it eludes all classification. Because it is the which than which there is no whicher, and therefore is not in any class. Secondly, if you try to catch hold of it and somehow possess it, you are doing what is called in Zen "putting legs on a snake." Because there is no need to possess it: you are it, and if you try to possess it you imply that you're not. So by trying to catch hold of it you—as it were—push it away; although you can't really push it away because the very pushing is all it, you see?

So there are people who are divided into two schools of thought: those who believe that by exerting their energies to get hold of it they can achieve something, and the opposite people who think that by doing nothing at all one achieves it. But both are wrong because both the attempt to get it and the attempt to try not to get it are actually attempts to get it! And there is no need to. But nevertheless, by going into this—by meditation and so on—it is possible to realize that we are identical with the fundamental energy of the universe, that that is our real self—and although it doesn't make a difference because all differences are, in a way, made by it, therefore it makes no difference to differences—nevertheless it's completely basic. You see, it's as if what has happened to us is: supposing you're a gambler, and you've got involved in a game where you're playing, actually, for peanuts, and you are immensely wealthy. When you get extremely absorbed in the game, even though you're only playing for peanuts, you can lose your temper and you can be anxious as to who's going to win, who's going to lose, am I going to lose my peanuts, you see? Whereas you really have nothing to worry about at all, but you got so absorbed in the details of this game that you've forgotten the larger context in which the game is

happening. So, in exactly the same way, every individual is so absorbed—myopically, with his mind—in the details of his birth and death that he’s completely forgotten the context in which birth and death is occurring. And so, just as the chicken—when you put his beak to a chalk line—can’t get off it and is hypnotized, so we have been systematically and progressively hypnotized by our whole upbringing into the sensation that we are only this particular ego in this body. And we believe that and feel it so firmly that the context in which all this has happened is completely repressed.

Now, therefore, I want to propose a few things, first of all, in thinking about this, and I would ask you to listen to what I have to say, temporarily postponing the question “What are the practical consequences? What should we do about it?” I want to start with a consideration of our ancient ideas about the relation of the individual to the world in terms of fate and free will—or determinism and free will—because if we actually were aware of all the information that is coming to us through our senses, we would have a very curious sensation which would bug us because we wouldn’t be able to find words for it. It would be like this: you would first of all realize that if you didn’t be so selective—in other words, if you didn’t pay attention to this detail and that detail, but were just simply aware of it all in general—you would get the funny feeling, in the first place, that you were just a puppet, that you were automatically responding to all kinds of physical and social influences around you, and that you couldn’t help yourself. You might object to that, or you might alternatively enjoy it. You might get a sensation that you were just floating. You didn’t have to do anything, you didn’t have to think about any problems, you didn’t have to worry about what you ought to do, you would just feel yourself responding, and that would be a very pleasant feeling if you liked it. But, on the other hand—depending on your personal constitution—you might feel terribly threatened by it, and you would interpret this sensation as a feeling of unreality. Have you ever suddenly felt that you were dreaming everyday life, that it wasn’t quite real, and it spooked you? So you say, “Gee, it ought to be happening!” See? And I feel like I’m going around in a dream. Because occasionally, our mind slips. It’s like the tuning dial of a radio: it occasionally wanders off and you get another station. And so, in the same way, our minds occasionally slip into another way of seeing things, and

people get accidental illuminations, and psychoses, and all sorts of funny things.

But you would get this as a preliminary sensation, and you would interpret it as feeling that you are a puppet on the end of strings being manipulated by events only because of your previous background, wherein we have—all of us—been conditioned to believe that part of our life is not under our control and part of it is. There is this distinction between the voluntary and the involuntary. The voluntary: what we do; the involuntary: what we have to accept passively. The borderline between them is not at all clear. Breathing, for example, is something we have to go on doing, and yet you can acquire the sensation that you are doing the breathing and controlling it according to your will. It's a very vague distinction here. But if you took in all the information—see, you can feel yourself making a decision out of the blue. You say, "I'm going to do that!" Like that, you see? And you don't have any awareness of anything that leads up to it. It just happens, you see? And because that awareness is screened out you interpret this act of making a decision as a different kind of act from breathing or from growing hair. Well, actually, it isn't different, but we think it's different because of unawareness. When you make a decision it happens—as the Chinese say, *zìrán*; *shìsen*—"of itself," "naturally," "spontaneously." But we feel that there are things that happen of themselves in contrast to certain things that I do, and that is because of incomplete awareness.

But then, if that awareness were to change—and you were to realize that everything is happening of itself, including your decisions—because of your background, you would then veer over to the opposite point of view: everything is happening involuntarily and I am left out; I am a puppet, I simply have to obey. You see? But this would be incorrect. The point is, rather, this: we don't have a system of nature which is either deterministic or voluntaristic. The relationship of the individual to the environment is not one of the individual as some little thing in the environment, which is moved by the environment and responds to the environment passively. Nor, oppositely, do we have a situation in which the individual is a center of activity that, all of its own, to some extent alters and changes the environment. Both of these opinions are based on lack of awareness or ignorance—ignore-ance—that the behavior of the individual and the

behavior of the environment are the same process. And you can look at the process from two points of view. You can look at it from the point of view of “It’s all happening to me,” or you can look at it from the point of view “I’m doing it.” These are just two poles of two ways of looking at the same thing.

If, for example, you realize that your neurological organization is creating the external world—in other words, there is no such thing as light, weight, heat, color, shape, except in terms of the human nervous system or some other animal nervous system—then, from that point of view, you can see your nervous system as evoking the whole universe. But you can take an opposite point of view which is equally true, which is that the human nervous system is something in the external world and is entirely dependent on sun, and air, and light, and temperature, and so on and so forth. Both points of view are true, but we have not yet—especially in the West—become aware of a logic which can integrate them. And so, when we first come to experience this thing as being so, we tend to interpret it in terms of our old logics and our old ways of thinking, so that one person may say on feeling this, “I feel as if I’m just floating around, passively responding to the operations of nature,” and another person going to the opposite extreme will interpret this experience as saying, “I suddenly realize I’m God. That I actually govern and control everything that happens.” These are two ways of looking at exactly the same thing. The point being, then, that there is just the one process which is equally the behavior of the organism and the behavior of the environment; that you can look at this process from many points of view, define it in many ways, but you can’t really split it up.

And so, the consequence of this—although I’m not going into this at the moment in any full way—is to learn to act and behave in terms of this vision of the world. Not as your acting upon the world, not as it acting upon you, but as the unfoldment of a process which, as you understand it, you become more intelligent and act more intelligently. Intelligence is a function of the degree to which you realize that your behavior is one with the behavior of the rest of the world. The more you realize that, the more one would say you appear to be better in control—although you’re not actually controlling it. The difficulty—the essential difficulty—that lies in the way of most people seeing this is the fixed notion that the world

consists of separate things and separate events. As Teilhard de Chardin put it: “The only real atom is the universe.” The word ‘atom,’ you see, in Greek, is ἄτομος. ἄ: ‘non.’ τομος: ‘cut.’ The uncut. It’s the same idea as in Lao-Tzu: “the uncarved block.” There’s a great symbol of naturalness. What cannot be further divided? And so de Chardin says it is the universe that is the only real atom. Because if you take anything out of the universe and separate it, you will find that it is raveled at all of its edges. It is not, in other words, cleanly divisible.

But this is something which is left out of our ordinary awareness, because in our ordinary awareness we overlook the connections that go between so-called things and so-called events and make them, actually, nothing but aspects of one event. It’s as if we were looking at everything through a sort of Venetian blind where intervals are ignored and cut out. Our senses are, of course—as we know—screening devices. The eye responds to a very narrow spectrum of the various forms of light vibrations. We do not see x-rays or cosmic rays. Likewise, our ear responds only to a rather narrow spectrum of sound. We keep screening out. And, therefore, not only do we screen with our senses—with the organs of sense—we also screen with the thinking systems by which we interpret what we sense. It’s a further act of screening. And so, as a result of this, there are gaps. And these gaps are symbolized by the fact that we ignore space.

We think—as we all sit around here in this room, you see—that the spaces between each of us as we sit here is nothing at all; it’s not important. But actually, it’s tremendously important. The spaces between people—and space as a marvelous thing in itself—is as important as, for example, the intervals between tones in music. It is the intervals and the hearing of the intervals that enables you to hear melody. And so it is the space between everything which, instead of being something that divides, it joins. But we ignore it and don’t see that space—like the diaphragm in the radio—space is that in which everything happens; and without space, no happening. It’s fundamental but ignored. And there are many other things besides. All kinds of mutual influencing constantly going on, but this is ignored because, for one reason—for two reasons. One: we don’t have time to bother with it. We don’t think it’s important. And we don’t think it’s important because we have been trained to regard only certain things as

important. And that's why in the process, say, of mediation as it's understood by Buddhists and Taoists, you stop valuing and putting a price on all the various things that you could be aware of. You stop thinking and you are simply aware, and it suddenly strikes you then that everything is equally important. And you start being amazed at things that you never were amazed at before; absolutely fascinated. You hear the sound of water, and that's quite as important as anything I've got to say! Only, you don't translate it, see? The wisest thing I heard in Japan when I was last there, from Morimoto Rōshi: he said, "the sound of the rain needs no translation." We were talking about translating Buddhist texts into English. He said, "You don't need to do that. The sound of the rain needs no translation."

So when you get that perspective and you realize that the divisions of one thing from another are all conceptual: cut out the concepts and see it afresh, and there are no divisions. There are connections. It doesn't mean that—in the continuum of the physical world—that there are no lines, that there are no solids and spaces, and all this kind of thing. It doesn't mean, in other words, that if you saw the world correctly it would all become a homogenized mass. A lot of people think that that is nirvāṇa, you know? It doesn't mean that at all. It stays just exactly as you see it now, but it has a completely different sense to it in which all the wiggles in this world are not separated, but it's a continuous wiggle.

I'm greatly interested in the philosophy of wiggles because this is a wiggly world. Look at the hills. As you fly—as I've just been flying, getting some perspective of nature from an airplane—and it's clouds and mountains; all wiggles. But just every now and then one sees these little squares and rectangular patterns and things, and you know that's human beings busy trying to straighten things out.

They somehow disapprove of wiggles because wiggles are difficult to control, they're slippery. And you want to put that thing there, and say "Now! Now, come on!" But you see, the trouble with a wiggle is: how do you count wiggles? How do you count the wiggles in a cloud? I mean, formally speaking, is one wiggle a smooth curve—like that, does that constitute a wiggle? Or—supposing it has bumps on it—are those each a subordinate wiggle? And how many wiggles does the bump have? It has

lots when you start looking at it in a magnifying glass. It goes on for ever. So: wiggles of the world, unite! You've nothing to lose but your names!

So, you see: this great continuous wiggleness—for purposes of being controlled and managed—is broken down into what we call things and events. But these are no other than conventional—that is to say, socially agreed—divisions between the various forms of nature. But nature is really formless in the sense that it's all one form. Not in the sense that there are—nothing that we could stick the name 'cloud' on—but that the name... naming the cloud a cloud does not separate the cloud from the sky, actually. Just as, when you pick up water in a sieve, you don't succeed in separating the water into strips like you would if it was cheese going through a sieve. So, all our categorizing leaves the world undivided. In fact, it is simply a way of being able to talk about it in order to agree how we are going to control it and what we're going to do with it.

Now, this is a point that is so fundamental that I do want to be sure that it's clear. To say you see that there really are no things and no events is, to most people, shocking and startling; it's an affront to common sense because we feel—you know... damn it, this is a shoe! [Alan slaps his shoe] And it's a thing! It's there! You see? And that, actually, this isn't a shoe at all. You know, a 'shoe' is a noise. And if this is a noise at all, it's this sort of noise, you see? [Alan slaps his shoe again] You can use it for a hat, or it has all sorts of possibilities. But it isn't the shoe.

Audience

[???

Yeah. Yeah, right. So, if you see that the idea of separate things is an abstraction—let's call it that—then this most of all applies to you as an organism: you are not a separate thing. You are, first of all—you can look at it from two points of view. On the one hand, a living organism is something like a flame. A flame, although it appears on a candle to be constant, is a stream of gas. And a flame is never the same for two microseconds. It's a constant flowing of energy. Or, take a whirlpool in a stream: it appears to have a constant form, but it's flowing all the time. So, in exactly the same way, all our bodies appear to have constant form, but we are a flowing of

energy. So we keep coming in and out. Also, it isn't only in this way that we're the constant flow; that you cannot say "I'm a separate event," but it's also because every thing that could be called—could be recognized—as a wiggle or a unit of any kind in this world has its existence only in relation to all the rest of them.

This is the principle that, in Buddhist philosophy, is called *jiji muge* (事事无碍): 'the mutual interpenetration of all things and events.' This is very important. I'm sure some of you have recently read in, say, the *Scientific American*, about holograms: a method whereby you can take a small square out of a photographic negative and, by the use of laser beams, reconstruct the whole negative out of which it was taken. Because the little part is nurtured and comes to be in a field of forces in such a way that all the lines of force within the little part imply the lines of force of the total photograph when it was taken. It can be reconstructed. Maybe Wynn can explain this more accurately than I can. But this is essentially the hologram. Because, you see, every part—anything that can be designated as a part of something—implies the whole just as the whole implies the part. Thus, a clever anthropologist can take a jawbone and can reconstruct from the jawbone, through all his anthropological knowledge, the beast or man to which it originally belonged. He'll say, "A jawbone like this, you see, implies this kind of a skull," and so on and so forth.

So, every single thing in this world exists only in relation to the whole system, to all the other things, because—the important point to realize here is that existence is relationship. Relationship is another word for existence. There is no yang without the yin. It is the relationship of yang and yin that enables yang to be possible and yin to be possible, solid to be possible and space to be possible, up and down, life and death, being and non-being. It is a relationship. So that, for example, if I have a drum but there is no skin on the drum, it doesn't matter how hard I hit it, it will make no sound. Because the sound is the relationship of the drum skin and the hand. And you can carry that principle all the way along; that, in other words, if I shout in a completely non-resonating environment, I will make no noise. In other words, if I shout in a vacuum, there is no sound because I have to make waves, you see? And I can't make waves if there's no water.

So, existence is relationship all the way along. And fundamentally, then, the relationship of all of us together, of all society, constitutes every one of us. We are—as individuals, as personalities—what we are in terms of a human community and of an interlocking complex of communities. And you may remember when you were children—I remember it very vividly how my personality changed in relation to each community that I went into. In other words, I was one boy at home, I was a completely different boy among my peer group in school, I was another boy altogether when visiting my uncle, and I realized I had all these different personalities in relation to different communities. And eventually, I put them together in some sort of way and integrated. But I feel, still—although I’ve got it more or less together—I like to come on differently in different sets of people and play the joker. Which, instead of playing a fixed role, and you can say, “Well, is that always you? Can we rely upon you always to have this sort of behavior, mannerisms, and reactions?” I say, “No, I’m not going to get fixed up in that. I’m going to play tricks!” But you did notice that, you see, when you were a child, because—you see—you were being defined all the time by the groups you were in. And so you are what you are, as a person—that is to say, as playing a role in life—in relation to the groups with which you move. And that is a little model of the fact that everything is what it is in its place.

Now, for example, it has been a sort of convention of scientific thought hitherto—especially in the kind of science of the 19th century—to try to understand anything and say what it is by a process of analysis. You understand it by asking, “What is it made of? How is it composed? How was it put together?” And so you dissect it. You get your microscopes out and you try to dissolve it down to the smallest possible component parts. And that gives a certain explanation of it, you see? But what is equally important is to look in the other direction. What anything is is defined not only in terms of what it’s made of, but of when it is and where it is: its context in time and space. Just as the meaning of a word is dependent on the context of the sentence, or the paragraph, or the book in which it is found. So, likewise, we, with our rather myopic way of looking at things.

Because analysis—the ability to analyze and to think analytically—comes from great skill in dividing wiggles. See, you may think that this is a very,

very fine wiggle. You see? But I can make wiggles so little that you can't keep track of them, because you're not as sharp as I am, see? I'm going to make wiggles and we're going to have a little competition: who can make the smallest wiggle and keep track of them? Because that's a test. If you can keep track of them and you can prove it to someone else. Of course, if you get down so small [that] nobody can keep track of you, then they don't know whether you're a charlatan or not. But if you can keep track of the wiggles and prove to other people that you kept track of them—see, this is the whole game of scholarly one-upmanship: if you can keep track of it. It's the same with certain kinds of music, you see? You can do very complicated rhythms, and they'll believe you if you can do it again. It's not enough to do it once, they say, "Do that again! Or was that a fluke?" That shows, you see, that you're in control and you've been able to count out the beats.

So, through the analytical mind—which pays attention to the details—we have got great skill in doing that. But you do that at the expense of neglecting completely the other side of things: in what context does every individual wiggle happen? See? That's just the other side of it. It's very important to define the wiggle, but you can't define the wiggle unless the wiggle has an environment. The outside of the wiggle is just as important as the inside. So, in the same way, everybody has an outside and everybody has an inside. We identify ourselves with what is inside—we say, "That's me"—and thereby ignore the fact that what is outside you is just as much your outside as what is inside you is your inside. And that's always overlooked.

And, I mean—when I talk about your outside I don't mean just the surface of your skin. I mean everything outside your skin, that's your outside. And if that isn't functioning in a certain way, the inside doesn't function either. They go together. It's like when a snake moves: the snake makes a curl, and so one side of it is convex and the other side is concave. Which side moves first? Why, they both move together. And so, in the same way, the inside world and the outside world are not different—in the sense that they're not separate. They're different, yes: one's inside, the other's outside. But they're not separate. They move together. Only, we're unaware of it—in the

ordinary way—through a kind of psychological myopia of fixing on, of being hung up on certain ways of looking at things.

There's a Buddhist word—kleśa (क्लेश) in Sanskrit, bonno (煩惱) in Japanese—that we normally translate 'attachment' or 'defiling passion.' The exact translation of kleśa in modern American is 'hangup.' It's a perfect word for it: to have a hangup. And so, to be hung up on a fixed way of looking at things that the world is only divided in this way, and that way, and the other way is to fail to see what I've been describing, then, as the going-togetherness, the inseparability of all insides from all outsides and vice versa, and of all organisms from their environments and vice versa.

You can get this very clearly when you realize that, if you get hung up on the viewpoint of separateness, then even your body is not a unity. You are just a mass of cells. And if, then, you take in physics: you're not even cells, you're molecules. Not even molecules, just atoms. Not even atoms! Just subatomic particles; wavicles, or whatever. And you disintegrate everything into that, and you realize that there are vast spaces between all these tiny little wiglets—whatever they are; wavicles—huge spaces. Y'know, if a molecule in your body was magnified to the size of a tennis ball, the nearest one would be quite a way away. Well, what ties all this together, you know? How can you look at that as a unity? Well, it's tied together by space, fields of force, gravitation.

And so, in exactly the same way, look at us behaving around here from a larger level of magnification, and you could very easily see that we are just as tied together as the molecules in our hands, and that generation after generation—you know—we come and go. You look at the leaves coming on the trees in the spring, and you can say—you can describe this in so many different ways. You can say "These are new leaves. Last year's leaves fell off and have fallen into the ground, and now a new generation of leaves come which are quite different." And if a leaf had an ego—you see—it would say, "Wowee! I've come into being! I'm new." But from another point of view you could just say, "The tree is leaf-ing again." This is something the tree does, like every so often a man gets up in the morning and he shaves: he's shaving. See? And he stops doing that; the next morning, he's shaving again. Now, is the shaving as if something that has

an ego? And that every day's shave is a different shave? It is, from one point of view. It is different, but it's also shaving; it's the same.

It's because we're so fascinated with the individual details of people that, generation after generation, we say they're quite different. But somebody who really was from Mars and didn't understand people would say they keep on coming, they're just the same ones coming back. So every year's leaves are the same old leaves coming back, see? They die, they are re-absorbed, and they keep coming back. The thing keeps doing it again, but there are these spaces in it, you see? It's like the troughs between the crests of a wave. And we say—where there are those spaces we don't see anything—so we say, “That's finished!” So, when you die you think, “Well, that's finished. Too bad!” But, you see, what you are—really—is the energy field, and it keeps doing you! It keeps people-ing. And it's you who keep people-ing. Who else is responsible? Only, of course, we mustn't admit that we're responsible for this because the whole game is to pretend you aren't. See? It's happening, but it has nothing to do with me; I'm not in control of this.

In this morning's session I was emphasizing primarily the theoretical aspects of ecological awareness, showing how our differentiation between separate things and events is an abstraction and that the whole world is an inseparable unity. Not of separate parts, but of the kind of system in which everything that might be called a part—when we talk about it—everything that might be called a part is, in fact, an expression or function of the whole thing. And that—if we came to our senses—we would be aware of ourselves not as only on the inside of our skins, but we would be aware that the outside is us, too. That there is a relationship between the organism and the environment, the subject and the object, and the individual and the world such that the two presuppose each other. And I did get around to the point of mentioning—towards the end—the reason how and why this can become apparent if our minds are not constantly obsessed with verbiage. If, in other words, we can come to contemplating, seeing, feeling the actual world without putting names and labels on it—in other words, to see it directly rather than thinking about it—for, as I said, these separations are conceptual.

Now, I want to take this into a more practical dimension this afternoon. And that is to say that, hand in hand with this whole question of overcoming the hallucination of separateness, there goes also the formation of a new style of relationship to the material present. It's very important, you see—first of all—to realize that all reality is present, that the present moment is where you have always lived and where you will always live. There is no other time than now. Time past and time future are also abstractions. But in our culture, in particular, we have a very bad relationship to the material present, and not only to the present but also to that aspect of the same thing which is material. And this comes out so strongly in the way in which we educate our children: we do not—in our schools—really have anything very much which relates people to the material present, and thus our achievements in regard to the handling of the material present are extremely shoddy.

School prepares people for a kind of Brahmin's existence, that is to say, for literary, verbal operations. It educates us to be bureaucrats, insurance salesmen, banker's clerks, accountants, and lawyers, maybe doctors, and so on. And a person who is going on—say, in high school, and is thought not fit for college—is encouraged to take reluctantly offered courses in trades and manual skills. And in England—where the state of affairs is much worse than it is here, even—they always make jokes about American universities where you can get a B. A. degree in basket-weaving. Because that's in for a dig; that is loss of face in an academic community: that there should be basket-weaving courses. Bad enough to have a degree in physical education. But the point of the matter is that we are so obsessed with the life of abstractions, with problems of status, with problems of the world as symbolized rather than the world to be symbolized, that most of us don't relate to physical existence at all.

Now, I remember—and I mentioned this in one of those leaflets I sent out—but I remember very well in 1936, in London, at the World Congress of Faiths, when Suzuki Daisetsu was present—he's the one who's written all the essays on Zen Buddhism; the great scholar—and he had made a very, very significant contribution to the congress; various lectures and discussions he had held. And at the final meeting of the congress they took over the Queen's Hall—great big auditorium—and they set as the subject

matter for the evening: “The Supreme Spiritual Ideal,” upon which representatives of all the great religious traditions got up and delivered themselves of volumes of hot air. Finally, Suzuki was the last speaker. And he got up and he said, approximately, “I am feeling very confused tonight. I am simple countryman from a faraway place, and I find myself in this assembly of so many people. I am asked to talk about supreme spiritual ideal. Seems to me, I do not know what supreme spiritual ideal is, so I look up ‘spiritual’ in dictionary. I cannot understand.” He said, “You have, around here, very big city, and I walk along street, and very prosperous. But it’s not right. You have spiritual over here, you have material world over here. And both are unreal.” And then he went on to give a description of his house and garden in Japan. And at the end of it, he had a standing ovation, for—somehow—he was real; he came across as somebody who’s lovable, intelligible and human, as distinct from a mere preacher.

And he made this intensely important point that if you understand the spiritual correctly, it is not different from the material. The material is the spiritual. But in order to see why that is so, one first has to make a clear difference between the material and the abstract and to understand that the abstract doesn’t mean the same thing as the spiritual. The abstract world is a world of symbols, a world of words, a world of concepts which has the same relation to the physical universe as the menu to the dinner, or as money to wealth—I mean money in the sense of bookkeeping entries in a bank or dollar bills. One must be very careful, therefore, not to confuse the spiritual and the abstract. If by the spiritual we designate the domain of ultimate reality—the unified or, more strictly, non-dual energy of the universe that I was talking about this morning—that has nothing whatsoever, really, to do with abstractions. What we call physical reality—the material world—is much closer to what would be meant by ‘spiritual’ than anything abstract is. But the thing is that when we form in our minds—the average person who talks about the physical world, he has a concept of the physical world which is what really should be referred to as ‘materiality’ when one uses that word in a put-down way.

If, for example, we talk about—I could even say this to theologians and they would eventually understand me—if we talk about the evils of the flesh, the word ‘the flesh’ doesn’t mean the body in the sense of this [Alan

(presumably) indicates at his own body]. The flesh, as something evil, represents a conception of the body as something to be exploited in order to satisfy one's spiritual emptiness. And thus, too, when we speak of materialism: we aren't really talking about materialism, we're talking about an abstract conception of the value of the material world. Real materialism would, of course, be the love of material, which is something quite different from materialism as one sees it in practice. So it's very important to realize that when we say "the physical world" and we talk about matter as something which is antithetical to the spiritual, you are not talking about this [Alan indicates at his body] because all this doesn't have those kind of qualities that we would call materiality as against the spiritual. If you really get in touch with your senses, with the so-called physical world, you're in for many surprises.

First of all—if you go back to the point I made that there really is only the present—you will see that what we call this physical world is not something expanded in time, stretched out over time, and it is not material also in the sense of being composed of stuff. You see, one of our problems in the West is we think about the relationship of the spiritual to the physical by analogy with form and matter, or rather, with clay as matter and the form as the pot made out of the clay. And therefore, we've never been able to put the two together because our conception of matter as something essentially like clay—a sort of primordial stuff—this has no intelligence, nor does it possess energy. Therefore, when you think of the world as a sort of cooperation—or a mixture of form and matter—you have, therefore, to invoke an external agency to inform matter and to bring it into shape, to order it, and to produce art.

But this dualism of form and matter is really rather meaningless. Nobody ever saw an immaterial form or a formless material. There really is no such thing as 'stuff' out of which the universe is made. 'Stuff' is actually a word for looking at the world with bad focus. When your focus on something is not clear, it is fuzzy. And this fuzziness, or indistinctness, is 'stuff.' When your focus on the world is clear, you see pattern, you see details, you see structure. Now, as you look more deeply into any structure it starts to get fuzzy again, and therefore, you ask "Of what stuff is this structure made?" 'Stuff' meaning fuzz. But then again, when you turn up the level of

magnification and it once again becomes bright and clear, you see within the great structures and the great patterns smaller ones.

So, you always encounter the world as patterning, never as stuff. And so, our physical world that surrounds us is, in a way, immaterial. It is a fantastic pulsation of vibrations which give an illusion of solidity in just the same way as if I take a lighted cigarette in the dark and rapidly revolve it, you get the illusion of a continuous circle of fire. So, the apparent motion of the present moment from the past to the future gives an illusion of continuity as if there were something extended in time. And in exactly the same way, the table—because it is vibrating with such tremendous energy—gives the illusion of solidity in exactly the same way as the blades of a propeller or an electric fan when they're in rotation. And in the same way as you'll come to trouble if you try to put your finger through the fan, the only reason you can't get your finger through the table: it's going even faster than a fan, and it bounces your finger off. When you feel hardness your finger is being bounced off because of this tremendous energy that lies in and as the table. Likewise, it's also in your finger.

So, what we're actually confronted with, what is here and now—nowever—is certainly not a material world as we ordinarily conceive it, but is something intensely magical and strange. And the more—Spinoza once said, “The more you know of particular things, the more you know of God.” And then, put it in another way: if you want to find out what is the spiritual, what is Buddha-nature, what is Brahman, what is Tao, the best way is to go directly to the physical world and find out: the physical world as you are it, and as everything around you is it; the immediate experience.

Now, to go back. This, as I said, is something which our culture—which WASP culture in particular—neglects, because we are obsessed with abstract attainments. And this goes back to some curious factors in our history. To introduce this matter I have to refresh your minds about caste, strangely enough. In ancient Hindu society, there are four castes, respectively: brahmins, who are priests, theologians, philosophers, and intellectuals; kṣatriya, who are warriors and rulers, politicians; vaishya, who are merchants; and shudra, who are laborers, blue-collar workers. These castes have something peculiar about them in the fact that they are

eternal—let me say perennial. They still exist, even though we don't admit it. There are kṣatriya people around and they are very different from brahmins. The typical fraternity American with his crew cut and his—uses alcohol, is aggressive, likes football, and so on—he's a kṣatriya type. The professorial, quiet fellow is a brahmin. The businessman is a vaishya, and our blue-collar people are shudras. They're still there. And they're all necessary to each other; they balance each other in a very fascinating way. The brahmin cannot get on by himself, he needs the kṣatriya, the vaishya, and the shudra. And likewise, every one of them needs the others.

But there was a curious revolution in Europe at the time we call the Reformation. When the vaishyas got the upper hand of the brahmins and the kṣatriyas, the feudal aristocracy began to lose power in the face of, say, the great merchant bankers of Italy and the burghers of central Europe. The brahmins, who were the priests of the Roman Catholic church, began to lose power because their doctrine was criticized and fell under suspicion. For, you must see that the Protestant religion was the creation of the burgher cities of Europe, of places like Geneva, Frankfurt, and—one must add—London, Edinburgh. And immediately, money values began to dominate Christian theology. For example, the number of holy days was very strictly cut down by on Protestant sects because those were holidays and the merchants didn't want their apprentices taking all these holidays off and not busying themselves. And so, always connected with the Protestant ethic are the virtues of frugality, saving money, saving up for the future, and in such things are vaishya ideals running a bit wild. And thus, you see, the common-sense ethic—that is to say, the basic conception of the good life as it is held in the United States—is very largely a creation of bourgeois Protestantism. We have a very bad relation to the material present. Because that's one thing that the vaishya can't maintain by himself anymore than the brahmin or the kṣatriya or the shudra could maintain it by himself.

We have a whole world based on these two things: save up, there's a good time coming—so, put your money aside, invest it—secondly, which is somewhat contradictory: happiness consists in the possession of things. A lot of people, when they feel inadequate, bored, unfulfilled, try to get rid of this sensation by going shopping. A lot of people spend all their daytime shopping. That's the thing to do. You go out and shop. There are women

galore who go into San Francisco every day just to shop and come back loaded with all kinds of things. But these things are not true material possessions—for at least two reasons. Number one: most of them aren't well-made. Number two: you can't use that many things. You can store them, you can put them away, you can show your friends that you've got this and that, but you can't live in six houses at once, you can't ride more than two horses at a time—unless you're doing some sort of a circus act, you know? You can't drive more than one car at a time. So we tend to become absolutely overloaded with possessions and have the greatest difficulty, therefore, in moving ourselves around. Because every time we move, we have to carry all the stuff with us.

Let's take the comparison between a Japanese living room and a British, American, or German living room. You see, the Japanese living room: you have a table, and some cushions, and the floor. And you don't have any beds because you sleep in a futon, in a quilt, and that's delightful. You don't, therefore, have to haul beds around, you don't have overstuffed chairs which stand in most rooms like gun emplacements—you know, these huge things, vast things that have to be pushed around, very heavy. We, in other words, are absolutely cluttered with enormously heavy objects. And it doesn't redound to our true material comfort because we're always using our muscles to lug them around. They have to be taken care of, they have to be cleaned, the moths have to be kept out of them. They're a perfect pest! So we don't really understand furniture.

Now, I would think furniture, and a house, and a shelter over you is one of the most important things in life. Shelter is fundamental. But when you see what shelter most people in the United States have provided for themselves, you're aghast. Clapboard boxes—miles and miles and miles of them—that you wouldn't want a dog to live in. Have you ever looked at the furniture in Dagwood's home? The absolutely uninspired junk. It has nothing whatsoever to recommend it. It isn't good design, it isn't fun, it's just nowhere.

What's something else of material importance that, really, after all, we ought to know something about? Clothes. Well, by and large, we are shockingly clothed as compared with many other people. Men go around

looking like funeral directors in the most uncomfortable survivals of military uniforms. Women wear frocks and dresses, and things to cover up amazing systems of pulleys and blocks and tackles. And, you know, it's sleazy and they have no real joyous color. Occasionally—I mean, we all know exceptions—but I'm talking about the generality of the culture. The clothes don't look as if anybody really enjoyed wearing them. They're worn because one has to be dressed and covered up, and decent. And therefore, they're worn rather apologetically. To get, furthermore, they wear out in nothing flat. And to buy good clothes you have to go outside the country. There are, of course—if you want to dress in a rather traditional way, you go and get British tweeds from the Hebrides. But if you want to dress colorfully and beautifully you have to go to Mexico and get gorgeous materials. Or to India, and get silk for saris. Or to Java, and get batiks for sarongs. And these things will last forever. They are beautifully made by people who had a real enthusiasm about making them.

Because in the life of the people who make such things, they don't make a differentiation between working and playing. But in a culture where you work, and play is different—you work in order to make money to play—this is insane! Because you spend most of the time working, and then if all you carry... if you don't really value the work—I mean, you're lucky if you've got work that you really enjoy doing—but if you don't really value the work, all you get out of it is money. Then you come home with that and you're supposed to play. Well, you're pretty tired, to begin with, and we just don't play. That's all there is to it. You might play Saturday, or something, when there's a day off. But in the evening very few people actually play. They sit and passively watch television. And they got all the money in the world—I mean, compared with Hindus and African and so on, we live like princes. But we don't enjoy it. Not really. There's no gusto for it. You would think that people would come home and have orgies, and banquets, and... with all that money, and they don't! It's just a—sort of—constant disappointment.

Well, going back to clothes: I can illustrate another way in which our clothes are made without regard for material values. Most clothes are made of cloth, and when you weave cloth, cloth has a certain nature. It comes out in a long, wide strip which is rectangular. We take this material, woven this

way, and we try to fit it to the contours of the body by shaping it, by doing things with rectangular material that rectangular material just doesn't want to do. To fit the sleeves of a man's jacket—it doesn't want to do that. And therefore, our jackets don't fold up properly. Whenever you take them out of a suitcase they have to go to the dry cleaner's to be pressed, or your wife has to iron it. Our shirts—a man's shirt is the most ridiculous construction. It will not fold unless you're an expert laundress. There's nothing you can do about it. And it always comes out of a suitcase ruffled. And it requires all kinds of care to get the thing ready to be wearable. And it's white and gets filthy, and nothing flat. There's no rationale to it whatsoever. Nor to the necktie, which has to be worn with it; sort of noose to strangle you with.

But if I may point out: a Japanese kimono is quite different. It follows the nature of cloth. The rectangular forms of the cloth, if you stretch it out like that, it hangs in a rectangle right here from your sleeve, and it falls over you. It hasn't been forced to fit you, and therefore, it fits you comfortably. The cloth conforms itself to you by its nature, and therefore, gives you a certain dignity. I once saw a Tibetan woolen garment. It was a cloak. And it was prepared by their method, which is: they have a method of pounding wool rather than weaving it. And they make it into a great big—again, it's a rectangle. And it's a double rectangle: the front one and the back one. The front one is split down the center, and at the sides there's a place for the sleeves to go through, and beyond that, it's stitched. So you just got this sort of—if you put it out like that, it's like a sort of sandwich board. But we had this one evening, and we got every man in the room to put it on—and there were about five men—and it turned all of them into kings. They looked absolutely regal in this thing, it was so dignified and so exquisitely beautiful.

I have a Japanese friend who told me he always wore Western clothes in Japan, and I asked him why. I said it's absurd. I said, "You have the most comfortable clothes anybody ever invented. What on Earth do you go around in a Western business suit for?" "Oh," he said, "I wouldn't be seen dead in Kyoto in a kimono. You can't run for a bus in a kimono." It's true. But what a degradation, you see, of the human being: you've got to be someone who's got to run for a bus now, you see? Whereas if you put on a kimono, you're very comfortable but you have to be leisurely. You have to

stroll rather than rush, and that slows you down. Because, you see, all people who are in a rush are not related to the material present.

Supposing—let's take—you're in a rush to get coffee when you get up in the morning. What do you do? You take instant coffee. And that's a punishment for being in a hurry. It doesn't taste of coffee; not really. So, because you forced it—it's like forcing the growth of tomatoes: they don't taste of tomatoes anymore. Forced apples: they're called 'delicious.' They're nothing but wet pith. So this is very important. This is showing that we aren't here. We're insane: we're not all there, as they say. But trying to get to something—the result, the thing we thought we wanted, the thing that we thought would be what would make us happy; you've got to get something.

Now, it's true: in order to not be hungry, you have to eat. And therefore, when you eat there's a certain satisfaction. You feel alright. But then, when you begin to consider that life is going to wear out, and there are all sorts of problems—disease, change, and misfortune—and you get depressed. And then, in order to feel happy, you eat when you don't need to eat. Then you begin to get obesity and indigestion, and wonder why the possession of all this great food isn't doing anything for you—it's supposed to! And so, in the same way with property of all kinds: when it is used to get the thing that you look forward to in the future and don't seem to have now, it becomes a complete delusion. And you can't understand, because you think that the possession of these things ought to make you happy. The admen have persuaded you that if you could get this kind of car, this kind of yacht, this kind of house, this kind of scene—whatever it may be—that's the thing in life, that's what's important, and it doesn't make people happy at all. And then they wonder why it doesn't, and feel cheated, and they have to go to psychoanalysts and churches and things like that to be persuaded that it's coming sometime, somehow; the thing that always seems to be missing. And there's nothing missing at all! Except—I mean, supposing you're absolutely starved and you just don't have the normal flow of energy through your organism, then, of course, you need food. Or, if you're freezing, you need shelter. But in the ordinary way, when you are fed and sheltered, there isn't anything missing. It's all here, but nobody is here to see it; everybody is wandering off to something else in the distance.

And, of course, this is preeminently true with two other aspects of life. I've discussed housing, furniture, and clothing. But, more specifically, food in the White Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture is unbelievably bad when you consider it by and large. The reason being that we eat food because it's good for us. And that's a dreadful thing to do because it means that you look at the food from the point of view of abstract dietetics rather than concrete taste. And wherever dietitians get interfering with cooking, it is utterly destroyed. In every university from coast to coast, where you would think would be centers of culture, the institutional food is unbelievably abominable, and the scholars are ashamed to come out about it and protest and lay down the law because they're supposed to be devoted to higher things. And, after all, what you eat—just so long as it's got the right chemicals in it—isn't very important.

But what this is—you see, the trouble with that is two things: to eat in order to live—sort of, that it's good for you—is... what do you mean, "good for you?" It means that it helps you to go on into the future. But what is the point of going on into the future when all the meals ahead of you are these unappetizing things that are just going to enable you to go on into the future? And the second thing is that eating in this spirit is very disrespectful to all the creatures you have killed in order to eat. It's even disrespectful to an onion to eat it improperly. Onions are living creatures, and if you cut up an onion for dinner you should reverence the onion, you should respect it. Because if you don't have a feeling of love for the onion, for the fish, for whatever you eat, you won't cook it properly and you won't enjoy it. Cooking is a process of loving. And it is a paying of respect to these marvelous beings which we ingest in order to go on living. So this entirely futuristic, dietetic attitude to food is—again, you see—a question of purely quantitative thinking, of lack of relation to the material world.

I may make out: one other rather important aspect of life is lovemaking. Here, again, is a subject entirely neglected in our education—from any practical point of view. I mean, [there are] a lot of theoretical works, some of which are fantastic and grotesque. But as a fine art, when you compare what goes on in most bedrooms with the things that are suggested in the Kama Sutra, the difference is amazing. That there could be a real great art as between lovers—husbands and wives, and so on—is something, again,

that we don't consider because—once again—although sex is fun, we go about it not really because we enjoy it—we can't admit that—but it's good for us, it's a healthy outlet. And also, it's necessary—of course—for having children, and that's also something for the future, you see?

And, likewise, when it gets to children: we don't relate to children in the material present very well. This is especially true of what one calls child-centered families. Here is a frustrated mama and papa who feel guilty for some reason or other. Either they didn't really make it in life the way they wanted to make it, and they hope their children will. And they feel that, anyway, the reason why I am earning a living and you are a housewife is that it's for the sake of our children. We live as husband and wife in order to bring up children. Now, this is completely backwards. If a husband and wife have a vocation in life—that is to say, they are deeply interested in and devoted to living—supposing the husband is a doctor and he is fascinated with healing people, and that's really what he's about, the children—if permitted to do so—will catch his fascination. If the wife loves working in the kitchen, the children actually want to help. But we don't allow them to because what we do is: in an industrial society you can't possibly have children around the factory or the office. In more primitive agricultural societies you can have children around the farm, around the shop, and so on, and in countries like Mexico—and it used to be so in Japan before they shrilled them all off to school—the children worked along with their parents and learned their crafts.

But now we, first of all, say no, no! We're going to do some—we're going to propitiate you with toys. And these are fake plastic replicas of things that adults play with, like guns and dolls, and they're always frustrating. They never quite come up to expectations. The children, therefore, break them and it reduces them to fury, and at the end of the day every household I know—in good, nice, American homes where there are children—they are strewn from end to end with disintegrated plastic. Papa is coming home from the office with a mysterious commodity called money—which is... you've got to bring it, but nobody's really interested—and so the house has to be tidy for him to get back. Therefore, there's a screaming, knock-down, drag-out battle with mama trying to get all the children to clean up and throw this stuff away. And he comes home from a job in which nobody is

interested because they have no part in it. The wife knows nothing about it except in a theoretical way, the children know nothing about it because it's something he does off there. And then, all his interests—if he has any interest in his job at all, off there, with the community of people with whom he works in that situation—he comes back, and with people to whom he now has absolutely no real relationship whatever he's supposed to be a good pal and nice, kind husband. And that is why, in all our comic magazines, the father of the family is portrayed as a clown. Invariably. All the jokes are on poor old dad. Whew!

But again, you see: this is abstractionism. It's a result, for example, that the whole family set-up in our culture is an institution hanging over from agrarian civilization, which just doesn't work in an urban-industrial civilization. And we keep it up because that's the way things are supposed to be, and we've never re-thought human relationships in immediate relation to this new kind of situation in which we're living. So those families that thrive and get on reasonably well with each other are fortunate flukes—of which there will always be a certain number.

I could go on endlessly with this discussion of our lack of relation. I mean, let's just take our notions of feminine beauty: they're entirely fabricated by some curious creeps who edit Vogue magazine and Harper's Bazaar to make stuffed dummies who, when actually encountered, are about as comfortable as falling into the middle of a bicycle. And, you know, poor women: they're always having to live up to the image of some movie star, or somebody, who is the great type of the day. They feel their husbands will be disappointed if they don't look like that. And that's because we set up these ideal external surface forms of beings, having no sensitivity to the substance, to the weight, to the volume, to the temperature, and—above all—to the smell.

It is, indeed, the sense of smell—among all matters of the material present—is the most repressed in this culture. And therefore, interestingly enough, it is one of the main channels of unconscious communication. Whatever is repressed is, as Jung would say, put into the unconscious and thereby activated in a special way. So a great deal of ESP—or telepathic communication: intuitive likes and dislikes we form for other people—are

the result of the sense of smell which we don't recognize consciously because we are not attending to it. And the word 'smell' means bad smell: it smells. You know the story about Dr. Johnson—who never bathed, you know?—and he was traveling in a coach, and a very dignified lady got in, sat down, and said to him, "You smell." He said, "Madam, on the contrary: you smell. I stink!" But, you see, smell is essentially bad smell.

In English, there are only three adjectives peculiarly used for qualities of smell: fragrant, acrid, pungent. All other adjectives used for smell are borrowed from taste or some other sense. It's repressed, you see? We're not really aware of smell. And so, we want the human body to smell of disinfectants and things like that, rather than its own natural, interesting flavors. And so, everybody is scrubbed, and over-cleaned, and squirted with alcohol or something, so that they shan't smell. But, actually, they do smell, only they smell of a kind of a lab instead of people.

So you can see in these many, many ways that we're not here, and we're not present to materiality because of the strange notion—you see—that the material present is a hoax. You say:

Lay not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where moth

and rust doth corrupt

But lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven

Well, the way we've interpreted that saying is: lay up treasure in the future. Take out your eternal life insurance policy, you see? So: it's coming.

Actually, "treasure in heaven" is now, but we think that the real now-world, you see, is disintegrating, crumbling, and therefore is bad. But that's not the reason. The fact that—yes—the real-world now is always unceasable. It's changing. You can't grasp it; there's nothing to hold on to. But that's why it's spiritual. When you lean on it, it collapses. But don't lean on it. Live in it, but don't lean on it; don't try to hold it. Because in just the same way as when you embrace someone and you try to hold too hard—you squeeze the breath out of them and therefore you strangle them—so, in the same way, you don't grab hold of the world. You can't sense it that way. I cannot feel

whatever this is by [Alan hits the object] doing this, you see? I can't get the maximum taste out of beef by grinding it to pieces with my teeth and forcing my tongue against it. Because what I do is I dull the nerve ends. It's a kind of a light touch; you let it flow through your fingers.

And so, by letting life slip—and it's always slipping; it's nowever changing. The more it runs, the more it stays. The more it stays, the more it runs. That's the way it is. And if you don't hold on to it, it's always here. If you do hold on to it, it's always running away. So you suddenly discover that (this is the most shocking thing, you see) that the physical world—right here and now, this absolutely concrete moment— is everything that you could ever have imagined the beatific vision to be. This is quite startling that it's so if you are really wide awake.

I have thought of a sort of fantasy, and I'll try and describe it. When you read about the beatific vision in the Paradiso of Dante, you get this fantastic description of the sort of rainbow-rose: at the center, vivid white light which you can't look at. Just dazzling white light. And then, as it goes out from that, you get all the colors of the spectrum going out into violet and then going out into black. But it's black so transparent, like obsidian, that it's not... it's luminous black. And then, again, suddenly, vivid white in a great arc comes around the black, and it does the trick again. And now, that's not all it can do. The rays start waving, see? And the whole thing starts shimmering like waves. And then it says, "Now, that's not all we can do." Then they do curlicues. Every conceivable kind of complexity. Then they start making angles. All the light starts dancing, you see? Ka-doo de-da, che-doo de-dah, che-doo de-dah, cha-cha-cha! And you see—you could imagine those Buddhist mandalas where there are radiances full of myriads of Buddhas, all dancing, all rattling bells and thunderbolts and swords, and the whole thing is going ka-cha ka-cha ka-cha, and suddenly it goes into another dimension, see? There's more of it. And then it starts getting sound dimensions going with all this color, and smell dimensions going with the sound. And the sound gets so deep, and so bass, and so vibrant that it becomes solid, and you can touch it. And the thing gets more and more complicated. And suddenly, before you know where you are, here it is. We're just that thing, [which has] reached this degree of complexity. See?

Just like that. But it's never somewhere else, you see? You don't get it anywhere but here.

Now, if you try to find it here, and say, "Now, golly! Let's do this right now! I've really gotta pay attention to now." See? And you try to look at that, you see, and bring now into focus and really look at it: you're still pushing it away. It has to come to you by—you can't seek now, because the moment you seek it you're not looking at the real now, you're looking at one just ahead. See? So in some, this necessity of relating to the material present is one of the cardinal components of a good ecological attitude. Because greed—which is, essentially, discontent with the present (admittedly, some people living at the edge of poverty have an inadequate material present from a physical point of view)—but it is the greed of the well taken care of that is so terrifying: people who have enough to eat, and wear, and're clothed, and are still greedy, and therefore go out to exploit this Earth and drag every last ounce of wealth out of it—which is immediately turned into rubbish and poisoned gas—because they can't be alive here at the moment.

So, let's take an intermission

In yesterday's session—two sessions—I covered first the ecological conception of an organism's relationship to its environment—and thus, of course, of the individual's relationship to the universe—and I was trying to show you that this is not a question of two systems that are separate, acting upon each other or interacting. It is a question, rather, of a single system of energy expressed with great complexity which is one process, one activity. It is possible to become aware that this is so, not simply theoretically, but as a matter of sensation. And when one becomes aware of it in that way, the feeling is at first curious and is apt to be misinterpreted. It can be felt either as if you were sort of floating—that is, completely passive: not doing anything, not making any exertion of will, but as if all your behavior was simply happening. That is one way of feeling it. Another way of feeling it is the sensation that you are God and making everything happen. These are the polar opposite ways of feeling the same thing. And when people, for one reason or another, slip into this kind of sensation—and it can happen by accident—they may jump to very strange conclusions depending on their background, their religious upbringing—because it is that background

which gives them a language in which to express to others and to themselves how they feel. But you must be very clear about this and understand it theoretically thoroughly—just in case this ever happens to you—so that you won't be accused of being crazy.

It is not, you see, that your own individual organism is the puppet of everything else, responding to it as a billiard ball responds to being hit by a cue. It is not also that you, as an individual, are an independent source of energy which pushes the world around. Both these views are based on a false assumption that the individual organism is really separate from the world; that's the false assumption. And we think about this situation by analogy with billiards because Newton thought that way, Descartes thought that way. And Newton and Descartes have molded the common sense of the average person living in the 20th century, even though our science has abandoned the mechanics of Newton—it certainly has in physics, it certainly has in biology. Although I find that, in psychology, people still talk and think in a Newtonian way. That, for example, Freud structured the organism of psychology, of the human psyche, by analogy with hydraulics. So you must call Freudianism a form of psycho-hydraulics: the unconscious is the deeps, sexual energy is represented like the flow of a river which can be dammed up, repressed, it has to be provided with outlets—these are all hydraulic terms. And hydraulics is a form of Newton's mechanics. Because, you see, in Newtonian mechanics—which is based, really, on billiards—the balls are standing for atoms, and they bang each other around. And so everything is explained, the movement of ball A, is explained by the behavior of balls B, C, D, E, and so on insofar as they impinge against it. And you have to go back, and back, and back, trying to figure out how it all started. Who pushed it first? And who pushed him? You see?

Well, this model won't do anymore. Things just don't behave that way because they are not separate from each other in the first place. This is the point I wanted to make clear in this first round of discussion that we had yesterday: that the differentiation of the world is not separation anymore than when you see many waves on the ocean, they are different waves but it's all the one ocean waving. And you can't have half a wave, for example: a wave that is crest without trough. That's—half-waves are just not found in nature. And so, in the same way, you can't find solids except in space, and

you won't find space except where there are solids because they are aspects of each other in rather the same way as in magnetism: the positive and negative, or north and south poles, are always found together. You can't have a purely north-poled magnet. And in order to have a current—an electric current—flowing, it must be polarized. It will not flow until both poles are hitched. So, in the same way, there is a polar relationship between the individual and the world. They are both aspects of a single energy. And so, there is no question of things being controlled, and moved, and pushed by other things as billiard balls are, or billiard balls appear to be from a certain superficial point of view. We've just got this huge being—although 'being' is not quite the right word because existence is composed of being and non-being, corresponding to solid and space, crest and trough of wave. Because, fundamentally, the energy of the world is vibratory. It's on and off, and there is no off without on, no on without off. To be or not to be is not the question, because to be implies not to be as much as not to be implies to be. So in the Taoist Chinese philosophy it is said that being and non-being arise mutually. It's like the egg and the hen: you don't find eggs without hens, nor do you find hens without eggs. A hen is, as a matter of fact, one egg's way of becoming other eggs. It all goes together.

But we don't see this for the simple reason that we are primarily involved in using a method of perception which is analytic, which spotlights various features of the world and does so with the aid of naming, or giving symbols to, those features of the world which we consider significant and, therefore, ignoring features of the world which we don't consider significant and for which, therefore, we don't have names. Haven't you noticed how often children point at something and say, "What is that?" And you can't make out exactly what it is they're pointing at. They are pointing out something they've noticed but which adults don't consider important, and they want a name for it. We don't have a special word for dry space. We don't have a special word for the inside surface of a tube. But American Indian languages have such words. Eskimos recognize five different kinds of snow, but the Aztec language has one word for snow, rain, hail, and ice. You can see the geographical reasons for that. So, according to what you consider important, you have names. And according to naming, you identify separate things. But they're only separate in a purely theoretical way. They're not materially separate, not physically separate.

And so it's immensely important that we become aware of this fact, because if we're not aware of it we do the most stupid things. We try to solve problems by altering what are only the symptoms of problems. We try, for example, unilaterally to abolish mosquitoes, forgetting that mosquitoes go with a certain kind of environment and play a very important part in it—not to mention other insects which are killed when we kill the mosquitoes. And so, in this way, we are doing things without recognizing that they're going to have unpredictable results in unexpected places. Same way if you put certain drugs or certain operations in the human organism: you've got to be very careful of what you're doing and you have to study the organism very carefully in order to know what consequences this will have. If you farm in a certain way without due respect for the ecology of the whole area in which you're working you can get the most appalling results. And, characteristically, our technological civilization is much too heedless of these ecological connections.

Therefore, in order to overcome our characteristic sense of hostility to the external world—and to stop conquering nature with bulldozers, or conquering space with rockets—we have to realize that the external universe is just as much ourselves as our own body. That we have—each one of us—an inside and an outside. And if the inside of your skin is your inside, what is outside your skin is your outside. And the two are inseparable, they are polar. Because you can't have an inside without an outside or an outside without an inside—except [if] you construct something like a Klein bottle that is a sort of freak. Maybe the universe, as such, is a Klein bottle; who knows.

However, the second point I was making, which arises directly from this—and this was the burden of the second session—was that this ignorance (or ignore-ance) of the inseparability of all different things goes hand in hand with a bad relationship, or an inadequate relationship, to the material present. I was showing that the material present is the only time there is. Other times—past times, future times—are abstractions; there never is anything but the present. But you mustn't, of course, think of the present as a split second. That's an abstract view of the present. You tend to think of the present as a split second because you're used to looking at a watch, and the watch is marked out with hairlines, and the idea of watchmakers is to

make those lines as thin as possible consistent with visibility. And therefore, as the hand sweeps across the hairline, you've hardly time to say "now." And we begin to think that the present is that. Well, of course it isn't. Present time is rather like the field of vision, where you've got, as it were, a fairly clear center: the field of vision is an oval and you can run your fingers 'round it just at the point where they start to become invisible. And you realize that the edge of the field is fuzzy. And so, in the same way, we have a vision of movement in time as having fuzzy edges. Just as when you are listening to music: you don't hear music a single note at a time, you hear it in phrases. You anticipate what's coming and you remember what has been played. And so you have a kind of wide but fuzzy-edged view of what is called the present.

But it's what is always there, you see? And if—in a culture—we are brought up not to see this, we start to living for the future. And we live for the future mainly because our present is inadequate. And it's inadequate because we are not seeing it fully; we're seeing it in terms of abstractions. And if your present is inadequate and is, matter of fact, only an abstract version of life, you're like a person with a non-nutritive diet. You always, therefore, feel hungry, and you keep eating because you want more! So, in the same way: "More life, please!" "More time, please!" More! More! More! More! Because sometime or other, it's gotta be alright; the thing I've been looking for must happen—I hope! But, of course, it never does. Not if you live that way. Because when all your goals in life are attained and you are at the top of your profession, or you've got beautiful children, or you—whatever it was you wanted—you feel the same as you always felt. You're still looking for something in the future. And there isn't any future! Not really. Therefore, I often say that only people who live in a proper relationship to the material present have any use for making any plans at all. Because then the plans work out; then they're capable of enjoying them. The other people aren't.

So people, then—who aren't here, fully, but whose minds are off somewhere else all the time—are always starved and always rushing to get there. And there's nowhere to go—except here. But I qualify this word 'material present' because of the fact that the word 'material' is a very much misunderstood word. It's a word you can use in a lot of different

ways. As generally used, we say the body, the earth, the rocks, the trees, the animals, and all that are material. And we set over, against that, the spiritual or the mental as if that were some kind of vaguely gaseous world permeating the material world. Or perhaps not gaseous, but rather abstract: a world of ideas, a world of principles. But it's so curious that, when people do that, they debase both the material and the spiritual domains of life because these domains of life have vitality only when they're together. When you see the material as the spiritual and the spiritual as the material. And then both of these concepts tend to vanish because what we call the material world in this put-down sense of the word 'material' is only a concept. If you want to conceive the world as material then that means, really, people who do conceive it as material in that sense of the word 'material' haven't got a good relationship to it. But if you have an immediate relationship, if you really are aware of the present, then your vision of the material world is transformed and you see that it isn't material, it isn't spiritual, it's indefinable. It's what there is. And there is no way of saying what that is because you can't put it into a particular category. And you can only define what you can classify.

Now, I know that is perhaps a little bit of a difficult idea to master because of our confusions of language. We could—if I might try to put it in one more way: I would say, probably, that the correct use of the word 'material' is to mean something like 'metered,' 'measured.' When we say something is immaterial, we can mean both that it doesn't matter—that is to say, it doesn't measure up to anything, it doesn't meter—or that it's spiritual, non-material, immaterial. So I would say the correct use of the word 'material' is: "the world as measured:" the world as represented in pounds, miles, decibels, photons, or whatever. And that, of course, is abstract. Because when you measure the world you don't really make any difference to it, just as the equator does not cut the world in two pieces.

So what is the world that is existing upon which our measures are imposed? What is it that underlies the network? The network of measurements, of classifications, of quantification? Well, you can't say. You can point to it, but you can't really say what it is. It's not a what. But that is what's here, I mean, that's the world we're actually living in, you see? What Korzybski called the unspeakable world. And so when I said the 'material present,' I

was using the word 'material' in an incorrect sense. Not the measured present, but the physical present of actual nonverbal being. And people, therefore, who do not relate well to this become incompetent in the practical arts of life. They become bad cooks, bad lovers, bad architects, bad potters, bad clothiers, because they really have no love for anything except abstractions: money, quantities, status, symbols. And people become absolutely bamboozled by symbols, and so want the symbol rather than what is signified by the symbol. But, you see, however, if you want what is signified by the symbol, then you've got the universe by the tail because every thing that is symbolized by a symbol is inseparable from the whole universe. When you, in other words, you catch a fish, it's not just a thing called a 'fish' that you've got, you are being fed by all oceans when you catch a fish. You are being sustained by this colossal life. And everything, of course, that goes with the oceans. It's as if the ocean reached out and fed you. And that's why the real reason for giving thanksgiving at meals that... of course, in the West people thank God, but it's a more concrete expression to thank the fish. But then, of course, you're thanking the ocean and so on.

So this attitude, now, of a new vision of nature: not as something chopped up into bits so that we could look upon the universe as an assemblage of things, as if somehow or other there's all this collection of galaxies and stuff floating around—where would they come from? Well, they've sort of been washed up like flotsam and jetsam, and have come together by some sort of gravity, and here they are, spinning around. As if it was a collection in the sense of something gathered, that formerly hadn't been gathered. Of course, astronomically, this isn't taken seriously. People think, rather, that it all blew up, that all the galaxies expanded from a center and are still going. It's far more likely. Maybe they'll come back together again and then blow up once more. Who know? Maybe they'll all fade out. But then, things will be where they were before it all started. And what happened once can always happen again. Pulsation, you see, is the very nature of life. Big pulses and tiny pulses. Pulses within pulses, forever and ever.

So, this point of view is one which has flourished in the Far East, where the relationship of man to the physical world has been very different from our idea. And this raises some curious problems because the great civilizations of the Far East, particularly the Chinese and the Japanese, did not—until

coming into contact with Europe and the United States—did not evolve a technology. And because they didn't evolve a technology, they had all kinds of problems for which we say that made them backward. They had problems of disease, and famine, and poverty. And we say, "Well, the poor benighted Chinese! We have nothing to learn from them because their civilization didn't do the things we've done!" But what we don't realize so readily is that this technology which we've produced is very recent. It was only in the middle of the 19th century that we really got going with this. And note that, before that date, we permitted as perfectly ordinary procedures judicial torture, slavery, child labor, filth of unspeakable proportions, and plagues, and all that sort of thing was just the way it was anywhere else in the world, in Europe. But we've forgotten it; we have short memories. We could sing in church:

All things bright and beautiful,

All creatures great and small,

All things wise and wonderful,

The Lord God made them all.

The rich man in his castle,

The poor man at his gate,

He made them high and lowly,

And ordered their estate.

Now that verse is, today, eliminated from the hymn. Because it's saying, you see, that the stations of life—fortunes and misfortunes, riches and poverty—are God-given and nothing can be done about it, and people tend to accept states of affairs about which nothing can be done. And nothing could be done about it until the industrial revolution. And then, of course, the minute that starts everybody wants it. The Chinese want it, the Indians want it, the Japanese want it, and so on.

But the Chinese—for some reason or other, you see—did not develop technology. Now, why didn't they? And why did we? There isn't any simple answer to that question, but one thing that we should note: there are various geographical reasons, and this is not the only reason, but when you look at the map of Europe you will notice that it's very wiggly. It's full of inlets, harbors, and all like this, see? China, by contrast, is a great solid landmass. So is India. The Europeans were preeminently sailors, and it is highly possible—to begin with—that all the great early technical discoveries were the work of seafaring people. This is one of Buckminster Fuller's theories. That, in quite ancient times, there were rather independent seagoing people who had their own culture, who knew that the world was round, who had great navigators, and from then we learned such things as the hoist cranes, that the first real houses were overturned boats, and that trade and the cross-fertilization of different civilizations and different cultures was a work of sea travel. With the machinery necessary for sea travel. You're not depending on a horse, you're depending upon something a human being has made, and upon a very high form of technology. Because sailing is a direct exemplification of man and nature in cooperation. Rowing is different. Rowing is a rather unintelligent way of propelling a boat because it requires a great deal of effort. But sailing is so skillful because you are simply using the energy of nature to move the boat. You are flowing through nature, effortlessly, by using the forces around you in a clever way. When you want to go against the wind you tack, you get the wind to blow you into it.

And this is what is called in Chinese wu wei, meaning literally 'non-interference' or 'non-aggression.' Sometimes translated 'non-action,' but that isn't quite correct. Wu wei is acting in accordance with the field of forces in which you find yourself. Therefore, in splitting wood, you split with the grain because that is the way, the course of things, the Tao, is arranged. So any skillful person will therefore always inquire: "What is the nature of the field of forces in which I find myself?" The Chinese would ask, what is its lǐ? And the word lǐ means: what is the organic pattern of this situation? And then, act in accordance with it. Don't ever force it. Suppose, then, you are sawing: you will find that if you push the saw you will make a jagged cut. And you get impatient. When any people saw wood impatiently they always make a mess of it. But the saw has its own weight, and if you get the

sensation that the saw is doing the work, you see—that's not quite true; your muscles are involved—but you get the sensation of the saw doing the work, then you will make a good cut. See that the saw is sharp and let it do the job for you. You will find in all crafts that the same kind of thing happens when anybody develops consummate skill. When you sing well, you get the sensation that the song is singing itself. When you drive well, somehow, the car and the road are carrying you along, but in a very skillful way. This is this thing I was remarking on at first, this new feeling of a relationship to the world. And what you're doing when you do anything skillfully, you see: you are expressing the total power of the field of forces which is expressing itself in the form of skillful action through the agency of you as a human organism. But it requires intelligence to do this.

Now, what is intelligence? Well, I'm going to reserve that question. I just want to go back a bit to the Chinese. Why didn't they evolve technology? Well, they knew an awful lot of things. Joseph Needham is writing a seven-volume history of science and civilization in China. Telling us all about their mathematics, their astronomy, their physics, their husbandry ideas, everything in the way of techniques that the Chinese evolved. But there were two reasons why they didn't go on to technology as we have it. One of them the bad reason—I think—and the other a good reason.

Confucian thought is not interested in nature. It is humanistic—interested in human relations—but very scholastic because it's based on a literature. In other words, the great Confucian classics exercised a rigidifying effect upon Chinese culture even though they were a great principle of order, of social order. But just in the same way as when you get any scripture—the Bible, the Koran, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, anything like that—and people say that that's the authority, then you're stuck. And then you get the situation of the theologians who said to Galileo, "We won't look through your telescope because it already says in the Book how the universe is working, and the book can't be wrong. We know!" And people who get stuck on books always think they know. And it's happening today. When somebody advances an absolutely outrageous proposition for science, lots of scientists are so blind they say, "Well, that's impossible. It couldn't be." Because many scientists aren't true scientists. They are rigidly defending a conception of the universe which requires that everything be as

dull as possible. That the universe be absolutely boring, and stupid above all. And therefore, anything that reveals something that science can't account for—all events that science can't account for are simply ignored. And Charles Fort was a man who devoted his life to collecting records of events and occurrences for which there is no reasonable scientific explanation as yet. And the trouble is: all these events are rather unusual because science only studies the usual. And you have to have an event happen several times in order to study it scientifically. [You can] say, "Well, it happened. And we all saw it." And then the scientist comes in. It's like, you know, when you get sick and you call in the doctor, and all the symptoms vanish. And so—or your car goes wrong, and you take it to the mechanic and nobody can make it make that funny noise it was making, and so on. So, in the same way, a scientist comes around and says, "Well, you say you saw this thing happen. Well, I'll observe it." Well, it won't happen!

So, this is the problem, you see: the Confucians got too hung up on books—that is to say, on a theoretical system—in just the same way that we are hung up on our abstract concept of nature, and are operating in terms of an abstract concept of nature which is taught to us in school, and which we are brought up so much so that we are absolutely hypnotized by it, and we can't experience things which our conceptual system doesn't provide for. When the concept system stops working because it no longer fits the constantly changing pattern of reality, we're in trouble. Well that, of course, was the trouble for the Chinese. Their Confucian concept system had very serious limitations.

Now, that was the bad reason. There was another reason why they didn't evolve a technology, which was Taoist. The Taoists were really interested in nature. If you read their writings—in Lao-Tzu and Zhuang Zhou—they are full of natural illustrations. The behavior of water, of insects, of the elements are all used as illustrations of the art of life. Now, the Confucians—in contrast [to] the Taoists—were lexicographers. They believed in what's called the rectification of names. The language, in other words, mustn't get out of hand; there must be very clear and rigid definitions so that we use words the right way. Now, the Taoists had a critique of this. They said, "With what words will you define the words? And with what

words will you define the words that you used the ones to define with?” Obviously, this situation is circular. Every dictionary is really a vicious circle because it’s words defined in terms of other words. And they’re all the words in the dictionary. So that, say, you take a dictionary that has no pictures in it: to someone who doesn’t know the language it’s absolutely a closed system that you can’t penetrate.

I once thought, as a little boy, I was going to write a fundamental book which would contain the necessary fundamentals for knowledge. And the first thing I naturally did, therefore, was to write down the alphabet. Then I wanted to write down how it was pronounced. And I saw that I couldn’t possibly write down how it was pronounced. I needed to know from the living world how to sound “A, B, C, D.” And that could never be written down. So I was stuck at the start. I abandoned the project at once.

So the Taoists laughed at the Confucians on that account. But also, they felt that nature was organic. It was—they saw, so vividly, that it was a single living organism of immense complexity. And thus, they never thought of it as consisting of separate parts. Just as the head goes with the feet, and as a stomach goes with a brain, they arise mutually; together. They are different but not separate. And therefore, they were very cautious about interfering with anything.

Furthermore, their theory of politics was quite different from the Confucian. Confucian politics is based on the idea of rulership. There is the emperor. There is the family, which is strictly hierarchical structure of authority from above which must be followed and obeyed by those below. But the Taoists, when they—the first book, the Tao Te Ching, is a manual of advice to the emperor, among other things. And what it says to the emperor is, “Don’t rule.”

Because the great Tao flows everywhere,

both to the right and to the left.

It loves and nourishes all things,

but does not lord it over them.

And when merits are accomplished

it makes no claim to them.

Therefore, the emperor is to be retiring, to disappear, to be rather more like—in our own local government—the sanitary engineer than the mayor. To have a kind of anonymous quality of being underground, and of being the one who allows a democracy. Because the Taoist feeling is that you get cooperation—people from people best by letting them cooperate rather than compelling them to.

Now, then, contrast this with a Western theory in which the world is seen not as an organism, but as a mechanism. Now, what's the difference? A mechanism has replaceable parts. It is fundamentally an assemblage of parts. An organism isn't. Furthermore, a mechanism has a governor. And an organism apparently doesn't. It may have a network of governors, all working together in a kind of reticulate pattern. But take, for example: does the brain run the body, or does the stomach? Which is the more important? Well, there are two schools of thought (of course). The stomach people say, "Well, stomachs are really fundamental. They were what was there at first. Because an organism... really, eating is the important thing. But the brain helps the stomach find food. That's what it's really doing. It evolved in order to develop eyes and ears to sneak around and find out things to swallow." So that's the stomach theory. Then, the brain theory is that "It's true that the brain is perhaps a later development than the stomach. That means that the stomach was just the forerunner for the really important character to arrive on the scene. And all the stomach does is it gives fuel to the brain. And the operations of the brain, in terms of culture and all that sort of thing, are what life is really all about." Now, actually, both theories are right and both are wrong. The arrangement between the head and the stomach is mutual. They arise together.

Now, in a system which has a boss, it's different. When you've got the mechanism, and the chauffeur or the engineer who puts it together and operates it, then you have a government. You have a monarchical world order. And when you have government, and things can be viewed as happening in a mechanical order, you can say, "Change it! I order you to behave differently. Do it this way instead." And how do we do that? Why,

we apply mechanical techniques: chop off heads, or force people to do this, that, and the other; I mean, just separate these things up and rearrange them. So then, because—in the West—we went through the phase of Newtonian mechanics, which arises out of the theory that the physical world is an artifact, that it was made by an architect or a super-cosmic engineer, and governed from above by law, we thought up the idea of explaining the behavior of things by mechanical causality. And this led to technology. To steam engines. To automobiles. To hydraulic systems. Everything. Electricity.

But when we reached a certain point in that development we started wondering. We started discovering all kinds of processes for which the mechanical analogy was not adequate. It did us well up to a point, but now, in quantum theory and in biology—in these two things in particular—an organic way of looking at things is clearer, is nearer, to the way they're operating than a mechanical way. And therefore, say, the philosophy of Whitehead—he's probably the greatest organicist in the West—reads just like the philosophy of Zhuang Zhou. It's the same view of the world. So that, somehow, just at this moment of the development of technology—when we suddenly see it's a lot more complicated than we thought it was, and that our project to change the universe is not going to be as easy as even H. G. Wells imagined—it's just at this moment that this Chinese wisdom becomes available to the West. And we can understand it because it's now talking our language. It's talking of the language of relativity. The whole Zhuangzi book starts out with an absolutely marvelous chapter on relativity: relativity of the opposites, the interdependence, the mutual interpenetration of everything that happens. And we've discovered it.

So, there is [the possibility], then—isn't there, at this point in history?—of civilizing technology. Let's put it that way. You could almost say naturalizing technology. Technology came in as a barbarian. A very competent barbarian: all steely, all glittering with force of arms. And technology is busy transforming the face of the Earth into its own image, which is the image of a machine. Covering the Earth with concrete. But technologists know that these freeways will be obsolete in the not too distant future. Grass will grow up through the cracks and they will vanish. Because we shall take to the air like insects. And all our wires and cables;

all that terrible stuff will vanish because we shall be able to transmit electric power without using them. We shall abandon telephones. Suddenly, as it were, the whole mechanical structure will vanish because it was only a step; what de Chardin calls a peduncle—that is, you know, when you’ve got an amoeba separating, it goes apart and there’s a thin little—like an hourglass—a neck joining them, and then they separate, and so there are still two little pear-shaped tops facing each other, and gradually withdraw and they’re balls once again. And that little neck, and the two projecting pieces, those are peduncles. And the peduncle disappears in the course of evolution. Like an umbilical cord is a peduncle. And so all this contraption that we’ve devised, technologically, is a peduncle. And it will vanish because, as we really go about it, we’re going to get so that we don’t need houses, practically. We’re going to find ways of, you know, just altering the temperature in the air and living in a grass hut, or an invisible plastic dome. And spread it all so that we don’t concentrate in cities; don’t have to, because you can just sit and you can dial any book in the Library of Congress and read it on a screen in front of you. All sorts of things like that to be done. So that this, also—Toynbee, in the Study of History, pointed out that we will become increasingly independent of tracks, roads, wires, and so on, so that the civilization becomes airborne. Maybe it’ll even go so far—and here I’m getting into science fiction—as abandoning the electronic method of communication; we may get a telepathic one instead. Who knows? Be a funny world, wont it, when there’s no private thoughts. Everybody’s completely transparent to everybody else. Sure have to get along! Although, as a matter of fact, this distribution will facilitate privacy. Because the thing that really militates against privacy is the city. And the controls of huge traffics of human beings going about their business; this is a real problem. This is invasion.

So then, this, however—this technical type of development, in order to go along those lines, requires that people who are responsible for technical development be well-imbued with an ecological philosophy and see the direction of things so they will not keep perpetuating anachronisms. If—for example, the automobile is a hopeless anachronism with a gasoline engine. But it’s going to be very difficult to get rid of it because people want to sell oil. Or because machine tools would have to be completely made over. It would be terribly difficult for the industry to change. Therefore, we get

anachronisms which blind us to ingenuity and ability to see what could be done instead. You may think that sounds communistic. It isn't at all, because nothing is more of an anachronism than a bureaucracy. A collectivist state, in other words, is the most hopeless thing to change because nobody has any responsibility. It is not organic, it's a monolithic machine. That's the pattern that we see in so-called communist countries. And they have just as tough a time producing an innovation as we do. We have to think of new political ideas altogether; ideas that've never been heard of. But the way of thinking about politics, as of thinking about technics, is by an organic model instead of the mechanical model. The world as one body. But a body, you see, is a highly diversified system with all kinds of division of function, and yet, all one. It is not like an anthill. It's much more differentiated. And that is the human image as distinct from, say, the insect image or the machine image.

The problem I was discussing this morning was really the relationship of ecology to technology, but I was discussing it in a historical way: raising the problem of why technology originated in the West and not, for example, in China, and showing—first of all—that those people in China who did make some progress in the study of nature—the Taoists—thought about the world in accordance with a different model than people in the West. A model that did not immediately permit a technological development. The West thought about nature by analogy with mechanics, with machines. The Chinese thought about nature by analogy with organisms. A machine is something which can be taken apart and reordered, something which is the product of an act of engineering, and is therefore an organization with a governor. An organism is not made piecemeal, it grows and doesn't have a governor. All the parts in an organism are in an orderly anarchy—that is to say, they govern themselves. And the Chinese word for nature, *zìrán*, means 'that which is so of itself.' Therefore, that which functions without being pushed around by some external force. It is automatic, but not as we mean the word automatic. We mean a self-governing machine, and there's a certain difference here.

So, the problem then is: if the Chinese—viewing the world as an organism—felt on the whole that it was wiser to restrain one's interference with things—that is to say, there are certain situations in which the human being should simply lay hands off, there are other situations in which the human

being collaborates with nature—but he does so by virtue of having great awareness of the field of forces in which he is situated. This takes us back, of course, to the point that I made right at the beginning: that you really are the field of forces in which your organism is situated. Self-realization is, in fact, realizing—as a sensuous experience—that you are that field of forces; that you are both your outside and your inside. Which, of course, leads us to something that we can experience but cannot define.

And we can't define it for two reasons. One is: it's too complicated. And another reason is—even deeper than that—it leads us to the root and ground of reality, that is to say, (I'm only speaking in analogical terms) the continuum in which all things exist which can't be thought about as an object because it can't be classified. You can't say anything really meaningful about it at all. But it's tremendously important to know that you're it. That's the real you. Because if you don't know that you go crazy. You become dementedly absorbed in details, identifying yourself with a purely temporal—and, indeed, in some respects arbitrary—role which you're playing, and you forget that even if you do lose your shirt in this game, it doesn't matter in this round. Because at that level, there's no winner and no loser. So

So, the question we come to now is: well, how do you go about knowing the field of forces in which you live? How do you know which way the wind is blowing so that you can sail properly? When it isn't as simple a matter as wetting your finger and holding it up, and see which side gets cold first—that's where the wind's coming from. Or is it as simple as that?

We know—or think we know—that nature is extraordinarily complicated, and so, very difficult to understand. And if you can't understand a very complicated situation it's immensely difficult to make decisions about it. But there is a point of view from which nature is not complicated. And that, to an educated Westerner, may sound quite astonishing. When Buddhists speak in their philosophy about the world of form and the world that is formless, these two categories correspond roughly to the world as complicated and the world as simple. What makes the world complicated is not its actual physical structure, but an attempt to understand it in a certain way.

When you ask, “How does it work? Why does it do it?” then you start analyzing a flower, a body, a geological structure, and you are asking the question, really, “How can I reproduce—in words or numbers—what is going on here?” in such a way that I can predict what it will do next. Now, the trouble with words and numbers is that they have some peculiar limitations. It takes time to read. It takes longer, still, to listen to a tape recording. And to scan a mathematical expression—again, it is something strung out in a line, and you have to think carefully to understand the various steps which have been taken.

So these are methods of breaking down the phenomena of nature into a code. These codes can be handled by computers with astonishing speed. But the part of the human mind which we are mainly concerned with, which is the conscious mind, can only handle them very slowly because the conscious mind has to work in terms of symbols—verbal and mathematical—which are really very clumsy. So that by the time we have really thought about something, it’s usually too late to do anything about it. The circumstances have changed. The crisis about which we had to make a decision has already happened, and therefore we have to act without the kind of preparation we think we ought to have and without the kind of knowledge we think we ought to have. Because we cannot comprehend the world in verbal patterns.

As a result of that we always feel frustrated. We think we’re supposed to comprehend the world that way, and manage it that way, and a lot of people are not satisfied until you’ve given them an explanation. But it should be obvious that there never will be an explanation—in those terms, in the terms of words—because you can talk about the simplest object in the world forever and not fully describe its attributes. Words have a use, but they only have that use when they are operating in subordination to a kind of understanding that doesn’t depend on words at all. Words are like claws on the end of an arm, and the claws are no good unless subordinate to the more subtle organization of the arm and the rest of the body. So words are the claws in which we tear life to pieces and arrange it in certain ways, just as you have to bite—and therefore separate—the bits of a piece of meat in order to digest them. So, to make the world digestible in a certain way, you need to claw it apart.

But actually, we do all kinds of acts of understanding along with words which are not contained in the words. A person, to get your point, does many, many nonverbal operations. For example, to read a book requires that I be able to see. And seeing is a nonverbal operation. When you try to put it into words you come up against barriers of all kinds. It is a very difficult thing to describe. But that's only because you are trying to describe it in a difficult way. It's the same problem if you want to unload the bathtub because the drain is stopped, and you take out the water with a fork—it will take forever. But if you bring in a pail it'll be a lot faster. And there is something in trying to describe the world in words that is rather like trying to move water with a fork. It is efficient, in other words, for some purposes. But words—again, I point out: they communicate only to those who already know what you mean. “To him that hath shall be given.” And for that reason they're convenient: because then we can remind each other, in common by words, of things that we already know.

But water, as a word, means nothing to people who haven't experienced water. Once they have experienced it, the word is useful because it's like using money instead of barter. I can discuss water with you without having to bring some into the room and show it to you. So, words provide this kind of a shorthand. And very much, in so many ways, they have the advantages and disadvantages of money. Money helps us to transfer wealth, words help us to organize experience and communicate about it with each other. But beyond that, when we try to put our experience into words and—in terms of words—comprehend experience, then we run into insuperable difficulties.

Not so long ago, a professor at Harvard—in discussing the heresy of certain members of the faculty who were conducting experiments in terms of changed states of consciousness—said that no knowledge is academically respectable knowledge which cannot be put into words. I don't know what became of the department of physical education at that point, but—or, not to mention, fine arts, and things like that, and music—but still, this is what he said. That's what lots of people feel, people who are in the scientific and technological world—but obviously is a type of intelligence that is not verbal or computational intelligence.

The eye, the brain, the organization of a plant are obviously intelligent. What do I mean, “intelligent?” I say they’re obviously intelligent because anyone can see it. I would even go so far as to say they’re not products of intelligence—as if some intelligent fellow had been around and left this as a kind of track of his competence—the growth of a plant is intelligence itself. And intelligence is naturally something that, in words, would always escape definition in the same way as the nervous system, upon which intelligence depends, is incomprehensible even to the neurologist. We know intelligence when we see it because we say, “It’s fascinating. My, isn’t that tricky! How ingenious. What a wonderful organization. How beautiful!” And we recognize in patterns of nature that this has happened. So when you see a human being, and you say, “What a piece of work is man! This is extraordinary! The beauty of the eyes, the marvelous organization and coordination of the limbs.” But then you realize that this is you. But you don’t know how you work it—and you do work it.

So, what it comes to is this: that in your total organization and nervous system, you are expressing a kind of intelligence that is—when looked at from the point of view of conscious analysis—unthinkably complex. And yet, from its own point of view, it’s perfectly simple because you don’t have to make an effort to see. You just see. You don’t have to make an effort to hear, the ear does it for you. You don’t have to make an effort to hold yourself together, the body holds you together. You do have to make an effort to get food, sometimes to keep warm, sometimes to defend yourself. So, some effort is always involved. And in a certain way, the heart, for example—which we don’t think about—it does work and it consumes energy, but you don’t have the sensation of making a decision every time your heart beats. Some, you see, people who are studying music, probably the wrong way, have to make a decision every time they play a note so as to stay on time and to play the right note. And then they get absolutely worn out because it’s decision after decision after decision, and there’s nothing more wearing than that. Because with every decision goes anxiety: was it the right decision?

There’s no way of avoiding that because if you’re going to decide—with the ordinary, responsible way of making decisions that we’re supposed to do—you never know whether you made a right decision or not until the

event about which you've decided is past. Because you never know how much information you need to collect to make the right decision, whether you did indeed collect enough, and whether the information you collected was relevant. And also, you realize that every possible decision can be radically affected by unforeseeable variables such that you've completed a contract with a business corporation and everything is in order, but you had no means of knowing that the president of that corporation upon whom you depended was going to slip on a banana skin and have a serious accident. There would be no way whatsoever of foreseeing that eventuality. Should you have taken an insurance policy on him? How comprehensive can an insurance policy be? Is it worth taking out an insurance policy? What are the chances of unforeseen events occurring of such significance and in such number that this sort of insurance policy is worthwhile and you're not just wasting money on paying the premiums? In the long run, in the long run, all insurance is a swindle. You should read Ambrose Bierce's book *The Devil's Dictionary*: he has the most subtle and extremely logical demolition of insurance. But in the short run, in a kind of chance-y way, you see, it sometimes pays off.

But, you see, this is the problem—the anxiety with which we are faced—in trying to conduct our lives by the exercise of conscious will and control: we realize that it is really beyond our comprehension. We don't understand. We cannot foresee all eventualities. And therefore, this sense of frustration through trying to control things gives us a feeling of existence which, for thousands of years, men have called *The Fall*. And the idea that there has been a fall, that something has been lost, is universal and very ancient. In the Taoist literature of China there are constant references to a sort of Golden Age. Lao-Tzu says, "When the great Tao lost"—in other words, when things did not always and automatically go in accordance with the course of nature—"there arose duty to man and right conduct. When the six family relationships fell apart, there was talk of filial sons and daughters, and faithful wives. When ministers became corrupt, then only did one hear of loyal ministers and wise councilors."

Now, therefore, when things have fallen apart, somebody gets up and starts preaching. And if there is one thing quite clear from history, it is that preaching does no one any good. It makes only hypocrites. Because if I tell

you that you ought to be concerned, and you ought to be unselfish, and you ought to cooperate, and you ought to be responsible—and because I imply to you that you're not—you will, in the first place, be resentful that I've had to tell you that, and you will feel guilty. But now you are under the impression that you really, and indeed, are a separate self with the power to perform all these virtues, and you then go through the motions of doing what you were told to do in the sermon. You are—in this case, then—an egocentric and selfish person pretending that you aren't. And the truth will always out because, in the long run, you will let down the people who are relying on you to be what you're not. And we have the most subtle ways of letting people down while apparently going through the motions of doing exactly what they expect of us.

Yes: we can be so pure, but so cruel. So loving, but so demanding. So wise, but so dull. So that we take it out on others when we feel that we are forced into doing things for them that are against our own nature. And we do that invariably, but we do our very best not to be conscious of the way in which we do it, because that would puncture the whole balloon and show it up for a farce, and we can't afford that.

So, there is, then, this feeling of nostalgia for the Golden Age when we have the feeling that, once upon a time, at some point—and this may refer back to childhood, it may refer back to life in the womb, it may refer back to primitive conditions before the invention of language and writing and numbers—but somehow, there is a feeling that we get, especially from contemplating animals. They don't worry very much. They seem to follow their nature. They don't seem to go through a decision-making process, just as you don't go through a decision-making process when you sneeze, or when you breathe, or when you blink. It just happens. And it's just as well that it does.

So the thought occurs to us: would it not be possible to conduct our life in that way always? And instead of making these pathetic decisions on the basis of utterly incomplete information, wouldn't there be some way in which we could manage to do the right thing—that is to say, to respond appropriately within the field of forces in which we are living and which we are—without these clumsy attempts to do so by force and by will? That, of

course, is what Taoist philosophy is considering all the time. And it is trying to point out that there is, in fact, a way of living like that. Only, nobody will believe it because they're scared out of their wits that it won't work. And, of course, you have to ask all sorts of questions as to what do you mean by 'work?'

But surely it should be obvious that if you are organically intelligent enough to be able to see, isn't there just the faint possibility that the kind of intelligence which enables you to perform the incomprehensible operation of seeing might also be of use if it could be canalized and invoked in solving other problems as well? Isn't there a possibility, in other words, that the human brain is not a muscle, but a fantastic electronic contrivance—like a computer—which does not think in words, but thinks in terms of neurological operations which are never conscious? That is to say, they are never attended to in detail—that's what consciousness is. In other words, that thinking is not... basically—only a small part of thinking is a verbal process. The greater part of thinking is a physical process. But it's a highly organized process and, when thought about inwards, is a very, very complicated one. But we do it, and it's the simplest thing in the world to do it because you don't have to decide. That's what you mean by simple. You don't have to enter into the complexities.

Now, the proposition that this might be so—I have caused a professor to go completely blue in the face with rage at such a suggestion. That it seemed so—to him—anti-intellectual, undermining the whole nature and dignity of the academic professions, and so forth. But, really and truly, if human beings are to adapt themselves to the increasingly troublesome environment which they are creating, isn't it possible that we are not really trusting ourselves or using ourselves to the full to come to an understanding of our problems? You say—a lot of people say, “Oh, well that sounds like the people who simply say, ‘Oh, ask God to help you and he'll do it. He'll think it out. He knows.’” But that's not the case, you see? The case is: it's asking you to do it. But if you have started out with a definition of yourself which really has very little to do with you at all—which is this kind of joke that you are an ego, and that you are some sort of being inside a bag, and that you're in control, and that you're the boss of this bag (or at least, supposed to be) in the same way as the chauffeur in charge of the car or the engineer

who makes the machine. You might possibly be that if you knew how the whole thing was constructed. But the whole point is: you don't. But if you could revise your view of yourself—who you are—and realize that you are the field of forces with their patterning and with their incredible intelligence, and you trust yourself to decide. To respond, in other words, spontaneously to a situation instead of going through this whole thing of “what is the right thing to do?”

But, you see, if you have been brought up in a civilization inured to the doctrine of Original Sin, you cannot possibly trust yourself. In fact, you see, what happens is this: we know that an airline pilot is a fallible being. And when he's driving a jet things are happening much too fast for him to make up his mind if he has to make a decision. And therefore, increasingly, we put in all sorts of automated decision-making machines on a jet plane. Eventually, the pilot loses his confidence in himself more and more, because he doesn't know how the damn thing works—he's just sitting there. And the famous story about the time when we have supersonic rockets, and you get on board, and a tape recorder says, “You are now taking off for London where we will be arriving in half an hour. All facilities on this aircraft are fully automated. There is no chance of human error and, therefore, no need to worry—to worry—to worry—to worry—”

But, you see, we can do a rather good job in eliminating error by use of the computer in rather limited circumstances. Why? Because the computer, as it develops, is more like a nervous system than it is like a linguistic system. In other words, it is able to deal with ever so many operations at once, and to synthesize them. And words can't do that. Words have to go along a single track. Now then, if the brain is still far more sophisticated than any computer we can yet construct, what is the limitation on human skill is that a human being isn't using his brain in the right way. He's not really using it to the full at all, except in some peculiar beings whom we call geniuses. And the funny thing about geniuses is they cannot explain why they are geniuses. They can't teach it. Here is a case in Zhuang Zhou's book of a wheelwright: he makes the most beautiful wheels, and the trick of a wheel is to get it to fit the axle. It mustn't be so loose that it wobbles, and it mustn't be so tight that it sticks. It has to have just the right thing. And he says, “Here I have been doing this for years, but I do not know how I do it.

So I can't teach my son, and so I'm still working when I'm 75 years old." And this is an eternal problem of all fine craftsmen and skilled people. They cannot explain how it is done.

This was my problem as a small boy in school. Because, when I started out in school—around when I was seven, eight, nine years old—I was considered stupid. Because I always failed in examinations and got terrible marks. But at the same time I was absolutely fascinated with the bookish process. I collected books, I loved books, I loved the smell of books, I liked the look of them. But nobody really got across what you were supposed to do with them. I mean, I could read them. I used to think, well—they used to say, "You don't work!" You know, like saying, "This watch doesn't work!" I said to the teachers, "I want to work very badly, but how do you do it?" They had no explanation. So I used to look at exemplars of intelligence, some of the teachers whom I admired, and I thought maybe I can find out how to do it by imitating the way they do their handwriting, or by wearing clothes the way they wear them, or by making the same sort of gestures, or by speaking in that sort of way. That, by some sort of sympathetic magic, I would acquire the mysterious power which I seem to lack.

In the same way, I remember from childhood, again, that our nurses in a hospital, sanitariums, or homes had a very, very peculiar anxiety about constipation. In fact, that was about the criterion of health; was that you were not constipated. Therefore, you had to do your duty—as they called it—every day. And if you didn't, there was a graduated series of punishments. It started with a concoction called California Syrup of Figs. It went next to a thing called senna tea. It went next to cascara. And finally, to castor oil, which is disgusting stuff. The trouble is that, if they resort to that, you get back in a vicious circle because the whole muscular system is upset, and so you begin all over again.

Now, the mistake that they all made was to issue a commandment to the conscious mind to achieve a result which the conscious mind is perfectly incapable of producing. The conscious mind has nothing to do with whether you're constipated or not. That has to do with the unconscious. Or, I prefer to call it the superconscious, because it's a lot more clever than the conscious mind is—and, indeed, a great deal more trustworthy. Only, we

don't believe that because we believe in original sin. And therefore, the unconscious can't be trusted, and if it wants to take a day off or so from going to the bathroom, we think it's sinful; there's something wrong with it. And that attitude, you see, that was reflected in this rather trivial little illustration, ran through everything. You must love us! You must be free! You must make the right decision! It's up to you. You've gotta do it. See?

Well, of course, as a result of that, one of two things happens. Most people simply lose their nerve. They realize "I've got to make the right decision, but I can't!" Therefore, they drop out; they become the sort of people who just say, "The whole thing is just too much. It's absurd." And they become low-grade intelligences, or so we think. Then there's another kind of people who grit their teeth, they pull themselves together, and they resolutely smash into this way of existence, and they get rewarded accordingly—that is to say, they get more and more power. They succeeded in this game of being God, and so society rewards them, you see, by saying, "Well, you be president. You be this. You be that. You be the other thing." Looks fine. Looks great. Everything's going beautifully. But we've only seen the beginning of it. As it goes on, they say, "Well, hmmm. You've got to control this. Got to control that. You didn't think of that one before, did you? You know, we can avoid a mistake if we get that under control." We get this one fixed, then say, "Now, wait a minute. I can't think about all that. We're going to hand all that problem to this computer which we've got here. We'll keep an eye on that one corner and we'll get that deciding about this."

And so, all these aids to intelligence come along, but at the center of it all is a guy who thinks he's in charge with his conscious intellect. And so, soon, he begins to feel more and more responsible. And because he's making a mess anyhow—I mean, just imagine being the president of the United States! You don't know where you're going, you've got all these decisions to make, you haven't got any private life at all because there's a telephone here and a Secret Service man there and a secretary there, and a this, and a that. And here it goes. But whatever you do, it doesn't make the slightest difference. Everybody's objecting; everybody's saying, "You mustn't do it that way! You forgot this! You are a so-and-so!" And they call you names and everything. The only way of insulating yourself to that is to plug your

ears. But then you can't get any information at all. Cut off the phone, you know? But then you're stuck.

Because, you see, this is the fate that comes to anybody who tries to be God in the wrong way. Everybody is God, actually, so there's no need to try to be. But the moment somebody tries to be, that means he wants to be God from the standpoint of the very limited faculty of conscious thinking and deciding, which is a very clumsy agency for controlling what happens in the world. You're never going to be God that way. Because if God—just figure it out—if God had to think about every motion that a gnat made with its wings in order to see that it happened, boy would he be tired! What a nervous breakdown that would be. Well, you can say, "Only God can do it," but it's a way of saying the whole conception is nonsense. Things like that aren't handled that way. Things like that are handled the way you and your body handle things: which is that they organize themselves without thinking about it. That is to say, they have an intelligence, but it's not verbal intelligence, it's not linear intelligence. It's multi-dimensional, multi-variable intelligence wherein everything altogether everywhere is happening all at once. And if we don't reacquaint ourselves, shall I say, with that kind of intelligence, we're going to be in trouble.

Now, you see, the point is: we have it. It's all there. But we don't give it a chance. Let's take in social intercourse, see? We're very, very controlled. When somebody—you see, conversation goes on in a linear pattern. And it's a game. Somebody suddenly changes the subject. Now, that creates a small social crisis because they say, "Wait a minute, we weren't talking about that. You interrupted." So, in order to protect ourselves against that you, say, you wait for a slight pause and say "Ahem, excuse me for changing the subject, but..." And that indicates that you know—that they are not to take you for a madman who thinks associatively instead of logically, in a linear development. Now, what happens if you change the rules and you put a group of people together for conversation and say, "Say anything comes into your head." Well, that sounds like free association in psychoanalysis, doesn't it? And what about saying to somebody, "free associate?" It blocks them, because they suddenly go blank. Which is a warning: don't move because you can't trust yourself. Don't move. Go blank. So, to help you along, the analyst says, "Did you dream anything last

night?” Oh, that’s alright. “Yes, I did have a dream.” I tell the story of my dream, which is a way of kidding yourself. You are making a statement through a dream for which you’re not held responsible—because it was only a dream. You can, through that, say something about yourself without admitting that you’re saying anything about yourself. And without your—you did the free associating in the dream, you see? The dream was an associative process of thinking rather than a logical one, and you can describe it because it’s safely passed; it’s not happening now.

Then he can, perhaps, draw you out a little further and say, “Now, what do you think about that dream?” Well, if the analyst is a Freudian, you know what to think about the dream. All long things are one thing, and all round things are another, and it’s as simple as that. If you’re a Jungian it’s not so easy; if the analyst is a Jungian it’s much more complicated. But [???] to help you out, saying, “Well, it’s up to you. I don’t know what these things mean in your dream.” But when you think of a particular image that occurred in the dream—which was a certain friend of yours, say—what does that fellow mean to you? And he tries to get you to see that the person you dreamed about actually represents an aspect of yourself. You didn’t have a dream about that actual, objective person out there, but he stands for something in you which you associate with him. So, gradually, associative thinking is drawn out from you.

Then, another thing to do is draw pictures. That’s pretty safe. Just draw anything. Well, you draw a lot of meaningless stuff, you know, and bloo-loo-loo-loo for a while, and then gradually use it as a Rorschach blot. And things begin to come out. But all this is coaxing people, you see? But in a situation where you are directly verbalizing spontaneously, it’s very embarrassing because words are tremendously powerful in a social scene. People can be blown to pieces with words in just nothing flat. Say the wrong word and everybody blushes, just like that. I’ve produced a complete neurological-physiological reaction with nothing but words! So it’s dangerous to get away from the order of words and communicate with people in an unstructured way. Because that’s, to some extent, what happens in tea groups where—or things like the Synanon game—where people are somehow encouraged to say anything they like. But it would get way out indeed if, instead of saying to somebody, “After all, when I look at

you, you really annoy me. Something about the expression in your face which I can't stand." You know? That can become a stereotype; you can go on with that kind of argument. Kind of mutually embarrassing game until it merely becomes a ritual.

But let's suppose that, instead of that, we just started talking nonsense. Or anything goes. It might suddenly stop being nonsense, or at any minute change into nonsense. So that we would immediately withdraw, you see? Say, "Oh, that can't go on." But, on the other hand, if we don't withdraw, we say "Well, all this is going to be words anyway, and there's nothing much that they can do to us. So let's see what happens." Then, if we don't withdraw, people begin to feel at ease. That, after all, I can trust myself to behave in a non-egocentric way without harming others, without creating murder and mayhem and bloodshed, without stealing people's things. And suddenly, when a group discovers that it can have that kind of lulling, pentecostal, glossolalia bit with each other, there's some possibility they might love each other. That's why this has been done in certain spiritual circles for a long time.

And this is why, in Zen Buddhism, there is this game of challenge and response, where you are put in a situation where, if you stop to think what to do, you've lost and you're out. And you have to try again. But you never really know what the situation you're going to have to respond to is going to be. So, once upon a time, there was a master who posed a kōan to one of his students. And a student gave a certain answer, and the master accepted it. The master's assistant, after this student had left, said to the master, "I'm doubtful about whether he really understood the point there." The master said, "Oh, really?" He said, "Why don't you try him again?" The master said, "Yes, I will." So the student came back the following day and he put the same problem to him. And the student responded the same way. The master said, "No, no! That's wrong." But the student said, "But you said yesterday that it was right." He said, "I know. Yesterday it's right, today it's wrong."

Because, you see, every situation is different. It's always changing. And the point is to respond in a way that is appropriate to the field of forces as it is now. And you cannot tell intellectually, you can't tell by analysis, you can't

tell by a process of conscious criticism what the structure of the field of forces is. Your body knows, your brain can find out. But not through conscious attention and formulation in words. But if you don't trust your brain to be able to find out, you will fumble and you will do silly things. And since you have been habitually brought up not to trust your brain to find out, to get into a pattern of trying to behave spontaneously is, of course, to run the danger of making a great fool of yourself. And that, of course, is indeed what happens in a great many experiments in the arts where people think they're going to paint spontaneously, they're going to make spontaneous noises with a musical instrument, they're going to dance spontaneously, they're going to have non-plays on the stage—or happenings—where anything goes. By and large, these things are colossal failures and are completely boring. And it's perfectly understandable why: that, namely, they're being done by people who don't really trust themselves and who are doing this in a background of self-mistrust. And who have never, in other words, cultivated—because it is a kind of a discipline to trust yourself and let it happen.

But, you see, when you get a great comedian working, you can't really train to be a great comedian. I mean, how would you go about it? Would you read all available jokes and memorize them? Would you study the great comedians of the past? Remember all their gags, gestures, expressions? The point is: if you did that, everybody would think you were corny. They would say, "Oh, that's just Mark Twain again." Or whatever. W. C. Fields; it's his gag. The whole point of a comedian is the element of surprise, the unforeseen joke that nobody expected. The thing that really has people laughing is what they just didn't quite expect.

Now, the ability to put this over is something that you either—apparently, you either have it or you don't. And you—also—you have to do it in a situation where you don't know what's coming up yourself. You could be a comedian, in the terms that you've got a script and you've learned your lines, and the script was written by a genius, and you're a good actor and it's very funny. But if you're in a real comedian situation where people in the audience are interacting with you and, in other words, the situation is unstructured, the real genius is the one who can pull the gags just like that,

as if, indeed, they are ad-libbed. That man has got his genuine intelligence working for him.

But so, we come back to the point, then, that the genius is unable to say how he manages to do it. He can say, “Oh, well, yes. I do a lot of hard work.” All geniuses do. But that’s not the cause of it. It goes along with it; it’s a kind of necessary accompaniment of the art rather than the cause of the art. Because one uses work to polish something which was a gem in the first place, you see? When you write poetry, it’s a lot of work to get it; exact melody and beauty of words takes hours. But you had to have something there in the first place that wasn’t simply the polishing, it was the gem. So that the coming forth of such gems, in the same way as a cure for constipation, is something that requires trust in one’s own inherent and original intelligence.

This was what the Zen master Bankei calls your unborn mind. That is a way of saying the mind that you have, that is not individualized, that is not personalized, that is not the ego. And he would say to people, “When you hear something go caw, you know immediately it’s a crow. When you hear something go ding, you know at once it is a bell.” And when he was once heckled by one of those Nichiren priests—you know, they are very fanatical Buddhists; they run the Sōka Gakkai movement—this priest said (standing right at the back of the audience) he said, “I don’t understand a word you’re saying.” And Bankei said, “Come closer and I’ll explain it to you.” And he moved in. And he said, “Closer, still. Still, closer.” The man came forward. And he got right up to the platform. Bankei said, “How well you understand me!”

So, in the same way, once a military man was with a Zen master and he said to the master, “I’ve heard this story that there was a man who kept a goose in a bottle, and it grew so large that he couldn’t get it out. Now, he didn’t want to hurt the goose and he didn’t want to break the bottle, so how does he get it out?” And the Zen master changed the subject. So, finally, the military man—the officer—got up to leave. And just as he got his hand on the screen to go out, the master said, “Oh, officer?” And he turned and said, “Yes?” The master: “There! It’s out!”

Of course, if I say to you, “Hello!” or “I say!” you say, “Yes, what is it?” See? You don’t stop, you don’t hesitate. You don’t think, “What mischief is up here? What could he be planning?” You just respond. And the response is, in this case, perfectly appropriate. Now, you could say this is just habit. True, there is habit. And there are responses that are conditioned, fed into people. But we saw that that doesn’t work for the comedian. He needs something more than habit. And you’ve often had the experience of finding yourself in a crisis where you somehow managed to act intelligently though there was no time to decide. Driving a car, or something, you know? Suddenly, your own being comes to your aid. Well, that—of course—is the whole thing.

But the basis of it is to realize not that this is something sort of rather heroic, which one really ought to try to do—as if there were some other possibility, as if it would be safer not to do that, as if we could sit back here and say, “Oh, now, let’s not get mixed up with that adventure! Let’s be safe and rational, and believe in original sin and mistrust ourselves.” If we do that, we are finished. We go straight—by that method, with the kind of technology we have—we go straight into the totalitarian state and all that goes with it. The total police state: everything’s gotta be controlled. Somebody’s going to win at the God-game. And the end of that—of course, as everybody knows—is: every great totalitarian state destroys itself because it becomes too rigid, and it consumes itself with its own fury and frustration; it has to take itself, it’s hostility, out on itself.

So, actually, it isn’t a question that this is something that we really ought to do, or that to have faith in one’s self is virtuous, or something—you know—like psychologically integrated, and you hope you can be more psychologically integrated than the other people you know. It isn’t like that at all. It’s something that you really cannot avoid. That you, actually—although one, you know, sort of doesn’t believe it—you do do it all the time. Only, when it comes to your attention, then you think you should. But when it doesn’t come to your attention you are functioning intelligently without thinking. When it does come to your attention you say, “I’d better not do that.” It’s like, you know, we work for certain bosses. And, you know, one thing you mustn’t do, if you could possibly get away with it, is never ask their advice. Go ahead and do your job. But if you take it to them

and say, “Should I do it this way or that?” then, suddenly, everything is held up while they think about it. And then they can’t make up their minds. They go this way and they go that way, and they say, “No.” Don’t ask. Just go ahead and do it. And it’ll save the boss so much time, and it’ll stop him worrying, and prevent him from having ulcers.

So, in the same way, there are a certain kind of people want to know whether something’s legal. And the best advice is usually: don’t ask. Because there’s a saying in Zen: “Officially, not even a needle is permitted to pass. Unofficially, a carriage and six horses can get through.” So if the law is not challenged and asked to make a decision on this—forget it! You can probably get away with it. So, in the same way, again, if you realize that trusting in your own organic skill and intelligence is something you can’t really avoid. You can try to avoid it and get mixed up. You can get so mixed up that, if you cannot—if you say, if you think you can’t trust yourself, then it follows that that idea itself is untrustworthy because it’s one of your ideas. If you think you can’t trust your brain, how can you trust the logic which your brain makes possible? And this logic is so simple and, therefore, so clumsy in dealing with the subtle complexity of our world and of the field of forces in which we live.

So, you cannot let go, you know? You say, “Now I’m going to let go,” see? “Today I’m going to let go,” see? Don’t do it that way. You remember that you can’t hold on. That’s the only way to let go. You can’t hold on; there’s nothing to hold on to, no one to hold it. It’s all one system, one energy.

The Universe

The Power of Space

You may think it rather nervy of me to devote this whole seminar to talking about nothing. But it's about space. And in most people's minds space is just nothing unless it's filled with air. But once you get outside the air, space maybe in some way crossed. By floating bodies, by various kinds of electrical vibrations, light waves, cosmic rays etc. But since the Michelson-Morley experiment, which seemed to prove conclusively that there wasn't any such thing as ether, some kind of attenuated fluid through which light was propagated, space just isn't there. It's the way we have, in other words, of talking about distances between bodies. In other words when we say the distance between them increased, as if the distance were a substantive, that does something. Like the man walked, the distance increased. But I suppose what we're actually saying is that the two bodies we're talking about increased the distance between themselves. They did it. But then you suddenly find that you've got distance as an object. To increase the distance, the distance now being the object of, whereas before it was the subject. And so at once one begins to see: there's something fishy about space. And after all it is the background against which we see everything. And even a blind person has a sense of space in that which does not obstruct motion. And yet, funny thing about space is, it in a way doesn't end where a solid begins. You can shift a solid around in space without apparently altering it in any way. And after all there is space between the two sides, shall we say, or ends of the solid. We can think of that in terms of space and measure it in terms of space.

But it is against space that we experience everything that we experience. And, by the way, also we experience everything not only in the dimension of space but also in the dimension of time. Now the fascination about space and time is that while they are basic to all possible experiences that we have, you just can't put your finger on them. Space seems to be completely immaterial. And when St Augustine was asked "What his time?", he said "I

know what it is, but when you ask me I don't." So these two basic dimensions of our physical world are uncommonly elusive. We could perhaps say that they are pure abstractions. There is no such thing as space and there is no such thing as time. They are merely our way of measuring and thinking about the behavior of the physical universe as a pattern, a system of patterns, energy patterns. And if you measure the movement of these patterns, the line along which you measure motion is called the timeline. If you measure their positions, the line along which you measure their positions you would call the spaceline. And these two lines would be as abstract as the equator in relation to longitude zero. These things don't exist on the physical face of the of the world. They are imaginary lines and are only to be found on maps. Could you also say that the same thing was true of time and space? We think for example that there are three coordinates of space and one of time. The three coordinates of space being length, breadth and depth. And through that runs one of time. But come to think of it it's rather artificial. It is making us think of space as having a sort of grain to it. As if it were a crystalline substance and however transparent the crystal it does have a grain. And space has the grain of up, across and through. Those are the three ways in which we think of space. And we can't think of any more, not with our senses. we can mathematically conceive spaces with infinitely many dimensions. That is to say you can write it down as if it were so but you can't conceive it in your imagination. You can draw, it's great fun to draw, a four dimensional cube having four spatial dimensions. That's called a tesseract. And tesseract is a good word to apply to a person who is ultimately a square. A four dimensional square. But the tesseract, you see, the minute you draw it, that obviously you can't have more than he three right angular dimensions of space or the coordinate in any kind of solid figure that you know. And so you can think about it in terms of mathematics, but you can't conceive more than these three coordinates sensuously. And so it's basic common sense to us that space has this structure. But of course the question is: "Is this a structure of space or is it a structure of the human nervous system, the human brain and human thought, which is projected onto the external world as a tool for measuring it?" This is one way of approaching the problem. But there's another way altogether. Which is to consider space as anything but nothing. If space is basic to all that we experience, as time is. You might say then that space is as near as we can imagine to being the ground of the world, or what some

people have called God. The texts of the Hindus, Buddhists and Taoists are full of ways in which the symbol of space is used to mean the ultimate reality. Space is used in India in basic Indian philosophy. In Vedanta it is called akasha. And akasha is for them the fundamental element. There are five elements. Earth, water, air and fire and Akash.

And so space contains all the other elements. In Buddhist philosophy, where the ultimate reality is called Shunyata, are the void. The Chinese will translate the Sanskrit with their characters it means sky or space. And the Taoists would say, quoting Lao Tze: The usefulness of the window is not so much in the frame as in the empty space through which something can be seen. The usefulness of a vase is is not so much in the sides made of clay as in the hollow inside into which something can be put. And of course that is a startling metaphor for a westerner because we think the other way around, you see. As I started out to say, we really think commonsensically that space is nothing at all. And we are much more sympathetic to the idea that it's pure abstraction than to the Oriental idea that space has some kind of basic reality. It bothers us, too, when astronomers talk about curved space. How can nothing be curved? Or properties of space, or expanding space? How can it do that? And then when architects begin to talk about the functions of spaces, the commonsensical Westerner thinks: why don't they talk about the functions of walls? Of course the walls enclose spaces, but the spaces of themselves have no function and they're bothered about this. Painters also are very aware of space because, especially if you paint in oils, you have to paint your background. And therefore, in filling it in, you begin to realize, that it has its own shape. It is the obverse of the foreground. And when you play with photographic negatives or anything that switches foreground to background, foreground to background, you begin to become aware of spaces as having a shape. The interval between all sorts of objects becomes new something significant. Even though it's constantly flowing and changing, as indeed are the objects within that space. So it is a kind of the bit of a shock to our common sense, which in most cases has not caught up with twentieth century physics or astronomy, to hear space considered as something effective. As something definitely THERE, so that you could say it has properties. Take another case of space, which is rather startling. There, are different kinds of space. Space is a basically, isn't it, an interval. There is an interval between each one of the sitting here. If we didn't have

that we would suffocate, because we've been packed together like sardines. We need space in order to function of the human being. We need a kind of area in which to just move and walk about and breathe and express ourselves. Now. You can have intervals not only in space but in time. Pauses are intervals. You can also have intervals in sound, the intervals between tones on notes. And the interesting thing about the intervals between tones is that they are that, upon which the hearing of melody depends. To hear melody is to hear intervals.

Now if you will simply visualize melody in terms of something graphic. Supposing you represent a simple, say, an introduction of a fugue. Or whatever, you know, you can see that in terms of the dancing line or a series of points, read at different levels, representing like musical notation the high ones and the low ones. And you recognize a pattern. But you see at once that the pattern depends on the way the critical dots in it are spaced. And it doesn't matter much whether the space is a big space or whether it's a little one. Because it will always be relative to the size of the dots. You can magnify it or minify it, but you will see it is the way they are spaced, that makes the difference, and here once again we are using spaced as a transitive verb now. We've talked about spaces or distances increasing. Or people increasing the distance. And now we can talk about space as a verb. To space. To be spaced. And so once again the language is either playing tricks on us, or else expressing a profound intuition. Language does both and you have to watch out for which it is. Of course it may be both, that is a possibility. But here at once you see, especially in that illustration of music, of it being necessary to hear intervals in order to hear a melody. You see that the way things are spaced is really another way of talking about the way things are related. So you begin to realize that space is relationship. Go further now. There is another idea about space, which is connected with the Oriental uses of space. It is quite fundamental to Indian and a great deal of Chinese thinking, that space equals consciousness. In other words, what actually we are experiencing as the all-inclusive space in which things happen, is your mind. And. Your mind of course is not something inside your head, that is a great mistake to make. Your head is something in your mind. We can define a person's mind in many ways. But beginning with something rather simple, mind is occupied with thinking. Most people think in words. And you didn't get words out of your head. You got them from

the community in which you live and were brought up. So when you think in a language which your community gave you you are not really thinking your own thoughts. It is very difficult indeed to have private thoughts. Because when the very materials with which you think are public property, it shows what a vast influence the public has on you, in you the deepest recesses of your mind. It's therefore very difficult also to think freely, independently, because we are pushed around with the symbolic systems of words or of numbers in which we think. But since, you see, the functioning of the mind in the process of thinking depends upon an outside community, you begin to see that your mind is a network. A network of relationships. You think only in the context of an environment of people and of natural processes. So that you could say that your mind is at the very least a most complex network of present and past relationships, stretching out to the very limits of the universe. And this, as I've often said, explains such truth as there may be in astrology. That, when you want to draw a map of a person's soul, you draw a map of the universe as it was when he was born. We say that is your chart. That expresses you in a special way. Now, the astrologers' maps are very crude. They're based on a rather primitive view of the universe. But the truth of it is there, you see, that who you really are, your soul, your mind is the total universe as focused upon you. And this connects with what in Mahayana Buddhism is called the doctrine of mutual interpenetration. Namely that every thing-event in the world, anything, in other words, supposing the whole world is a moving pattern. And then you want to identify the wiggles in the pattern. It's very difficult to determine how much of a wiggle makes one wiggle. But by a sort of calculus in which we chew the thing up we say: "All this wiggly world consists of so many wiggles and each individual wiggle is a thing event." What is called in Japanese, *G*, means a thing-event. And so the idea of the doctrine of mutual interpenetration is that every thing-event in the universe implies all the others. It goes with it. Doesn't matter how long it lasts or how short it lasts. The fact that it is, or the fact that it was, implies the existence of everything else. To put it in another way, the fact that there is a moth lying around me, it's very small and it will soon run into a candle and extinguish itself. That little incident would not be possible at all except in the context of all these galaxies. Because their existence goes-with the possibility of there being such a minute little life flatteringly around. What is not so easy to see, is the picture in the opposite direction. That in the same measure all these galaxies

depend upon and go-with this little moth. As the poet Suso, Henry Suso, once said. No it wasn't Suso. Someone like him, lived about the same time. I'll think of it the minute. Anyways. That I know that without me God could not live for one moment. And this is the other aspect of it. And this is the difficult one to understand and we shall be able to approach this in the course of the seminar. In fact if you realize that, then you've really got it, you've got the point of your own existence. But to get the reverse picture, you have first of all to get, clearly, its opposite one, namely that the existence of any one minute little thing is intimately related to everything. And then what happens when you clearly understand that and you've really got that, your mind does a flip. Bliblip, like that. You know, it's like when you squeeze the air into a sausage balloon and you get all the squeezed up, you think, into one end of the balloon and suddenly it goes Bliblip and it comes out the other entries. Well, it's sort of like that. And you have to be very careful at that point not to go crazy. Because, you see, when you find out that all this universe depends on you, some people get frightened, others get cocky and from both things disasters can follow. You have to discover that and then be natural. Act as if nothing happened.

So then, this Buddhist idea, Mahayana Buddhist idea of mutual interpenetration is expressed by the great simile of the net of jewels. In which you have a multidimensional spider's web in the morning dew. And on inspecting one dewdrop you see the reflections of all the others. And in each reflection, in turn, reflections of all the others and again and again. And so of course one discovers this to be no mere philosophical fancy, no mere metaphor when you start working with laser beams and find out that you can reconstruct a whole photograph from a tiny snippet out of the negative. Because the crystalline structure of the whole photographic field, the chemicals spread over the acetate or whatever, when it's exposed to light, all those crystals change in harmony with each other. See, suppose we all touch each other. And then somebody says boo. We'll all jump a little bit together. And if you examine any one jump carefully enough, any one individual jumping, you will see, if you can find out enough about it, that the way he did it was in response to the ones next to him and they did it in response the ones next to them and they jump so far because they couldn't push any further and some were a little bit pulled in that jump and so on. And by seeing exactly what one of them did you could reconstruct what all

of them were doing. Only usually we don't bother to think about things like that, because it takes too long. And this is one of our great difficulties as human beings. That the mode of thinking upon which we largely rely for our practical calculations is unbelievably clumsy. Because it can only deal with one thing at a time. And that doesn't get you anywhere. That's in a way why a great deal of scientific work is apt to be trivial. They are all very well if I had all that time to think it out. But I don't. I have to make practical decisions in a hurry, and no time. But on the other hand here is nature, here is your body. Not merely your body it by itself as a something bounded by the skin, but your body in relationship to a whole community of people and animals and bugs and vegetables, functioning in this astonishing way. Doing myriads of things altogether everywhere at once and not thinking about it at all and. It is astonishing, you know, how we overlook that. Because of course this is the faculty which everybody possesses. And therefore we say "Well that sort of cleverness is a dime a dozen." What we like to distinguish is special cleverness, people who can do strange tricks. Like great feats of thinking and talking and intellectual and cerebral performance. But we mustn't forget that there are also people who do absolutely astonishing things without thinking at all. There are jugglers. There are very beautiful people. That's a pretty astonishing when you pick out someone and say: Gee, isn't she a goddess." And that's done without thinking and it embarrasses many women to be told that they're beautiful. Because they want to be admired for their intellectual achievement rather than for the bodies which their parents provided for them. And so we are a little bit on the defensive about the things that we achieve without our egos being in charge. But we do the most beautiful things that we do, really, by that means. Because all that thought and intellectuality can do is it can embellish your natural talents. A lot of people who are incredibly good at thinking never do anything creative because they have no talent available. They may have it but they don't know it, they don't trust it, they don't know how to make use of it. And therefore that intellect works to little purpose. Because the function of the intellect is to be the servant of the organic intelligence. You see? Only what we're doing, is we're trying to make the intellect the master. The intellect is a wonderful servant just so long as it knows its place. But once it becomes saying to nature: "Look. You submit. I know how you ought to be run. Now I'm going to take charge." That is the moment of hybris where Adam eats the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge, that

is to say of technical knowledge, and tries to be God to the world. And God says: "OK baby. You try." And then, you see, you've got to work. That's why the curse of eating the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge was work. Everything became work. Cats, you know, dogs and birds, they don't do any work. They, true, they scurry around getting food, but that's that that's what there is to do. That's fun, that's life, that's living. It's not work. Besides you don't have to think about it. Your brain tells you where to look for it, your nose tells you where to find it. You do what comes naturally. And there it is. And if God so clothed the grass of the field which today is and tomorrow is cast into the oven, how much more would he clothe you, faithless ones? But I never met a minister, never, who would not comment upon that, that that is a very impractical passage which we can't live up to. But to get back to space. All I was showing in this sort of digression was that our mind, our self, is not inside our heads. But extends. And so, you see, you have, as the great vehicle of this extension of the universe, you have space. And you see immediately that you cannot pin space down. You cannot really conceive space at all. Look at the wonder a child has when it ask questions and begins "What's up there? What's beyond? What's after that? what's after that?" The child is absolutely fascinated by thinking about that. Do you know all children of fascinated with infinity? Don't you remember seeing, say, a child's book. And on the cover of this book is a little girl sitting, reading the same book with the same little girl on the cover and so naturally there is another little girl on the cover of the book she's looking at in the picture. And so the child begins to wonder: "How small can it get? How far can it go?" Or they get in the opposing mirrors and look and say "That's wonderful, why can't you line them up so that it doesn't just disappear around the corner always? Couldn't you get in straight on this?? Seems so difficult. "Mummy, what did God do before he started the World?" Think back. "What would it be like to be in heaven and live forever and ever and ever and ever?", and immediately this somehow stretches the skull and children love doing this because children are always trying out experiments on themselves. You know, they prod themselves, they pull themselves, they love to spin in circles and make themselves feel dizzy, because that's a great thing, you know, that feeling. They're always fascinated with the limits of experience. So what's out beyond that? Because now when a sophisticated astronomer tries to tell you that space is finite, we're still, we resent this. And say "All right space is finite but

what's outside it?" "Well," the astronomer says, "you see you can only talk about an outside inside space. Outside space there is no outside." You see, the mind won't take it. The sense, you see, infinity. So. This space fascinates us. Going on forever. Expanding. It seems to be actually going on forever, you see, if the universe is a huge explosion. But you can see, can't you, I think this: Space, although you cannot pin it down, and has the quality of infinity. There's no way of talking about space, because it has no color. It has no weight. You can't cut it. You can't possibly chop it into pieces. And yet at the same time you cannot differentiate it from solids. We come to another important point here, you see? That solid and space are in a secret conspiracy with each other. Actually there's very little solid in the world. Most of what appears to be solid appears so by virtue of the speed at which it's jiggling. It's like an electric fan, which, when put in rotation, the blades appear to form a solid disk and this chair is solid for rather the same reasons. You can't put your finger through it, it's moving too fast. But actually, whatever it is that is dancing in space, is increasingly difficult to define. The more you think about energy, you see. and you can make a calculus of energy like you make a calculus of wiggles in the world, and you can say there are various waves, or wavicles, or particle of energy, which we give all sorts of different names to. But the more we pursue it, the more it all seems to disappear. Like space, the more you try to think what it is, the more difficult it is. So in the same way the more you try to say "Now come on. Let's sit down. What is this here?" It's alright if you stop at a certain point. Then you say "Well now we know, that's practical. Let's not ask anymore questions." Think. If you keep on asking questions everything falls apart. You notice this in the scholarly world. Scholars spend far more time debunking than they do creating. Because everything that has ever happened has been debunked, practically. You can show that there is no evidence, you know, that Julius Caesar existed not really. Certainly there is no evidence that Jesus existed, that Socrates existed. There was a great deal of doubt about Plato probably the approach Shoko was a myth and so on. You know you can go on in that indefinitely. Finding out that there really is no evidence. I don't know, probably the same sort of thing is happening with the Warren Commission. I don't know. Although it's something that it didn't happen anyway. Because that is the work of the analytical intellect you see. When you finally try to be God, that's to say, define it exactly. Now just where is it and let's get perfectly clear, so that "plop", it's fixed,

see? It all becomes slippery. Because in order to handle the world, you see, you have to touch it rather gently. You mustn't try to pin things down. As they say in Zen, you do not try to drive a nail into the sky. Because that's the beauty of space, you see, there's nothing in it to hang on. It hasn't a hook to put your hat on somewhere in space. And yet it hasn't got a floor to fall onto. See, if space had a concrete floor on the bottom, it'd be pretty dangerous stuff but it doesn't. There's nowhere in space to collide with space. You can run into somebody or something else, yes. But not with space. Figure, then, on this. Work on this hypothesis, you see, it's only a hypothesis at the moment, nothing more. That space is you. Because you are equally inaccessible to inspection. When you look to find out who you are, somebody like a Zen master will interrupt you and say "Excuse me, but who is it that wants to know? And who is it that's looking?" Find out that. So, you know, you're soon chasing your own tail like a little dog. And you never catch up with it. All this, you see. So space is like you. Only we turned in the ordinary way to think of ourselves when we make the gesture like this. I'm here. We go this way. I can feel this. I'm inside it, it's me. But always when you get a certain feeling about things, examine the opposite possibility. That you are this. Now we're going to look in due course at the neurology of this. But you do see that what you see outside you. And feel outside you. Is the way you feel inside just skin. Since all the optical images, shapes and colors and everything are neurological states in the brain. So what appears to you as outside is the most intimate feeling you have of the inside of your head. Because, you know, it's difficult to feel inside of your head unless you have a headache or a tumor or something. But in the ordinary way, the inside of your head is unconscious and the surgeon can open up your skull and put instruments in the brain and you won't feel them at all. The brain is very anesthetized. So, in order to feel the brain, you have to look out there. And that's how it feels in the brain. So I'm just trying to give an indication of how to get the feeling of reciprocity. Of: you, on the one hand it's easy to see, as I said, you depend on the whole show.

Now I want you to see the opposite and equal truth that the whole show depends on you. So that you don't anymore put yourself down as this wretched little bacterium, living on this obscure planet, that evolves around a minor star on the outer fringes of one of the lesser galaxies. This is the

great nineteenth century putdown of man. How nice to be all unimportant. Watch out for this. Watch out for the political consequences of “everybody is equally inferior.” The political consequences emerging in becoming clear as day goes by: barbarism is the answer to that. Untrammelled violence, police states and shocking disregard for human existence. Because they’re only wretched little bacteria. See? Let’s get rid of a whole lot of them. Zip. Burn them up. And this is not unrelated, you see, to this feeling of the individual as someone who doesn’t matter at all. Which can be the reaction against the philosophy of life in which an individual matter too much in the wrong way. In the Christian tradition, we have made the individual matter too much in the wrong way. That is to say, you as an ego are infinitely precious. God has made each one of you separately and each one of you as a separate ego will last forever. And therefore you are all-important in the eyes of God. But you better know your place, baby, because you’re subjects of the King. On the other hand, the other way of looking at the individual as an incarnation of the divine, as God him- or her- or itself, coming on at God everywhere. Did you realize how fascinating that is? That if you were God, would it be fascinating to see myriads, to know yourself in terms of myriads of reproductions of yourself all different. And really different. Like other peoples need to be different from you. And they’ve got a secret in them, you don’t know what they’re going to do next, you see? So they are ALIVE. If I push you and you just go “blargh”, I say “It’s only plastic.” If you jump a little, I say “Ah, that’s someone else! I don’t know what she’s going to do next!’ That’s what I’m looking for that’s what we’re all looking for in personal relationships. And that’s, you see, you can imagine. If you simplified. Here is a kind of ball of light, which is the Divine Being. But it’s fascinating, you see, it’s fascinated with itself. And so, in order to find out its own possibilities, “Bliblip”, it puts another one out there and they bounce together, and “Flop”, there comes another, you see? And they go all over the place and so you get this idea of ever so many echoes of one sound and they’re all chattering back but they’re not just plain uniform, you see. As soon you introduce into this the element of differentiation, so that each one looks as different as possible from the other. But it’s all one. Because there can’t be the sense of I am I, without the sense of “ Oh, there is someone else.” Something else, there is other. I And other imply each other as much as solid implies space. Well, we we will have an intermission. Last night I began by revealing two possible concepts of the nature of

space. One that it is simply an abstraction and projected upon the physical world in rather the same way that we project measurements. Lines of latitude and longitude or the cutting-up of another abstraction called time into divisions like hours, minutes and seconds. Which are there only on the dial of the clock. The earth in its rotation doesn't tick. And time is of course seen thus, simply a measure of change, of the rate of change as between two changing processes. The changing process of the clock and the changing process of, say, a person's running around. It is out of that relationship, in other words, that you get a concept of time. And similarly through being able to measure distances in a similar way you get a concept of space. You see this is one point of view, that it's the an abstraction because force would be lent to this point of view by the fact that space itself isn't really there. Space is there just as absence and you must be very careful not, as Whitehead would have said, to reify, that is to make a thing out of something that is isn't there at all. Like saying have an absinth. Oh boy. Gary Snyder invented a corporation. It was called "the null and void guarantee and Trust Company". And its slogan was "register your absence with us." And so I had some business cards made up for him. Which put at the bottom "Gary Snyder, non-representative". But this is of course Zen humor. Because Zen people are always joking about things not really being there at all. The the general feeling of this being nobody at all, as distinct from being important and somebody, has a kind of inverse human to it. One becomes a sort of bag of wind and there's something about that. The Zen masters call each other wind bags and rice bags and things like that. Because the whole idea of taking nothingness for real is somehow funny. The other point of view, that I was trying to contrast with this, was rather different. And that is that just because they are so imponderable and so un-get-at-able, space is you. Space is your consciousness. And your consciousness is not something located in your head, although your head is a way in which it's focused. And therefore consciousness can be altered by a surgeon putting instruments into the brain. But the full range of consciousness, or the full range of the mind, is the entirety of space as the continuum in which the universe exists in rather much the same way as images exist in a mirror. Only here, there seems to be no solid mirror. There is an infinitely permeable continuum of space. In a Chinese text called the Tanjing or the Platform Sutra, attributed to the sixth patriarch of Zen

Buddhism Huineng. He has the passage where he says that the mind. is like the emptiness of space.

Now he says if you want to realize this don't exclude everything from your mind, because if your mind is like space, space contains the earth and the stars and the sun the moon and the mountains and forests good men and bad men, enlightened men and man and unenlightened men, everything is in it. And so if a person wants to attain an understanding of the mind merely by emptying his mind, he's making his mind small instead of a great. So. You cannot therefore separate space from what it contains. Because without the content there is no container. Without the container no content. And when you see that kind of relationship. When you seem two apparently very different things going together inseparably, always find them together, you can smell a rat. For example, nobody has seen any stuff that had no shape. And nobody has ever seen a shape that had no stuff. There is a suspicion here then that stuff and shape are the same. And likewise, improbable as it may seem, you can realize that space and solid are the same. Only they are, as it were, the same energy, showing itself under two different aspects to a being who always must see things two sidedly, which is man. Man is symmetrical, almost, you see, right down this dividing line. Two sides to his brain, two eyes, two nostrils, a symmetrical mouth, two arms, two nipples, hips, legs, you see, all balancing except the heart is a little bit over to one side. But here he is, you see, this two-wayed thing. Man is like a Rorschach blot. He's some mess that was squeezed, folded and then you unfold it, and by Jove it's symmetrical. And it's a very strange thing about that, you could make order out of almost any mess by symmetrising it. In various ways, you know, there's a gadget called a telidoscope, which is a marriage between a kaleidoscope and a telescope. And you can look at things through it and because it's got mirrors inside of the forty five degree angle, they will balance the reflection in a circle, which is very elegant. And the more messy that you think you look at, the more interesting it is with the teleidoscope. Because it is through this balancing process of some sort of symmetry that order comes about. Repetition. Regularity. So the human being, being thus two sided, is always wanting to ask "Is you is or is you ain't?", "Is it this or is it that?" Answer yes or no. True or false. Black or White. And has very different great difficulties, the more simple minded the person is the more difficulty they have in using their conscious attention to

do anything but estimate these very simple contrasts between the good guys and bad guys. Are you man or a woman? There can be no doubt, there maybe nothing vaguely in between, no grays, no way no washes. Because a simple mind wants this great precision, which of course you can't have. But as poles, you see, one of the greatest dualities in the world is the duality of something and nothing. Of being and nonbeing. and of course in our thinking the solid world represents existence and the space world represents nonexistence. The conquest of space, therefore, will be the conquest of nonexistent, perhaps. See, this is the great attempt to survive by being able to leave this increasingly plundered planet go somewhere else and plunder that. That's the difference between mining and farming. Hunting and farming, too. Well. So there's this great contrast. Of reality considered a what's in the space. That's what's there. And the space is simply what's not there but you can't make it that simple because you only got to think about one step to realize that you can't have the recognition, or perhaps even the existence of what is there. Unless there is also what is not. In other words. I wouldn't be able to see you as moving human entities if you were all densely packed. In some sort of material medium like, say, jello, or milk or whatever because then there would be no intervals between you to bring you out. You see.

Now actually, space must in this connection for a moment be considered from the point of view of optics. The eye is receptive to a certain spectrum of vibrations of light. And therefore, where such vibrations are not being transmitted, the nerve ends are not stimulated and therefore don't report. And that failure to report is space. We call it darkness. Where there is no visible light. But actually there is nowhere in the universe where there is not some kind of vibration going on. So that if you had instrument that responded to it, you would see that space was full of impulses. And if you saw it all, you wouldn't be able to make out the individual outlines which require these nonbeing intervals in order that their being can be realized. That is to say outlined, distinguished, delineated. Discriminated. So to see the outline of the being, you must have the intervening space of the nonbeing. But nonbeing means simply in this connection the lack of stimulation of whatever perceptive or perceiving instrument you are using. Now for example, when you print a book, we say: there is empty paper underneath the print. But of course it isn't nothing under the print. It's

nothing so far as print is concerned, but something very much so far as white paper is concerned. Now, do you see, in the same way, perhaps it isn't nothing in which we are living in moving. It's only nothing so far as our visible shapes of concern. But you could say this: that space is a something of a quite different order than ordinary something. Ordinary something being the things and events which we say occupies space. As does the print occupies the paper. But the philosophers, especially modern philosophers have a great deal of trouble thinking about this. And the reason is that they are too one sided in the kind of instruments they use for understanding the world. And the instrument they use principally is words and thought.e thought. Now, they have just as much trouble in thinking about the universe in terms of their words and thoughts and logical categories as you would have in a printed book, writing some words down, which pointed directly to the paper underneath them. Supposing I say: there is paper underneath every word on this page.

Now, The Philosopher, the type of logical positivist person who dominates American and British academic philosophy today. He would think that could only mean something if I wrote the sentence "there is paper under every word on this page" and then under each one of those words I wrote the word Paper Paper Paper Paper. Then he would say "yes that's true." But you see, that isn't the way it is. The difficulty is, you see, there is an incongruence in between the print and the paper. If we can stand outside that because we are diverse enough to realize, that print is one process and paper is another and they can be put together. But if you are immersed in the print you can't see the paper. And so if you're immersed in the kind of consciousness which simply discriminates things, you cannot realize the background. That is to say then, you cannot realize the nature of space, when you use only your analytical consciousness. The consciousness which looks at things bit by bit by bit by bit by nit, which I call the spotlight consciousness. If you use that alone then you can't think anything about the continuum, the ground in which all this flourishes. But you may then go on to make a mistake. If you're not following me correctly. And this is the mistake of course that these kind of philosophers fall into. If I say now underneath all distinct things, space constitutes the ground in which they live and move and have their being, this is not quite correct. Because, if I speak of space in that way, it makes it just another thing of the same kind

and nature as all the things it contains. If, in other words, I can think about space, and I can only think about it by analogy, by likening it to paper, to a mirror, to a basis, a background... Well, if I can think about it that makes it a think, which is to say a thing. All things are thinks. They're as much of life as you can catch hold of in one thought. That means a think. So likewise in German. Denken, to think, Ding, thing. In Latin, reor, to think, res, thing. So if I make space into a think, I've somehow missed it. That's why we have to say it's a no think. Why they in Buddhism it is said "the real nature of mind is no mind". And you realize this in daily life by the fact that when you see clearly, you see everything except your eyes. Except if there's something wrong with your eyes and you see spots in front, you know, that interferes with seeing. If you hear clearly, you don't hear your ears. But if you have trouble, you get buzzing in your ears. The same way if you're very healthy, physically, you hardly notice your body. Except as a kind of blissful vagueness, which is exhilarating. And if your clothes are comfortable, you don't notice them. So this is connected with the nature of a beautifully functioning mind. That it doesn't get its own way. It doesn't think itself. If it thinks itself, it gets in its own way because it's a no think. No thinks is the background for thinks.

So that's why every attempt to conceptualize the ground of being, whether it's space or God, is an idolatrous, and that's why sages of all was condemned idolatry. To understand the nature of the the ground of being correctly, you must not have an image of it. Now, we don't need to be compulsive about that. Compulsive iconoclasm is a terrible thing. The Islamic people suffered from it from time to time, and when they got to India they knocked down all the Buddhas and beautiful images and banged off their noses. And the Puritans did the same sort of thing to Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches in England. They hated images. That meant, you see, they were terribly attached to them. They hadn't there was still hung up by the images and therefore had to smash them. Either way, if you say: you must not, like as it is in very strict orthodox Islamic culture, you must not make any image of any living creature. And so their art, very interestingly, one must admit, went off into abstract patterning. But what one is saying here is not that it is somehow just wrong to make an image. The point is much deeper than that. It is this. That in order to realize in order to experience the ground of being, you need to be free from images.

That is to say, you need to suspend the activity called thinking. Now most people imagine that if they stop thinking, that's what's sort of the end. The life of the mind instantly curls up and dies. But this isn't the case, because there's a lot more to the mind than thinking. There is this direct apprehension of the world, unmediated through core concepts or thoughts. And that's the kind of apprehension of the world you need to understand space. It's interesting how to some extent this sort of thing enters even into the sciences. Because scientists operate with certain, shall we say, it's hard to say concept, with certain tools that are not concepts, really. We always feel about a concept that you have to know what it is. But for example the basis of algebra is operating with patterns and you don't know what they are. They're called unknowns, X. That is the unknown. You can say X plus Y equals Y plus X. And you made a perfectly clear statement. But you don't have to know what X is or what Y is. Could mean anything at all. So in the same way in in modern geometry, You don't define what you mean by a point. They've abandoned as a sort of a nonsense definition. Euclid's idea that a point is that which has position but no magnitude. You mean it has position. What has position? And so now, a point, everybody knows what a point is. But you don't explain it. Because, you see, there must be a starting point in anything that anybody does and anything they think about, in any system of ideas, any conception of the good life, where you don't explain it. Because everybody knows what it is. And yet, when you ask them about it, they don't. And you see, we get time and space. If you turn back on your starting point and say I will not go anywhere. I will not proceed with my geometry, with my investigation, with my business plans, until I am quite sure of my starting point. You will never begin. Because you can go back into your starting point forever. And that's manifests itself in people, who, for example have certain kinds of hypochondria. Their starting point is the body. "My goodness. Ought I to go out? Would I catch cold? Would I get into an accident? Should I go to a foreign country? Would I get the great Siberian itch, or heebie jeebies, or trots or whatever. So, always worrying about the starting point forever. Now are you quite sure that your premises are right? it's always good to look at your premises. But you can very quickly come to the conclusion that if you don't have some premises, you won't go anywhere at all. So as a general once said: A poor plan of attack carried out with zest and determination is much better than an excellent plan carried out in a wobbling way. So in this way, for

example, in Japan I have no idea really about talking Japanese. I know lots of words and no grammar. Therefore I have no compunction whatsoever about talking because I know it's mistakes all over the place. And if I were nervous about it, as they get nervous about talking English, because they do desperately want to be correct, I have absolutely no desire to be correct. Because I know that in my whole lifetime, I will never be able to speak correct Japanese. So I just plunge in and I get understood. That's the way you have to do it in life. You muddle through. So if you keep turning back, you see, on the initial beginning point and trying to be sure of it, nothing will ever happen. So then, whatever is the point, whatever is the ground that we are and that we take our stand upon, appears to ourselves space. As not being there. To give us transparency. You see, if God were visible, nobody could see anything but God. It would blot out everything else, but by virtue of becoming invisible, the world is created. Because God gets out of the way, so that the world can appear. And the world is a selection, as I explained, the eyes select what they see, because they are only noticing what goes on in a certain spectrum of light. If you could change the eyes' spectrum altogether, you would see a different world of creatures. Flip, flip, flip, you could have to thing like a radio tuner, going from performance to performance, all on different bands of a spectrum. To see them all at once though, would be for our kind of intellect like taking your hands like this across the piano and going slap. See you just go to the chaos of sound. So that there being realized objects in space is partly dependent upon our using an attentive and selective type of consciousness. You see they're the same thing? If you have a selective consciousness you have a selective world. So putting down the five fingers on the piano, instead of the full, flat arm, selects a certain pattern of sound. And you can say it's a chord, it's a melody and so on. So when the Angels play their harps in heaven, they are selecting. They're the fingers of God selecting what kind of patterns are appearing in the world, you see, that's really what that image is about. So then to see this, you go back to no thinking. The suspension of thought is, for modern man in particular, a tremendously important undertaking. When in about 1921, the Ludwig Wittgenstein published a book called the tractatus logico philosophicus, it was the end of Western philosophy. Because where he finished, he said, you know, philosophy is really a method for getting rid of meaningless concepts. And. So he practically got rid of all metaphysical concepts and ended up by saying "whereof one

cannot speak of that one should be silent". And this was the great moment for philosophy departments all over the western world to lapse into silence. And practice meditation. But instead, they had to go on talking. Because they couldn't prove that they were an academic discipline unless they did some talking and a specialist in publishing.

So they began then to chatter nauseatingly about trivialities. They became grim grammarians. Mathematical logicians and things and everybody forgot about philosophy because it got so dull. It wasn't expressing any more man's fascination and wonder at the improbable situation of living in the universe. So. But fortunately things are at last getting through to people. And you would not be entirely laughed out of court in academic surroundings today if you suggested that some non-verbal research be carried on. You would have to put it rather carefully. You would have to refrain from calling it yoga or Buddhism or meditation, but it would be the sort of research in non-verbal sensory awareness or something, you know, something out of academic gobbledygook. But it's coming. And this presents problems to people who are compulsive thinkers. Because when they try to reach this completely non-verbal level, they think about doing it. They think I'm trying to reach the nonverbal level, I'm trying to empty my mind of thoughts, I'm trying to think not thinking. And you feel so sorry for those people. But it is an awful problem if you have it. And to get rid of it, then, one uses gimmicks. One uses methods of absorbing the individual in non-conceptual experiences. Such as, you can play a single loud musical tone. And get that going and it really shatters thinking. It has you, just, turns you into this, your whole body becomes this one tone. And you get the person concentrated on that one point to see it go go go go and zip, you cut it off. Then where are you? Haven't had time to collect your thoughts. You are blown by this tone. And all those techniques that are used in yoga when they chant, when they do some kind of physical exercises, when they have a nonsense proposition like Koan, to concentrate on: all these things work in the same essential way. To suspend the analytical thinking. To suspend the spotlight mind for a while. So that you get back to what is called original mind, where you act without thinking. That's why in the whole interchange between a Zen teacher and his students. The Zen teacher is constantly challenging, challenging the student to respond intelligently to a given situation without thinking, without stopping to think. Just as in, say, using

Judo, you mustn't stop to think, you're lost if you do. You must learn to respond without thinking. So creative skill in so many things depends upon the opposite of thinking, when you examine what people say, what inventors say, what artists say, what mathematicians say about the discovery of new ideas, very few of them arrived at those ideas by a purely thought, thinking, verbal or numerical process. And the reason is of course that the structures which we have arrived at and we do understand by analytical thinking. Once you see them they tend to stay put. They become habits. And there's nothing more difficult to cure in an individual than a habit of thought. You know, I've argued for hours and hours and hours sometimes with people who simply can't understand knowing without a knower. Because they are so trapped by sentence structure. The verb has to have that subject. Therefore you can have a state of affairs in which there is just the verb, that is to say knowing. They say, well who is who is knowing. And it's as bad as arguing with a flat earthist or a Jehovah's witness. Impossible. Because of the ruts of thought and such a person can never be inventive. Why? Because he will never see a new pattern a new structure. And he won't see one, because he's thinking all the time. He's not open to the variations of the actual world. And so, he can only see what he's been taught to see. That's why academic psychology is always in a position of bafflement about learning theory. Because if learning is a process of converting new experience into the terms of what you've already learned, you never really learned all. It's like according to kind of a narrow minded aerodynamics, Bees cannot fly. There is no way of explaining the aerodynamics of that vibration. But it flies. And you often come up against this when an inventor has an idea and all his colleagues say to him: "Oh don't be silly, you can't do that, it just wouldn't work." Well, he says "I've tried it and it does work." Well, they say, "Come on." And very often they won't even try. They'll just say it can't be done. You can get them fantastic dogmatism in the scientific world. And you have to be terribly careful not to upset certain absolutely fundamental, strictly prejudices, which are the result of thinking too much. And of getting accustomed to the warm ruts of thought. And so you never could see the new. So this is the real meaning of an open mind. Not merely that you're a liberal sort of guy, but that you can turn off thought. And thus be turned on to reality. THoughts, you see, belong to the world of symbols. What we experience with our senses is of course the physical world, the real world. You may ask me: "Well isn't

there also a spiritual world?" But you must understand that the spiritual world is the same thing as the physical, when the physical is not confused with the symbolic. There is no real difference between the spiritual and the physical. It's all one energy. All in one space. Now, you see though, the difficulty is, that in saying something like "It's all one energy", this is the really the point, I mean if you understand that this whole universe is one energy and you're it, you don't really have any much in the way of further problems. I mean you have some few practical problems like how to make a good table or a beautiful dress or whatever it is that you're after. But you don't have any more metaphysical problems when you see that. But a person who thinks a lot can't understand that at all because he says well it doesn't make any difference. If everything is all one energy, let's begin again. I mean, what have you said? Of course we haven't said anything. Logically, the statement is pure nonsense. Everything is one energy. So What? But that's only because the person who has received this communication has had it only as a thought. And as a thought it's again like saying: there is paper under every word on this page. And thinking that that means that "paper, paper, paper, paper, paper". But when this is something that emerges from not thinking, and when you see that you've been bamboozled. All your life long you've been bugged by everybody else into thinking that you are some kind of a freak that came into this world. And you don't really belong here because all you are, probably your parents didn't really want you, and that your brothers, older brothers and sisters didn't want you around, you were eating up more and in school they tell you, you know, you've got to learn that you're not the only pebble on the beach and that therefore the best way of teaching you that is that you're really rather insufferable around here and you're on probation until you are acceptable. Well, babies, they will grow up, you see, with this treatment, feeling strangers. Feeling that the earth is something alien. And so we all have this feeling of being alone. Of being impotent little puppets of a huge system going on. And so we are progressively fooled out of, really, with our own cooperation, fooled out of this sense that you can get if you suspend all these identifications that that one does with the thinking process. This is this, this is that, I'm me, what's me is different from so on. You suspend that. And you see not simply that all those problems and all those definitions of who you are aren't real. There's something else, you see, there is the feeling, beyond having dissipated the illusion, of the sheer joy

and delight of this one energy now realizing itself as you. And how nice that it won't always be doing that, because that would get boring. You'll go "Bliblip", like this you see? And it will be a different situation altogether. You know, you'll run into a brick wall and "Bliblip", before you know where you are, you're going "peep, peep" out of an eggshell. The whole thing is flipped and you're doing it on another track. But there's only one you, you see. It's all the one energy. But this is, as I say, difficult to understand logically if you don't understand it experimentally. If you understand it experimentally, it's perfectly clear when somebody says everything is one energy. Of course. But the person who's stuck with the concepts and has nothing more than the concept simply can't make any sense of it at all. And he says, well you're suffering from a hallucination. And will proceed to prove, according to his ideas, that what you've achieved in that has made no difference to you or do anything else. And of course he can prove it. Because his proof is set up to give just that result. Well then. I got into that at some length, the question of no thinking. Because of trying to point out how one must avoid trying to understand space in such a way as to make it a thing. Like a box, you see, which contains all the objects in it. But a no-thing like space is at the same time in cahoots with things. They're two aspects, two poles, two terms of the same energy. Don't make space at the same pole of the one energy as the things, it's the opposite pole. It is then, because of our treatment of space as nothing, you see, that we are afraid of death. We are afraid of that pole of experience, which is one consciousness. That corresponds to space, surrounding the world. And because we think that reality, that our life, that our identity is entirely in the domain of consciousness and thingness and thinkableness the other pole seems completely threatening whereas of cost it is that on which it all depends. Because the two poles depend on each other. They energize each other.

So when you are scared of the nonbeing side of things, you are, as it were, frightened of your own mother. Now of course you may have reason to be, because there are such things as devouring mothers. But the devouring mother represent the original horror felt for the unknown. And in practice in human relationships the devouring type of mother is that precisely the person who cannot come to terms with her own unknown. Therefore she wants to control everything. She wants to see that all the children remain

perpetually under her dominance. Because she can't let go. Because if she let go, you know, she would become un-corseted and flop all over the place as it were. She becomes the devourer. But you always conquer the devourer by dropping into it. By faith, in other words. Faith in the sense of trust, I don't mean belief. Trust. Drop into space and you float. See, this is only begins to be understood by rocket people as they get out there. And we're going to have, I don't know how the psychology of this is proceeding, but we're going to have an awful lot of people getting out in space and not wanting to come back. Because when you're in orbit, then you float. Very interesting sensation. And they have to follow very strict rules. The same way will you do with the skin diving. When you get to a certain level of pressure, you start floating and you feel no body weight. And you have to absolutely keep your will going. When the watch says a certain thing, up you'll go. Orders is orders, see? otherwise you'll drown. In great delight and bliss. So. The point is though that we are at the moment looking at space as something to be entered by the tremendous thrust of a rocket. Because that is the attitude of attacking the unknown. And that causes us not to realize that we are already on the most magnificently equipped spaceship. Which could hardly be improved upon. It just got a source of temperature and energy just at the right distance from it. It is beautifully equipped with oxygen, with food supplies, with all kinds of delightful things to do while on the journey. And it's traveling through the space at a colossal speed. And it's called a planet earth. The art of exploring from the planet earth depends not on conquering space with rockets and bombs. But on developing greater sensitivity in the place where we are. Lao Tze said "without going out of my house, I know the whole universe". Clumsy beginnings of this sensitivity are seen in radio astronomy. Which instead of trying to leap out of the world, it stays here and gets more sensitive. And eventually, I feel, that we should discover each one of us have inside our heads a radio astronomical contraption of great subtlety. And we shall eventually, the more we use instruments, we shall begin to watch a process which I will call etherealization. What a present we call miniaturization is connected with this. Miniaturization means that electronic equipment becomes smaller and smaller and smaller until what was originally a great box like this becomes a tiny, tiny little thing. Little tiny cell. And so in the same way, as certain techniques advance, all kinds of joining lines like wires begin to vanish. See, when radio substitutes for the telephone, all the

wires vanish. When the airplane substitutes for road and railway, all the roads and rails are going to vanish, See. And more and more we'll find means of getting rid of the clumsiness of primitive technology. And then as all this apparatus disappears, we find that we are moving in the direction of having it all in our own operatus. Just like Dolphins have sonar, homing pigeons have built-in radar, I think it's all in us but we had to exteriorize it technologically in order to discover it within.

It's curious, how, past the middle of the twentieth century, there's a very strong evidence of a revival in western philosophy, of what used to be called idealism. Not in the moral sense, but in the metaphysical sense. That is to say, of the feeling that the external world is in some way a creation of the mind. Only we come to this point of view with very different assumptions than were held by people like Hegel or Berkeley or Radley, the great idealists of European metaphysical tradition. And probably rather more akin to similar trends in Buddhist philosophy emerging from India about 400 A.D. The difference of approach, the difference of the way in which today this thing arises and the way in which it arose in the thought of a man like Bishop Berkeley is that the new idealism has a kind of curiously physical basis. When one would argue: everything you know is in your mind. And the distance, the feeling of externality between you and other objects and people is also the content of consciousness. And therefore it's all your consciousness. This of course created all sorts of weird feelings. Are things there when I'm not witnessing them? Or, is there anybody else there? Or are you all my personal dream? And one has only to imagine a conference of such people of solipsists, those who believe that they alone exist, arguing as to which one of them is really there to make the whole idea rather laughable. And furthermore there seem to be no clarity in such philosophical thinking as to what the mind or consciousness meant. It had long associations with the miasmatic and the gaseous by way of images. Mind and Soul and Spirit were always vague and formless. And matter, by contrast, was very rugged. Craggly. And how these two ever influenced each other, nobody ever could decide. Because all properly behaved ghosts walk straight through brick walls without disturbing either the bricks or the ghost. And so, how can a mind incarnate in a material body move that body in any way? This was always a puzzle.

So people began to think that the differentiation between mind and matter was of no use. Because actually what happens in making such a differentiation, is that you impoverish both sides of it. When you try to think of matter as mindless, or mind as immaterial, you get a kind of a mess on both sides. It's the same way when you get a mystic who is not a bit of a sensualist, and a sensualist who has no whit of a mystic. Such a sensualist is boring, such a mystic is a fanatic. To spiritual. It's the same. When we divide the medical profession from the priesthood, both are loses. Not just because they lose their so-called opposite half. But the problem is, when you separate a doctor from a priest, you do more than create a specialization out of what was originally one field, to create two specializations. Because a priest-physician is more than a priest plus a physician. By having, as it were, the binocular vision from medicine and from religion, he just doesn't see two added areas. He sees the area in three dimensions as a result of this combination. Well in a similar way, when we have the concepts of mind and matter working separately, both are impoverished. Mind becomes vague kind of gas, psychic gas. And matter becomes mere stuff. But, you see, what has enabled us to make a transition is, first of all, above all I would say, two sciences. Biology and neurology. Because through biology, and to some extent physics, the method of physics has shown us, that the idea, that man can be an objective observer of an external world, that is not himself, so that, as it were, he can stand back from it and look at it and say what is out there, we see that this cannot be done. We can approximately do it. But we cannot really and fully do it for two reasons. One, the most important reason is that the biologist will show us very clearly that there is no way of definitively separating a human organism from its external environment. The two are a single field of behavior. And then, furthermore, to observe something, either simply by looking at it, or more so by making experiment, by doing science on it, you alter what you're looking at. You cannot carry out an observation without in some way interfering with what you observe. It is this that we try when we're watching, say, the habits of birds. To be sure that the birds don't notice us that we're watching. To watch something it must not know you are looking. And of course what you ultimately want to do is to be able to watch yourself without knowing that you're looking. Then you can really catch yourself. Not on your best behavior. And see yourself as you really are. But this can never be done. And likewise the physicist cannot simultaneously establish the position and the velocity of

very minute particles or wavicles. And this is in part because the experiment of observing nuclear behavior alters and affects what you're looking at. This is one side of it. The inseparability of man and his world. Which deflates the myth of the object of observer standing aside and observing a world that is merely mechanical, a thing that operates like a machine out there. The second is from the science of neurology. Where we understand so clearly now, that the kind of world we see is relative to the structure of the sense organ. That, in other words, what we used to be called the qualities of the external world, it's qualities of weight or color, texture and so on, are possessed by it only in relation to a perceiving organism. The very structure of our optical system confers light and color upon outside energy. And in this sense then, especially if you want to read a very easily digestible account of this thing you get the book by J.Z. Young called "doubt and certainty in science". But you see, here from a new basis altogether we have a new answer to the old riddle, if a tree falls in the forest when nobody is listening, does it make a noise? The answer in terms of modern science is perfectly clear. That the falling tree creates vibrations in the air. And these become noise if and only if they relate to an eardrum and to an auditory nervous system. Just as in ordinary drum, however hard you hit, the drum will make no sound if it has no skin. Because sound is not something that exists in the external world. Sound is a relationship between vibrating air and certain kinds of biological organisms. And therefore it is these organisms which confer what we call sound upon a vibration, which in an earless world would make no noise. Now you see, that is perfectly clear and straightforward. But now dare we take certain steps from that? Could we say for example that before any organisms existed, there was no world. And what we're talking about when we talk about a world prior to the existence of organisms is what is called an extrapolation. Let me explain extrapolation for a moment. Supposing you have a map of Kansas. And you want from the evidence contained in the map to guess at what kind of territory lies beyond its edges. Well naturally you will extend those straight line roads off and off and off, that's the only basis you've got to go on. Nothing in the map of Kansas would warn you that a little way west you will encounter the Rocky Mountains and the roads will have to wiggle. And still less will warn you that you're going to encounter the Pacific Ocean way out beyond, where you can't build any roads. So naturally you see, we extrapolate from what we know to the unknown. And so one might say

then, is the existence of a universe before there were any living organism an extrapolation? All we are saying is, this is how things would have been if we had been around. But we weren't so it wasn't. That is a possible argument, although in the climate of opinion today it is one that is not fashionable. You must watch out above all for fashion in philosophy. Fashion in science. There are completely irrational functions that govern what is or what is not a respectable scientific opinion. And although there is very careful work done, very valuable and thoughtful experimentation, always in the background of this work there are these irrational fashions of what is believable and what is not. Many things that we accept today were completely unbelievable. We are always coming across this. Authoritative pronouncements that no one will ever reach the moon because of incontrovertible evidence about this that and the other. But nowadays we have swung over perhaps to being a little bit too uncritical. And as Norbert Wiener warned in his book "the human use of human beings", we must not take science as a sort of fairy godmother, and say, well we have all these problems of overpopulation and lack of water and so on but science will solve it, don't worry. See, that's the other extreme. But there are these fashions. And so the idea that the world is in some way, you see, therefore. The one moment you let this little idealism thing in under the door, and I remind you, I'm using idealism not in a moral sense but in a metaphysical sense, as opposed to some sort of materialism. Now, the moment you let that in under the door, if I can possibly realize that the way the world is, is evoked by the structure of my organism, it is that way. All mountains and suns and moons and stars are the inhabitants of a strictly human world. Perhaps insects with their different sense organs have a very different universe and that is an insect universe. This is again, it seems, to be a recrudescence of what used to be called the prophetic fallacy. Which was the attribution of human qualities and emotions to natural phenomena. The wind sighs in the trees. My heart is sad. And somebody comes along and says: "It isn't the wind that sighing, it's you." True and not true. Because you wouldn't be able to sigh if there were no wind. And you sighing and wind blowing go with each other. I've invented this new word, gowith, G O W I T H, or goes with. It is to replace the idea of causality. Certain things go with each other and sighing wind goes-with a sane world in which there are human hearts and human emotions.. And if there were not a world with human hearts and emotions there would be no wind and if there were no

wind there would be no human hearts and emotions. It's a transaction, it's reciprocity. So in the same way every event, then, in the external world is dependent on the observer for its happening. As for example is a rainbow. You can say: The sun is shining. And there's moisture in the atmosphere. And the sun being at the right angle to the moisture makes a rainbow. And if somebody is there they see the rainbow. That is a mythology, a way of putting things that is acceptable to us in the current climate of philosophical and scientific fashion.

But I want to put it in another way. The sun is shining and there is a person standing. If there were moisture in the atmosphere, there would be a rainbow but there is. So there is no rainbow. If you want to be fair there is no rainbow if nobody is watching it, you see? Because you must have one of the three components sun, moisture, observer to have the thing called rainbow. And what applies to the tenuous, filmy, luminescent rainbow, applies equally well to the hardest rocks, the solidest mountains and the hottest fires. Because all existence is a relationship. It's like the skin of the drum. If it's not there, no amount of hitting a nonexistent skin will produce any noise. So you see energy, we can see this, energy is relationship. We can see the falling fist on the skin of the drum. Boing, like that. And if there isn't both the falling fist and the skin: no noise, no existence. But existence is not only the impact of rocks on each other. Existence requires always as its third, you can get the rocks knocking, the sun and the moisture, the tree crashing to the ground, the sun pouring out electrical energy. But none of these things constitute existence until related with. The neurological complex. But then you have to look backwards, and say at the same time: the neurological complex belongs to the same world as the sun. It's a physical pattern, physical behavior, physical energy. But it takes this complexity of pattern to evoke the world. You see, this idea is unfamiliar and that's the difficulty of understanding it, that's all. It's a very simple idea, but it's an unfamiliar one and it's an unfashionable one. Although as I say, this sort of thinking is coming back to us at this time. Very largely as result of people's experiments with psychedelics. Where one gets the perfectly uncanny feeling of the world and oneself as simply two phases of a single process. Well, as the rainbow metaphor illustrated, we arbitrarily favor an explanation of the triangle. The impact of energies in the external world and an observer of this impact, which, as it were, energizes all

realizes, makes them real. The difficulty that we have in our prejudice, that it's the two forces out there that are real, and the observer is irrelevant to the reality of the situation. It's what we're really saying. Goes back to the whole notion that man himself is irrelevant. Man is conceived as something, therefore, that is irrelevant in various ways. He could be said to be irrelevant because he is a spiritual visitor from another world altogether. He could be said to be irrelevant because he's unimportant. He makes very little difference to the total universe. He's very small. But when you get this kind of thinking, you want to go back and ask: "Why do people want to believe that man is irrelevant?" In all theory of this kind look for some sort of, well ask the question: "What do these people want to achieve by their theory, by holding this stance?" And it was fashionable in the nineteenth century to look upon man as irrelevant. For some very sound political reasons. I may sound a little bit like a Marxist in saying this, but it's when you're on the rampage, you have to believe either that you're the representative of God Almighty and doing everything at his bidding. Or that what you're doing isn't really very important. Either position will give you an alibi for behaving like a barbarian. So the great put-down on man, that our little affairs sort of no concern to God. Thank heaven he's not watching any more. Then we can get away with murder, which is what we wanted to do. In the colonization doings, especially of the nineteenth century, and the outrages of the two world wars, there is no God watching anymore. You know, the teacher is gone out, boys let's raise hell. That was a way of getting rid of teacher. You know, God is dead, let's have a drink. And as a result of this, you see, it became so fashionable to think of man as merely unimportant. Little victim of the cosmic trap. That, for a while, Western man lost his sense of the dependence of the, well what the Hebrews used to call, he lost his sense of man's position as the head of nature. And when you hear today, people's comments on that old myth, that man is the head of nature. They come back in a very funny way. They say "Oh that's the most conceited point of view. Man is part of nature." Yes, but why is it that the naturalists, who think that man is part of nature, are always fighting nature. Because they don't understand what it means to be the head of nature. Every creature is the head of nature in its turn. And we all take turns because it's taking turns that makes the world go round. Every creature in its turn is the head of nature, because each creature creates the world in its own image. And so each creature, as a creator of the world, is man. Man

simply means the middle position. This is the whole idea of man. The middle. The middle way. The mean. And so. Wherever is the central point that is the point called man, just as you are the center of your universe. And as the astrologers explained, that when you wanted to draw the map of the soul you took the center point occupied by the individual organism. In other words the date and the time, and that gave you a latitude and longitude. And so in relation to that date and time, how was the universe arranged, shows the map of the individual soul. Because the individual is the whole universe considered from this point of view. Or focused at this point of view. So in like way, the cosmic situation of a bee or a mouse, puts that mouse in the position of man when the mouse is considered the center of the universe. Now, every point in a curved space-time continuum is the center of the universe. You can see it, although this is only a metaphor and is not quite the right mathematical and physical description. But when you consider the surface of a ball of a sphere, any point on that surface can be the center. Just rotate it to what appears to be the front as you look at it and it's the center of the surface of the sphere. Any point. So if our space is curved like the surface of the sphere, then any point on it may legitimately be considered the center. And so considered as the center, that is the point called Man. Although, as I say, it may be mouse, it may be ant, it maybe insect, anything. But this becomes inconceivable and unimaginable to individuals who have no experience of themselves as center. And people who insist on the idea of being an objective observer, of standing outside and watching the individual, the world as a kind of television screen or movie screen upon which there is a distant panorama of passing events. That person, by adopting that position, has excluded himself from the feeling of centrality. In fact he rather looks down on the feeling of centrality. He says that is the egotistic situation, you see. You are the center of everything. But, you know, you may call it all sorts of bad names, you may call it the egocentric predicament, but that's the way it is. And it's much less egocentric to accept it than to say well I'll go off and play my own eccentric game as an objectively observer, who is a sort of controller outside the world in that qualitative sense in which the monotheistic God is said to be outside the world. The boss.

So then, if you take this to a very far extent, see how far we can go with it. Is it, then, that in the measure, that you are the behavior of the universe, is

the universe the behavior of you? I was talking in the beginning, you see, about the ease of understanding one way of looking at this and the difficulty of understanding the other. Even though one implies the other. When we see, that the degree to which individual behavior is a factor of the whole environmental scene, we tend to try and understand that in terms of determinism. That the individual organism is helplessly pushed around by and responding to environmental forces. But on the other hand, if the relationship between the organism and its environment is transactional, it won't be that one sided. If the relationship is transactional, it will be true simultaneously, that the individual organism behaves in accordance with the environment and the environment behaves in accordance with the individual organism. So if we put that in startling practical terms. If you got into a mess, that was what you wanted. Well, you say "I didn't know I wanted it. I certainly didn't think I wanted it." No, because that will be true, you didn't want it, so long as you refer to yourself only in terms of the conscious spotlight which scans experience bit by bit, and which thinks about it. To the degree you identify your own functioning with that alone, then you will say of what happens, "Well I didn't ask for this. It has nothing to do with me, I wasn't responsible." But as soon as you extend your way of looking at things, and are not that myopic about it, you'll begin to see what is, I think, clumsily foreshadowed by Freud and Jung, especially Freud, in his idea of self-punitiveness, death wishes and all these things. Where he is trying to say of the functioning of the unconscious, that when you get into a catastrophe, you are accident-prone, because you want to punish yourself. Now, actually Groddeck is much better at this than Freud. Very few people know Groddeck. Groddeck really was behind lot of Freud's ideas, and he wrote a thing called "The Book of the it", "Das Buch vom Es" And in this he explains the most extraordinary theory of the unconscious. Which, he doesn't, like Freud, Freud basically didn't trust the unconscious. That's why he felt, that the reality principle was in irreconcilable conflict with the pleasure principle and that this conflict would destroy human civilization. Groddeck, who looked like a goblin, with enormous ears. A little man, really looked like a goblin. and he ran a Sanitarium at Baden-Baden, where people who came for massage got psychoanalysis and people who came for psychoanalysis got a massage.

Well he wrote this book in the form of letters from a goblin to a young girl. And it's the most, it's much more sexy than Freud. But through the whole thing he has this complete faith in the unconscious and its wisdom. And a friend to whom I once lent this book years ago said "After reading that I will never be afraid of getting sick again". Because he pointed out about all sickness, that sickness really not a disease, but a symptom of the the It, the unconscious trying to cure you. And therefore, just as one does not simply knock down a fever with quinine, because that would stop the work of the fever, so perhaps one should not knock down all sorts of diseases. Because for purposes which we do not as yet understand, the unconscious is using them for a constructive purpose. But now so you see. This was something Freud was fumbling after. The notion of an intelligence in us, greater than the intelligence of consciousness. And operating in an unconscious way. Note the choice of words. Why didn't he say super conscious? Because the climate of opinion at the time in which he was alive wanted to insist that everything below human conscious reason was stupid. That mere matter, up blind energy, had displaced God upon the throne of heaven. But it comes back, you see, with with Freud. That you cannot eliminate the unconscious as part of your essential operation, yourself. Because you are an inseparable part of the world, you cannot divvy up responsibility and say: "You should praise me for that, I should blame you for that. It's your fault!", "No, it wasn't, it's your fault." you know? All this is a perfectly silly argument. And if we think it dignifies human beings and gives them a sense of, and theologians are always talking a lot of nonsense about this kind of thing, they're saying that the dignity of man depends upon each individual assuming his responsibility. And as soon as they start doing this, nyanyana, it is, it is, it isn't, you know, and arranging who's to be clobbered, who's the fall guy who gets the blame for the situation. It's usually somebody who was just happen to be standing by when it happened. So. If then you understand that you are an integral, functioning part of this whole cosmos, what price do you pay for stopping this yak yak about your fault, my fault et cetera? The price you pay is, you have to admit your own complicity in the catastrophes that occur to you. You have to see, that everything that comes to you, is what went out of you. Everything that comes to you is a return to you of what went out of you. You asked for it. But it's not the conscious you that asked for it. Not the you that is just the

spotlight consciousness, because that's unconscious of most of the things that go on in you.

So you get a curious, fascinating picture of how things are operating underneath the surface. This is what's so valuable about studying some science. Take a very so-called simple science, like elementary botany. Or best of all a kind of elementary course in ecology. Plant, microbe, organism relationships. And what you see is this. You see a developing pattern in which everything that happens gets integrated into the whole thing that's going on. That what is from one point of view, say, the disease of a certain plant, is the method of reproduction are some other species. If we get, say, malaria from anopheles mosquitoes, that is because anopheles mosquitoes have an extraordinary reproduction cycle, that involves their being parasitic to us. Now if you take the anomalies point of view, it becomes man. You see? So that, as you study these systems, you see, what is going on is, we need a little bit this way. And then someone says "Oh no that's going too far!" And then they say, they pull it and it comes back, you see, and now a little bit this way. You get it going over here, and then they say "Oh no no no, that's too much, too much!" They feel a strain or something that said "too much" so there's constant adjustment going on. And if you would examine, for example, the sharp edge of a leaf. You put it down under a huge microscope and there's a churning, churning, churning, going along. And there are certain little elements, cells in that leaf, you see, that want to go weeee, way out there. And if they do, you know, the leaf is disintegrating into gas, and weee. But then some police come along, along that line and say "Hey get back inside. Keep in, keep in." and the other thing: "No, you're destroying our liberty. We want to go out." "Go on, get in!" And this whole thing, this clamor goes along the edge of the leaf. From our point of view it's a perfectly stable, clean edge. We're not looking closely enough. So our turmoil, our problems, our walls and calamities and atomic explosions mean, if the planet blows up, that's going to be like. Morganroth once showed me a great plant covered in green fly. They were succulent and fat and having a ball. Came by the next day, the whole thing was grey dust. They'd eaten up the plant and disintegrated. As a fact of nature around here we say thank heavens for that. These green flies just ate the wheat up and both of them were pests anyway. It works out in the balancing system of nature.

So we are doubtless in the same situation. And only we have a kind of blinkers on, whereby we only see half the picture. We get the end of it, that it can push us around, but we don't get the end of it, that being pushed around is what we asked for. We evoke it all by the very fact that we're here. Children don't think that they are responsible for being born. They blame their parents, not realizing, that they can't really separate themselves from their patterns, that in the measure that, for example, I have sexual desires, I can really understand my father's predicament. And I couldn't possibly blame him, because actually I was the evil gleam in his eye, when he approached my mother. You know, I asked for it. Now you can see in this, that your relationship to the world as being responsible for everything that happens to you, is not the same as an ordinary boss. Who would be a magician and say that all sorts of improbable things should happen. Rather it is this. If you think of yourself only as the consciousness then, if you get some ideas for me about being in control of everything that happens to you, you will act stupidly, as if you were the boss of the whole thing, like a kind of a lunatic thinking he's god. But if, on the other hand, you understand that your real self is the wisdom, that is expressed in the intelligent form of your organism, then you won't fall into the error of thinking your relationship to the world of being that of its governor.

This morning I want to talk about space in relation to what is ordinarily is called reincarnation. Because this is one of the most fascinating applications of the sense that space constitutes something significant. Now, the subject of reincarnation is one around which is ringed an incredible amount of hocus pocus. And yet there is something in it. And there seems to be something in it not mainly because there is a lot of alleged evidence for it in the form of stories of children who remember their former lives and so on. I want to approach the subject much in the way that Erwin Schrödinger, the physicist does. Because he has a view of this, that does not involve any hocus pocus at all. It is perfectly simple, and all the evidence for it is already before us. So it involves no claim to special insight [or] psychic knowledge, but merely to grasping a principle that is staring us in the face.

And this principle is difficult to understand, not because there's any inherent intellectual complexity to it. But simply because it requires getting across something that's just unfamiliar. There is obviously some sort of analogy, which I've already drawn your attention to, between space and

unconsciousness. Between stars, there is darkness. Between stars, there is not the energy, which constitutes a so-called body. In some modern physical theory, that is purely hypothetical not really tested, bodies in space are thought of as points at which space is intensified. But, at any rate, there are these gaps, these intervals. And obviously the unconscious state must appear always to the conscious state as a gap or interval. So when we go to sleep at night, we wake up in the morning almost instantly. In other words, there appears to have happened nothing except something quite vague between going to sleep and waking, unless you had dreams. And so, you can conceive, or barely conceive, going to sleep, but not waking up. Or the reverse of it, waking up without ever having gone to sleep. Which appears to be the nearest we can imagine to death and birth, respectively. To go to sleep and never wake up, when we die. When we were born, to wake up, but not to remember ever having gone to sleep. And of course, this bugs our imagination, because it's inconceivable in terms of consciousness. People are afraid. Some people are afraid, of the possibility of eternal annihilation. And I suppose one of the most eloquent expressions of that is John Betjeman's poem "Before the Anesthetic". Where he would prefer rather even the dismal hells than that this I should cease to be. And other people, perhaps of a more rational bent, say "well that's no problem". Because if you simply cease to be, there's nobody to be disturbed by it. You can't experience not being there forever. And what most people do is, they project upon the prospect of annihilation the imagination of being shut up in a dark prison. An, as it were, supersensory deprivation chamber, forever.

But of course, the notion of eternal annihilation really has no meaning. It is an attempt to conceive nothingness, non-experience, and so far as our imaginations are concerned, nature abhors a vacuum. We have to project something into that. Because psychologically, as well as logically, it is a void. However, you see, just as we've been discussing the notion that all creatures whatsoever, not to mention all people, feel themselves in the middle. They feel central to their experience. And being central to experience is the nearest thing I can conceive as a meaning for the word I. Not an ego, because that is a social structure, a social institution, which has been kind of implanted upon our psychological behavior. Upon, shall we say, experience. Because experience is the thing that we are taught. We are taught what experiences are permissible and what are not. Just in the same

way as we are taught what speech is permissible and what is not, and what gestures are permissible, what actions are permissible and what are not. So our experience is trained, and we are trained to experience ourselves as egos. But still, underneath the implantation of the ego experience, there is this sensation of centrality. You may feel that your center is isolated, as in the ego thing, or you may feel that your center is simply the center of a being, which is you, which extends to the ultimate limits. But in every case, there is the sense of centrality in every being that exists.

And therefore, every being is I just as you are. And there are always "I"s, in this sense. So long as the planet endures and there are living creatures on it, this is a planet with eyes. And so long as there is the possibility, that anywhere in the galaxies there should be such a planet, or creatures, who focus the centrality feeling of the universe, there is I. And that I is always you. We know, that, when people die, other people are born after them. And that is all the evidence we need for the notion of a reincarnation. Or it could be explained in various ways, discussed in various ways and elaborated. But fundamentally, people die. And then people are born. And that is only the simplest way of saying it, because people are born while others are living. And the whole collection of I centers can sit around in a ring in this room. And I would explain, according to my feeling, that we are all a cycle of reincarnations sitting round here in a circle. Because reincarnation is the reincarnation of I. If you wanted to be the reincarnation of a particular i, then you will have to do something else altogether, which we shall go on to talk about. But one thing seems to me to be perfectly clear. There was a time when your I woke up. It emerged from the biological continuum, from what de Chardin calls the biosphere of this planet. And you don't remember having been here before, least not in the ordinary way. That is as surprising and as inconceivable an event as ceasing to be and, without any apparent prospect of being again. But, you see, after this event called life, if you go back to unconsciousness, you go back to where you were before you started. And since there can't be any experience of non-experience. Obviously any next I that comes up, and all in fact the next eyes that come up, are you. Only since I is an experience of centrality, you don't experience yourself as multicentered. You experience yourself as a particular center. Because the universe, although it is multi-centered, each center is experienced uniquely.

So what you might roughly expect is this: that after you die, the next thing you know is that you are without the slightest memory of what ever happened before. You repeat the same sort of experiences that you had when you were born. Because it's somebody else being born. There has to be someone around. I'm merely saying that the experience of being I goes on. Even if there's an interval of several billion years, it makes no difference whatsoever. Supposing the human race was wiped off the planet and it took that much time for it to reappear, or any living creature. That would make no difference to this phenomenon. So let me repeat. Since there is no possibility of a non-experience, there are always experiences coming up, and each one of them is you. Because it's I. Now I know there's a difficulty in this. Because it arises from the fact, that we identify I with the ego. And a part of ego is the memory system. You know who you are in the sense that you remember who you are. You identify yourself with a series of events, that you remember. And these are, like, strung-out in a line, they're like a certain tune. And therefore you identify yourself with that tune. So we repeat ourselves, we have consistent characters. Just in the same way as a tune is always constructed to repeat itself in a certain way with variations, so that we recognize the tune, and the name of the piece, by hearing even one part of it. So here is a tune, you see, that is being played. And it is attached to a center called I. Only the I is much more than this particular tune, this particular series of memories. Even though we are persuaded and kind of hoaxed into identifying the whole I with that series of memories. But, you know, supposing somebody plays a Chopin Etude. And then he stops. Then, later on, somebody else plays it. Is it the same tune? Why, in one sense yes, in another sense no. So it is possible, isn't it, that, even though your tune was wiped out, because the memory system goes with death, the same sort of tune could be played again with its characteristics themes. And that will be in another sense you. In a more particular sense than the you of centrality. In Buddhism, there has never been the idea, that rebirth or reincarnation involves the transmigration of a specific soul. Because all schools of Buddhism are agreed on the idea that the individual self, or soul, is an illusion. A Maya. And they liken the process of rebirth to the motion of a wave across the surface of water. Actually, the motion is illusory. The water simply goes up and down. Now, there is an optical impression of a wave moving out. No wave moves, and yet there is the seeming of movement.

So the Buddhist would say: no soul reincarnates and yet there is the illusion of reincarnation. Buddhists think of reincarnation as an illusion. And yet believe in it. Westerners think of it as something that might be a fact and find it difficult to believe in it. Westerners adopt the idea of reincarnation as a comforting idea. Buddhists are trying to get out of being reincarnated. It's very funny. But at any rate, the Buddhist doctrine of reincarnation says, that what passes problem life to life, is karma. Is doing, action, that's what karma means. Process. And that something like wave. Not soul, not entity, that doesn't pass. You can look at it in another way. There is an institution like the University of California. This university keeps going on and on and on and yet all the buildings change, certainly all the students change, all the faculty changes, all the administrative offices change as the years go by, and yet it's still the University of California. What is the University of California? Why, it is does a process. It is a doing. It is a pattern of behavior. Your body is in the same situation. There is not one scrap of you that was with you ten years ago. It has all been rebuilt, reorganized, completely repaired and renewed. Then who are you? You are a pattern, you see, you're a process, that is identifiable and recognizable. You face in a certain way, you hair in a certain way, you are in a certain way and you behave in a certain way, so we recognise you. But it's all inconstant. It's like a whirlpool in water. The water flows through and the whirlpool retains the shape. Until it doesn't. But then it can always whirlpool again somewhere else. So now, what do we do? If that's clear so far, what do we do to give any credence at all to the notion, that there is some connection between some lives of a peculiar character? That we could take a life lived between the years of 1500 and 1580, and look at that. And then see another life lived between 1700 and 1792, and say, you gods, there's no getting away from it, but that the latter is a continuation of the former. Now. How could you do that? Well, very simply. Let us consider that we are looking at an enormous number of biographies, scattered over a very great period of years. But to visualize them, we've got to think of them as different colored spots. Now, as you look at this great mosaic, you see, of spots of all sorts of different colors, you will very soon begin to pick out patterns in it, as you do with a Rorschach blot. And you will see continuities running across. And you will therefore have projected a particular, even personal, reincarnation pattern running between these different biographies. It is highly conceivable, that one of these blots may, at a certain point, there may

be a stream of blots that you associate as being a stream. And then at a certain point they divide, and two lines proceed from it. It could very well be, you see, that an individual could reincarnate as two next time. Or any number you want. Amoeba fashion. But you will see these connections in your blots. Now then the question arises: Is this just your idea or are these connections real? In order to answer that one, all we have to do, is to look out of some sort of pattern formation, that we find not in the situation, that we find a Rorschach blot, but say we are examining the structure of a muscle. We've sliced the muscle and are looking at it carefully with microscopes and things. What do we find? We find that muscle is an enormous conglomeration of cells. But that these cells have patterns in them. Or at any rate, we notice certain areas of their behavior, where they seem to constitute tubes. But what is the difference between the tube's one sees in a cross-section of muscle and the pictures of forms one sees in a Rorschach blot? Just get down to it. What is the difference? You might say that would be a large variation of individual opinion as to the nature of the Rorschach blot patterns. And less division of opinion about how one should interpret muscle patterns. But is that alone enough establish a significant difference between the two situations? Especially when you get down to the micro level, where more and more the molecules, or cells or whatever, are distant from each other. You see, isn't it really remarkable, that at a certain level of magnification we see this as a huge distribution of rather formless things and we can only see what form we make when we go down in magnification, and come back to approaching the normal vision, that we see these vastly scattered blob and globs and globs and globules or whatever, take shape. And is this alteration of magnification anything like a psychological projection? It's very difficult to draw a hard and fast line between making out sensible patterns in the physical world of everyday life on the one hand and interpretive Rorschach blots on the other. Seeing faces in marble. Seeing cities in the clouds. And so on.

So then, what might appear as lines of continuity between the various lives could be said to be there in the sense that there are veins and nerve lines embedded in the cell structure of muscles. But always it's quite clear to us: there is something about the projections we make, of faces into marble, that has a kind of illusion to it. Quite so. And what Buddhist philosophy wants to draw our attention to is that the same kind of illusion is existing in our

attitude to the physical world. We are projecting. But of course creatures of like structure will make the same projections. Just as we look around here and see that we are more or less all the same basic shape. And therefore probably have the same sort of brains inside our heads. We are projecting a more or less similar structure upon the external world. And our agreement about that is the same thing as saying "Well that's the way it is". But you see how relative that is. It is in relation to having a brain system of this particular kind. So. The Westerner may be anxious that his idea about reincarnation is something more than a fantasy. The Oriental, the Buddhist or the Hindu very much hopes it is only a fantasy. And in that case it can be overcome. He can be delivered from a cycle of futility. Only you mustn't understand, again you must understand that too literally. If you want to know what Buddhists really teach on this matter, put it in a very simple way, you get a book by Alexandra David-Néel, called *The Secret Oral Teachings*. Difficult to get hold of, but somebody in this country is going to publish it soon. It is published in India. But I think Lawrence Ferlinghetti is going to publish it. *City Lights*, San Francisco. That book really goes into this and I called, I call it the "I told you so book", because I've often been accused of inventing my own unique brand of Buddhism and hoisting it off on the public as being the real thing. I just have to point them to this book and say: "you see?" Alexandra David-Néel, that's French. DAVID-NEEL. Could say David Neil. So now.

What becomes interesting in this, is that you will pick out the lines of continuity between lives upon what basis? Why, just in the same way as you pick out continuity between tones. By the way they interval to each other. In which case the death interval, the off interval, becomes the significant connecting factor between the on intervals. That's what you do, when you look at patterns of blobs on a wall. You could play with Roland Hall's paintings that way and see all sorts of things in them. And it depends what intervals you find significant that connects what you call the on pieces. See, you've always got off pieces and on pieces. You've got a kind of mosaic. Look into a press photograph with a magnifying glass and you find a mosaic of black and white dots. And so you can, again, you can make the significant connections and as you do you come out with somebody's face. And so in the world, our nerves are very much like the press photograph. When something impinges upon the retinal backdrop of the

eye, it impinges upon a whole lot of rods and cones that are either on or off. The state of a neuron, you see, is that it fires or it doesn't fire. So we've got this press photograph in it. If you work with L.S.D., this becomes very clear. You get a vision sometimes of the world which is positively pointillist, like the paintings of Seurat. Somehow it seems as if your nerve ends had been activated individually. And you become aware of a grainy quality in everything. This could be dismissed as a pure hallucination, but all hallucinations have some basis in our neural structure. You see? They may not be experiences of what we call the objective world, but in any experiment, that turns your consciousness on your consciousness, your senses on your senses, you will get curious things happening. Just as you might get oscillations in electric circuitry. So. It would then be intervals once again. That could be the significant connecting factors in a developmental pattern of an individual through a series of incarnations. But those intervals are illusions. The connection is illusory. But, in a sense, an illusion, to which we Westerners are not really accustomed. Because Maya means illusion in a very complex sense. It means also: creative power. Art. Magic. Calculation in the sense of the calculus. This is difficult for us to understand, you see, the notion, that the world is Maya. Why is it difficult for us to understand that? What is our feeling about saying this is a dream a projection? What's the objection to that idea? Well. I think that that historically at the root of our Western objection to this idea is that it's discussion is to God. It is if to say God did not really create the world as it says in the Bible. But that he only seemed to. But you realize that this is an absolute verbal hang up. It's also question of of values. If the world is real, then I mistake you seriously, and you mistake me seriously. If the world is only a dream then it doesn't matter. You see, if you say it doesn't matter, then you are saying: it's purely spiritual. Like, it's immaterial baby. And you see how we flip around in our use of words. We say something "Oh, that's merely matter."

So, it doesn't matter. Everybody gets completely confused in the way they think about these things because they've never really been thought about really these questions of is it real or is it not real. When an Oriental says of something that it's not real, the first thing he means is, it's not permanent. And so the degree of the quality of change of the smoke like, and dare I say the dream like, because the dream vanishes, you see, and so they say life is

like a dream. As you get older you're more and more aware of the speed at which things change. With the child it seems to be slow. Children easily get bored. As you get older life goes zzzip. Especially if you live in California where you can keep a steady mailing list for more than two months because every two months a quarter of the addresses has changed. And, you know, the bulldozers come in and they change the shape of everything and knock down all the old buildings and up go new ones and then they get knocked down. Or they're so jerry built that they fall apart. But there it goes, you see, and so there is this quality. He means dream like, the thing is in constant flux. But he also means illusion. In showing the extent to which what is going on in this flux is a creation of the perceiving organism. So that by illusion the Oriental also means relative. As in the relationship between the vibrations in the ear. Between the cloud, the sun and the observer, these things produce, a rainbow, sound and so on. But these are relative realities. And so when Buddhist use the word void, Shunyata in Sanskrit, as designating the nature of the world, this should rather be translated relativity than nothingness. But the great scholar Scherbatsky e made this very plain in his book on the Buddha's Nirvana ["The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana"]. It is relativity, that we should think of, rather than our ideas of nonbeing. So from that point of view, as also from the standpoint of quantum mechanics and modern physics, the illusory nature of the world is very clear. It was so much so that one physicist, who was a little daft, used to go round in the most enormous padded shoes for fear of dropping through the atomic structure of the floor.

So one gets this extraordinary sense then, of living in this incredibly real seeming world. Which, the more you analyze it, consists mostly of space. And you come to feel a, shall I say, diaphanous quality about things. That a mountain is only a faster wave and longer lasting rainbow. And that, as the poet said, the hills are shadows and they flow from form to form and nothing stands. And if you will experience this, this kind of creepy feeling you get, when you think that this is just you, and everything about you is just a "phffsht". Here and gone. And swallowed up in space. Why do you say swallowed up? You see, people, poets, people who talk "swallowed by the grave, swallowed into space, disappeared into nothing, gone, vanished into thin, thin air." Why is there an objection to this? Well, one's been taught to object. Because you've been taught to identify with a solid side of

the picture. And to disidentify with the empty side of the picture. But you've been hoaxed and fooled. Because, you, when you die, are not, as it were, gulped out by thin air. You are just as much the thin air as anything else. It's all of a piece, it isn't a fight going on. But everything is represented as a fight. A contest between this side and that. But this is really the whole thing about illusion. Where the ordinary person sees a battle, the enlightened person sees a cooperation between two sides. Have you ever tried to play chess with yourself? And honestly take each side as you play its move against the other one? Or to get to, you know, those swords they have in bars, they stick into olives and martinis. You get two of these swords and fence with yourself and see if you really can stick it into one of your hands and have the other one defend it. This is the most fascinating game and this is the game God is playing, sitting there. Two hands, you know, is good, is evil. Here is Christ and here is Lucifer. And he got really involved in this fight, you see. When he finds out, that if he makes the right hand win all the time there's no point in the game. He has to get into the left hand but in order for there to be a real fight he mustn't let the left hand know what the right hand is doing and vice versa. He explains all the stuff in the Bible. But really, you see, underneath he two hands they join back here like a kind of a horseshoe or like the snake ouroboros, which is always after its own tail. And an aspect of that, not letting your left hand know what your right hand is doing, is the way we identify ourselves with what's inside the skin and not with what's outside it. We identify ourselves as reality with the solid things that we can see and all the rest of space and that's nothing and see. We characteristically take sides in a situation where both sides are aspects of the situation. Who would take this side? Will you have this or that? Choose. SBut the sage doesn't choose, because he says "Well, there's no choice here." He might choose, for the sake of going along, you know, like somebody says "Well, what would you like to do today? We can go into town and do some marketing or we can stay out here and go swimming." You don't care which you do, so you just say one in order to satisfy your host. So. Then behind the explicit battle, there is the implicit agreement. Tweedledum and Tweedledee agreed to have a battle. We agree to differ. If we want to have a sane social order. So cheer up. You may well be so conditioned, just like to feel the fear of the known, even though you know much better. If you have come in life to a point where, say, you have bad teeth through aging, or hardening eyeballs. When you get

awakened and you get satori or anything, it won't make any difference to your teeth or your eyeballs. I've never heard of a case of spiritual healing of somebody's teeth.

So in rather a similar way, there will be certain emotional habits that you have. That will be practically unchangeable. And they settle in as you get older and you have to live with them, just like you have to live with the color of your hair, or whether you've got a funny shaped mouth or something like that. It all goes along. It's part of the pattern that you're in for the time being and will live out. A lot of people go around judging other people and say "Well think they've had some wonderful experience, but they are still sick in some way." as if that was reprehensible. Or they're still lose their tempers a bit. One expects all these things to change. Emotional habits, proof like that. One must get rid of that kind of the Beaver Protestantism. And so. But, you know, what does happen is, although you have fears, anxiety basically, in the face of life and death, nevertheless you can get to a point where it's like having a deep center, which isn't anxious. And above all isn't anxious about being anxious. You say OK so I anxious. And somehow you can tolerate it, you can stand the tension. It's one of the most fascinating things to learn, to hold tension. And not go, when you get a problem, not go rushing off to solve it immediately. Because most problems, when solved in a rush re solved in the wrong way. Especially the emotional problems between people. You have to stand, for example, not being liked, which is a terribly difficult thing for Americans. But what I've said here, I think, about space and about rebirth and so on, you will notice one thing about it all. Nothing that I've said, or understanding anything that I've said doesn't require any kind of what I would call special knowledge. It's all out in front of you. It doesn't require, actually it doesn't require meditation exercises or LSD or anything. It's all out in the open. And the only really essential meditation exercise is stopping thinking. And being able to perceive without conceptualizing what you're looking at. And that's the interior silence. Without which there is really nothing to think about or talk about except thinking and talking. So let's have an intermission.

Individual and the World

If you were told that you were going to be given half an hour's interview with God, and you had the privilege of asking one question- I wonder what you would ask. You might be given some preparation, too. Because, when you think what is your ultimate question, you will probably do many things before you arrive at it and I know many people would discover that they had no question to ask. The situation would be altogether too overwhelming. But many people to whom I've put this problem say that the question that they would ask is: Who am I. And that is something we know very little about. Because whatever it is that we call I is too close for inspection. It's like trying to bite your own teeth. Or to touch the tip of your finger with the tip of the same finger. And although other people can tell you who you are and do, they only see you from the outside, as you see them from the outside. And you don't see from the inside. And so the nature of what is that we call eye is extremely puzzling. Because there is some confusion as to how much of us is I.

We talk in ordinary ways about my body. My feet. And when we go to the dentist to have our teeth fixed, we regard him rather as a mechanic. Like you take your car to the garage so you take your body to the surgeon or the dentist or whatever it is to be fixed how the parts changed or something of that kind. And they're really getting to work on that now. And so the question is when somebody has a heart transplant. That sounds very radical because we say in my heart of hearts. But nowadays most of us seem to feel that whatever it is, that I is, is located in the head. Somewhere behind the eyes and between the ears is the center. And the rest of us is an appendage a vehicle which carries the self around. Now popular speech also reflects the sensation. That I am very different from what we call the other. Other people, other things. Anything that we can become aware of is sort of other. There is an opposition apparently between the knower and the known. And so we talk about facing reality. We talk about coming into this world. As if somehow we didn't belong. As if instead of being leaves growing out of a tree we were a lot of birds that had alighted on bare branches. And it has become common sense for most people living in the twentieth century today to adopt the nineteenth century philosophy of science. Which interprets the physical universe outside human bodies as being a mechanical contraption which is essentially stupid, unfeeling automatic, Composed of mainly geological elements: rocks gases and so forth. And therefore we feel

rather alone and left out of this thing. In contrast with the ideas of Ptolemaic astronomy. Instead of being at the center of the universe. We are on the outer limits of a minor galaxy revolving around an unimportant star. On a small minute ball of rock. And therefore that astronomical way of looking at things is simply overwhelming. It makes us feel not only of no importance but also very much left out. And as a result, that is the common sense of most people living today.

We did of course have a religious view of our nature that we were the children of a loving God who is in charge of this whole operation. But very few people actually believe that anymore. A great many people think they ought to believe it and would like to believe in it but they don't. Most ministers that I know don't believe it but they feel guilty about this because they feel they ought to. But it became implausible. There never was a serious argument against it. It simply became unthinkable in comparison with the dimensions of the universe as we now see it. So having lost a way of looking at the world, an image of the world which gave us some sense of meaning, we now have an image of the world which gives us none at all. And so we feel rather inclined to put up a fight against the whole show. Interestingly enough, when in the nineteenth century we switched our common sense from supernaturalism to naturalism, one would think that a naturalist would be a person who love nature. Just as a materialist ought to be a person who loves material but certainly isn't. With what is called a philosophy of scientific naturalism. Naturalism is used in a negative way. It has nothing to do with being natural it has something to do with being not supernatural, Merely natural. And all sorts of phrases with coined in that epoch which I would call put down phrases. Freud spoke of the basic psychic energy as Libido, which means blind lust. People like Ernst Hegel spoke of the universe as being a manifestation of blind energy. Think of that put down word blind. And therefore we also speak of unconscious mental mechanisms. And the very word unconscious as being the deeper aspect of our psyche is a negative word and a put down word. So is to say what you are functioning as a rational ego with values and with a capacity to love, is simply the epiphenomenon of a purely mechanical process. To bad. So as a result of this so-called naturalism we began to put up the most whopping fight against nature that was ever engaged in. And that fight is an expression of our fury and of a feeling of being left out. So that the

technological experiment which became possible as a result of the mechanical Sciences has largely been conducted in a spirit of rage. And the results are evident all around us. Here in Palm Springs. You are gradually getting all the smog from Los Angeles. This great cloud of poisonous gas put up by a city which is exemplary in this whole civilized world for fouling it's own nest. Perhaps only Calcutta could be a bit worse. Or some such terrible slum. But we have done it by technology. By ruthless beating about of nature without consideration for what the scientist would call our ecology.

Ecology is that aspect of science which deals with the relationship between organisms and their environments. Ecology is the study of the balance of nature. Of the way in which every living being depends upon innumerable other living beings of all species. And also upon inanimate forces. Air, water, temperature, gases, vegetation and all sorts of things. And this is one of the most important sciences that we can possibly study today. Because we are in a position where we realize that we cannot help interfering with the world. To be alive is to interfere. You must interfere. You cannot go back and say: Hands off nature. let's leave it all alone. Because you're stuck with it. Especially once you've started to interfere in a major way. We have so altered our environment that there is no hope for it but to go ahead. But we can, to some extent, change direction. But the only way that I can see of our effectively changing direction is through a transformation of the feeling that we have of our own existence and of what we mean by I. The reason for this is simply that all kinds of intelligent and even powerful people like, say, Laurance Rockefeller who are interested in ecology and in conservation of our natural resources, they can scream their heads off but nobody pays any attention. There is as yet no really serious program at the government level to do anything radical about the pollution of water, the waste of water, pollution of air and the general ravaging of the United States of America. I'm amazed that congressman can pass a bill imposing severe penalties on anyone who burns the American flag, whereas they are responsible for burning that for which the flag stands. The United States as a territory, as a people, and as a biological manifestation. That is an example of our perennial confusion of symbols with realities. Which is in a way at the heart of the trouble because what we think of as I is much more a symbol than it is a reality. The living organism, the whole mind-body, is much more than

anything we mean by I. I largely stands for your personality. Your role in life. And the very word person, as you probably know, comes from the Latin persona. A word originally used for the mask worn by actors in Graeco-Roman drama. That through which sound comes, because the mask had a mega phonic mouth to carry the voice an open air theaters. So when you speak of being a real person, it really means being a genuine fake. Because the personality is only the front. What is behind it? Well of course the organism is behind it. The whole organism. And we must be very careful not to confuse the organism with various symbols that we have for it, because those symbols can be extremely misleading. If we say the organism is the body, what we usually mean by the body, is an impoverished meaning. When we speak of my body that is to say my vehicle, my physical automobile. That is an unenriched meaning of the word body. Because what you really are as a body, as a living organism, is not some sort of separate existence coated by a skin which divides you from the rest of the world. Shakespeare has King John saying to Hubert: "Within this wall of flesh there is a soul counts thee her creditor." Within this wall of flesh: the skin considered as a barrier. When actually, from a biological point of view, the human skin and all skins are osmotic membranes. You know when you get something by osmosis. By sort of soaking it in. So in the same way one's skin is a spongy construction full of holes. Full of communicators, nerve endings. And your skin is simply a vibrating membrane through which the so-called external world flows into you and through you. So that you yourself actually are not so much an entity that moves around in an environment. You are much more like a whirlpool in a stream. And, as you know, the whirlpool is constant only in its doing, that is to say in its whirling. And you could recognize individual whirligigs in a stream. But the water is flowing through them all the time. They are never the same but for a second. And so it is also with us. Or imagine it in another way supposing you have a rope and one foot of the rope is made of hemp, one foot of it is made of cotton, one foot of it is made of silk, one foot of it is made of nylon and so on. Now tie a simple knot in the rope. Now move the knot along the rope. And one minute it will be hemp, the next cotton, next silk, next nylon and so on. Same knot. It will be recognizable as a continuing knot, as that knot. The knot in that rope. But the constitution of it will change as it moves. And so our constitution is changing constantly. Imagine for example a university. The student body undergraduate changes

every four years. The faculty changes every so often. The buildings keep changing more and more. What constitutes the University of California? It certainly isn't the faculty, it isn't the students, it isn't the governors, it isn't the administration, it isn't the buildings. What is it? Why a doing. A behavior. A university-ing process of study and experiment and so on. So it is exactly the same with you. You flow. You are a process.

But how do we draw the line about this process and its relationship to all other processes? We find that a very difficult thing to do the more you think about it. If you really felt with your whole organism, instead of just with that part of it called conscious attention, you would become aware of this flowing fact. And you would get a very strange feeling which at first might frighten you. It is possible of course to have this feeling. And the feeling is like this: You would not be quite sure how to interpret it. You might feel that you yourself were doing everything else that's happening. That would be one way of feeling. The other way of feeling it would be that you are doing nothing at all. But that everything else is doing you. And you would feel completely passive like a puppet on the end of strings. Although on the other hand if you got the feeling that you were doing it all you would feel like God Almighty. It is very easy for our consciousness to slip into this state of sensation. It can happen spontaneously, like measles. It can happen by training. As when someone practices yoga. It can happen chemically as when certain drugs are taken. And one has to be very careful about this feeling because it's enormously easy to misinterpret. Either as being omnipotent, being God in the personal, literal sense. Or as being helpless and merely driven. Now what should be understood is that both these ways of feeling are right. Only they must both be taken together. To be simultaneously omnipotent and helpless. These are two poles, opposite poles of one and the same state. Because the message that is coming through, and that we find difficulty in understanding, because it's contrary to our common sense, contrary to our whole history and conditioning, the message that's coming through is: you as a living organism and all that is going on in your environment constitute a single process. What in physics we would call a unified field. A single process like a pattern but you know any pattern has all sorts of subsidiary wiggles in it. Like the organism itself is a unified pattern but it's full of wiggles. All sorts of tubes and organs and bones and nerves and so on. Working in this way. You know the body

doesn't have a boss. We could pitch a big argument. Who is really the top dog in your body, your stomach or your brain? I can argue for both ways. Let's first argue for the stomach. The stomach is fundamental. That's what eats and eating is the fundamental thing of being alive. By putting food into the stomach it digests it and from there it goes out and energizes everything else. Obviously the stomach is the most important. The hands, the mouth, the feet all exist to serve the stomach and naturally as a final achievement of the stomach is the brain. Evolving later in the evolutionary process as a gadget up there to scavenge around and find stuff for the stomach to eat, that's the function the brain. But now let's take the argument to the side of the brain. The brain says: "Oh no no. I'm not. Just because I arrived late doesn't mean that I'm unimportant. I was being gotten ready for. Because I am the thing that is the flower at the top of this thing. And this tube with stomachs in it and things below was preparing for me and the stomach is my servant. It is doing all the dirty work and getting energy to put currents through my wonderful circuits. So that by the creation of all the goods of the mind of the Arts and Sciences and religion and philosophy and so on I shall be the true head of man. Well both arguments are right. Because you have a relationship between stomach and brain, which is a sort of polarity. The one exists for the other. It's like when you prop up two sticks against each other they will stand up so long as they lean on each other. Take one away and the other collapses. So chop off the head and the stomach is finished. Take out the stomach and the head is finished. So this is the way all organic life proceeds. It's different with mechanical life. Because the mechanism must invariably have a boss. The man who puts the machine together, the person who constructs the computer, who designs it, who asks it questions, who programs it. He is the boss. But organisms don't have bosses. They are essentially, I would say, democratic arrangements. Where, somehow, in a marvelous way, an enormous company of cells are working together. But that isn't the way, the body wasn't sort of: one day a lot of cells all crept to together and said: We are a body. That does sometimes happen in the biological domain, but much rather this: when you watch the gestation of a mammal, you see first of all a very simple little organism. Which swells. And as it swells, it becomes more and more complicated from within. No parts are added, nothing is screwed on, there's no welding done or anything like that. It bulges and of course it does absorb material, but it transforms it. But all of it works together at once like the legs of a

centipede. Like you work all together at once. For, you see, when we come down to it, you think you decide things, but you don't know how you do it.

How do you open and close your hand? And you can decide I will now open my and do it, but you don't know how it's done. And yet in a sense you do know how it's done because you say I know how to open my hand. But you don't know in words. You can't explain it. Still less can you explain how you see, still less can you explain how you are conscious. How are you an ego? Well you don't know because the springs of being conscious, of being an ego are outside the surveillance of consciousness. They're somehow underneath. And that lets the cat out of the bag at once, because you see that what is I is something very very much deeper than the superficial consciousness. And what you call I in the sense of the voluntary willing center, ego, has very little to do with it. You are just a watchman on top of the mast or a radar on a ship that is scanning the environment by conscious attention looking out for trouble. Or looking for food. The real you is much too complicated to think about. Supposing when you woke up in the morning, you had to switch yourself on. That is to say, you had to, by an act of conscious attention, to go through your brain and turn on all the synapses necessary for wakeful life. It'd take you hours. Supposing you really had to be conscious of all the details involved in walking or in breathing or in circulation of the blood. You'd never get around to it. So you see when we inspect the physical world with conscious attention the first thing that strikes us is that the physical world is extraordinarily complicated. How can it possibly be organized. But actually the physical world is not complicated at all. What is complicated is the task of trying to describe it in words. Or of trying to figure it out in numbers. Because that is analogous to the task of, say, removing the water from the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic with a beer mug. We can only take one mug at a time. And so we say in popular speech you can only think of one thing at a time. That's not exactly true but what it reveals is that thinking, that conscious thought is a kind of calculus in which we understand things bit by bit. And it leads us into the superstition that things really are bits. Now, when you eat chicken of course you have to bite it. And you take it in bits. And to make it easier to bite you order from the grocer a cut up fryer. But you don't get cut up fryers out of eggs. Because you see although we can speak of A

chicken, AN egg, or A body, it is not actually a bit. It hasn't been bitten off except for purposes of thinking. Now.

This is beautifully brought out in a passage from Whitehead, which I will read to you. He is discussing the nineteenth century philosophy of science, which I was just discussing, too. And He's saying in this philosophy: All our impressions of nature are simply products of our minds. Nature gets credit which should in truth be reserved for ourselves. The rose for its sent the nightingale for his song and the sun for his radiance. The poets are entirely mistaken. They should address their lyrics to themselves and should turn them into odes of self congratulation on the excellency of the human mind. Nature is a dull affair. Soundless, scentless, colorless. Merely the hurrying of material, endlessly, meaninglessly. However you disguise it, this is the practical outcome of the characteristic scientific philosophy which closed even the seventeenth century. In the first place we must note its astounding efficiency as a system of concepts for the organization of scientific research. In this respect, it is fully worthy of the genius of the century which produced it. It has held its own as the guiding principle of scientific studies ever since. It is still raining. Every university in the world organizes itself in accordance with it. No alternative system of organizing the pursuit of scientific truth has been suggested. It is not only reigning, but it is without a rival. And yet it is quite unbelievable. This conception of the universe is surely framed in terms of high abstractions and the paradox only arises because we have mistaken our abstractions for concrete realities. He calls that, you see, the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. The attribution, in other words, to our bitty way of thinking to the world which we are biting. That is misplaced concreteness. The separations between things are abstract. They are concepts. In the same way, for example, as lines of latitude and longitude are concepts. Even though a Russian poet has recently made a beautiful poem about the world being like a ball carried in a net bag. But you never expect to trip over the equator when you cross it. And although it is something quite abstract and does not exist in nature, it's extremely useful for purposes of navigation. So in the same way, bit-ing and having words to describe particular events or particular wiggles in the universal pattern are very useful. But they are very dangerous when you confuse things with natural events. Because then you get into this sort of trouble.

The trouble of the sorcerer. The surgeon who is too much of a specialist in one organ runs into that organ and alters it and does what he considers a better mechanical job than the Lord did. But then he discovers to his dismay and the even greater dismay of his patient that the operation has unforeseen consequences in some other part of the organism. Because he didn't realize the connection. When, likewise, we object to certain insect pests. Oh, we say, get rid of them. D.D.T.. So. Then we found we got rid of something else we didn't want to get rid of. And worse still that this insect that we didn't like was doing a job for us in some manner of which weren't aware and we only become aware of it when suddenly we find ourselves covered with another kind of fly altogether, or with some sort of bacteria which this insect kept down. Watch it, watch it, watch it because nature does not consist of separate things which you can just pull out like parts from an engine. Take the case of bees and flowers. Oh, we always use the bees and flowers to explain fundamental things about life but we're going to go deeper than sex this time. Fascinating thing about bees and flowers is they are very different looking things. A flower sits still and blooms and it smells, or stinks to be correct. The bee moves about and buzzes. But they are all one organism. You don't find flowers without bees, you don't find bees without flowers. They are just as much one as your head and your feet which also look very different. So in that sense you see we are one with the incredible complexity of processes and wiggles upon which we depend. Although to say "upon which we depend" is not quite accurate. Because that separates us from it as if I were hanging onto a beam and depending on it. It isn't like that. You don't depend on it, because it depends on you. It's a mutual arrangement. And it isn't that one bit of this sort of came first. Although that sometimes happens. But it's always there in potentiality, what came later. But it's rather in the same way that, when a flower opens, you see all the different petals extending simultaneously. Especially when you watch a fast motion movie of a flower opening. And so in the same way there is a simultaneous arrival, or evolution, of the human organism and the human environment and thus biologists speak about the evolution of an environment as well as the evolution of an organism in it. In other words, human beings could not have appeared on this planet until its temperature had lowered to a certain degree, until the atmosphere contained certain gases as a result of vegetative development. And then the environment became evolved enough for human beings to appear in it. Evolved enough?

I'll say if something further: intelligent enough for the appearance in it of intelligent beings. For your environment is intelligent. Otherwise you couldn't be. You see, as Jesus said, you don't gather figs off thistles or grapes from thorns. You won't get pears off an apple tree. So you won't find people except on a people tree. And this planet, this solar system, this galaxy is people-ing in exactly the same way that an apple tree apples.

Put our existence into verb language, as distinct from noun language, and you're much closer to the point. You see nouns have the difficulty of designating things. Verbs designate process. Now everything is a process, really. When we speak of housing for houses, matting for maps, we're getting there. The Nootka Indians have a language in which there are no nouns. So they say: it houses. And then they add an adverb to show whether it houses religiously, homeily or marketingly. And so they see the world as the flow. What is IT that houses. What is it that rains when we say it is raining. You see we always have a funny idea that to get a verb, that is to say, to get action you have to have an agent. Now this is the most ridiculous idea conceivable. How can a noun start a verb? How can a thing start an event? Because there's no action in a thing. Action can only come from action. Energy from energy. You can't get energy from a concept. Because nouns are all concepts, they're abstract, really. It's only verbs that are concrete. As the world is process. Now, common sense insists that the pattern of the world must be made of something. Because we still think with Aristotle's common sense. Or with the imagery of the Book of Genesis where God made Adam out of the clay. In other words he made a clay figurine and breathed breath into it and it became alive. And so we constantly think that we are made of flesh as a flesh with some sort of stuff like clay out of which you shape bodies or like you make tables out of wood. Are trees made out of wood? What a ridiculous question. Trees are wood. They're not made of wood. And it is simply this artifact thing that gives us the idea of the well being made out of something. It isn't made out of anything. And so when physics tries to investigate what is the stuff of matter, it can't find any. Because you can never talk about anything except a process. You can describe what a process is doing, you can describe the structure, the nature of the dance, whether it's doing a waltz or a mazurka or the frog or whatever it is. Then you can describe that melody, shall we say, what it is performing. But there is nothing doing the performing at all.

There is no stuff out of which it's being done because when you examine stuff you just find more pattern. What you mean by stuff is fuzz. When you look at something with a lens and you're out of focus you see fuzz. But when you come into focus you see structure. Right now the structure is made of all sorts of little lines and things. You can see them and you want to know what they are made of. So you turn up the magnification and for a while you get a lot of fuzz but when you're clear again you see that those little lines are also made of more little lines and more structure. Big patterns have little patterns upon the backs to bite them, and so on. And that's the way it goes. So. Suddenly you feel rather insecure because stuff has disappeared there's a famous story about a physicist who understood this so well, but he always went about in the most enormous padded shoes because he was afraid of falling through the floor. Now look what's happened. Just look and see what has happened to us. If we go through everything that I've been saying, we find, first of all, that the thing that we thought was I is nothing more than a social institution. Just like the equator. Or an inch. And to mistake it, to reify it, as Whitehead would say, is the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. It's a strictly a hallucination. And any certain amount of psychological self-exploration shows this to be the case. But what we are is the organism. And what the organism is is a transactional interchange between the organism and the environment. It's not quite correct to say you're doing it and it's doing you because, you see, Whitehead, in describing the scientific philosophy, saying, for example, that blue is entirely our projection on the sky, he's half right, you see. Those scientists he's talking about are half right. But the part of it that is left out of consideration is this: True, you with your optical nerves and eyes transform the sky into the blue feeling. But without the sky you wouldn't have any optical nerves. It works both ways you see. Without the air whose density gives the blue effect. It's mutual. You do it and it does you. But that's, as I said, a two-way, a clumsy way of talking about: it's all one process, a unified process. And furthermore from this process there has disappeared what we thought was solidity. What we thought was common sense, substance and stuff- it's just pattern. And at once one feels sort of ghostly. As if you could be easily blown away. And that's why the Hindus call the universe the Maya. Which means the illusion. Don't forget illusion is related to the Latin word ludere- to play. So the play. Big act. It also means magic. As in a conjuror's creation of an illusion. It also means creative

power. It also means art. Finally it means the divine power. The Maya of the Lord. Lord is a bad translation of Bhagavan. Just the Divine One. Lord means boss and the Hindus don't do it that way. But now you see, having arranged this general introduction, which I'm afraid will be familiar to some of you who've attended my seminars before; but I've arranged this general introduction to raise the question: All right. If that's the way it is. How on earth are we going to arrange a transformation of man's consciousness so that he'll know it. Not just in theory but something he feels in the same way as you feel what you take to be I at the present moment, confronting an external world. How will you transform that sensation? Because if you don't transform that sensation, you are not ever be fit to use technology. We shall continue to use our technology in a hostile spirit towards the external world and we shall wreck the external world. We're busy doing it now. There is no necessity to abandon technology. We can't adapt. But we can certainly use it in a different spirit. I've just been in the island of Ceylon, which is a garden. A beautiful beautiful place. But it's completely undeveloped from a technical point of view and it's in very bad economic circumstances because nobody wants to buy natural rubber anymore. It has no foreign exchange. It is very peaceful. But the change has got to come. So I discussed with one of the high members of the government the possibility that we could set up in Ceylon an experimental station. Which would serve not only India eventually and Africa, but us, too. A an institute of ecological technology. Where we could in that experimental Island work out ways of production, of mechanization, automation and so on which would not ruin the island. And you have to do that sort of thing with a certain dedication because one of the reasons why we make such a mess with technology. is that the shareholders in any given corporation want to make a fast buck. Now there's nothing wrong, you see, in wanting to be rich. There's nothing at all wrong in being rich, in fact I think the world without rich people would be extraordinarily boring. Point is, you have to understand what riches are. And they are not money. Riches are land, clothes, food, housing, intelligence, energy, skill, iron, forests, gardens- those are riches. But when you're concentrating, you see, only on making the buck. Doesn't occur to you that you're not really getting rich, you're just impoverishing yourself. Like, you know, when you're up up up up up up prices, the value of the dollar goes down down down down down. You're just on a rat race, on a treadmill. The faster it moves, it doesn't get

anywhere. Well it doesn't even stay in the same place. So it is that kind again, you see, this is another example of confusing the symbol with the reality, the fallacy of misplaced concreteness as Whitehead calls it. So we should devote the rest of the seminar to discussing the various ways in which it is proposed that we bring about or assist the bringing about of that change in our perception and conception of our own existence. So that we can feel ourselves the way we are. As distinct from the way in which we've been told to feel ourselves.

MACHINE TRANSCRIPT

ORDER HUMAN TRANSCRIPT

If you were told that you were going to be given half an hour's interview with God, and you had the privilege of asking one question- I wonder what you would ask. You might be given some preparation, too. Because, when you think what is your ultimate question, you will probably do many things before you arrive at it and I know many people would discover that they had no question to ask. The situation would be altogether too overwhelming. But many people to whom I've put this problem say that the question that they would ask is: Who am I. And that is something we know very little about. Because whatever it is that we call I is too close for inspection. It's like trying to bite your own teeth. Or to touch the tip of your finger with the tip of the same finger. And although other people can tell you who you are and do, they only see you from the outside, as you see them from the outside. And you don't see from the inside. And so the nature of what is that we call eye is extremely puzzling. Because there is some confusion as to how much of us is I.

We talk in ordinary ways about my body. My feet. And when we go to the dentist to have our teeth fixed, we regard him rather as a mechanic. Like you take your car to the garage so you take your body to the surgeon or the dentist or whatever it is to be fixed how the parts changed or something of that kind. And they're really getting to work on that now. And so the question is when somebody has a heart transplant. That sounds very radical because we say in my heart of hearts. But nowadays most of us seem to feel that whatever it is, that I is, is located in the head. Somewhere behind the eyes and between the ears is the center. And the rest of us is an appendage a

vehicle which carries the self around. Now popular speech also reflects the sensation. That I am very different from what we call the other. Other people, other things. Anything that we can become aware of is sort of other. There is an opposition apparently between the knower and the known. And so we talk about facing reality. We talk about coming into this world. As if somehow we didn't belong. As if instead of being leaves growing out of a tree we were a lot of birds that had alighted on bare branches. And it has become common sense for most people living in the twentieth century today to adopt the nineteenth century philosophy of science. Which interprets the physical universe outside human bodies as being a mechanical contraption which is essentially stupid, unfeeling automatic, Composed of mainly geological elements: rocks gases and so forth. And therefore we feel rather alone and left out of this thing. In contrast with the ideas of Ptolemaic astronomy. Instead of being at the center of the universe. We are on the outer limits of a minor galaxy revolving around an unimportant star. On a small minute ball of rock. And therefore that astronomical way of looking at things is simply overwhelming. It makes us feel not only of no importance but also very much left out. And as a result, that is the common sense of most people living today.

We did of course have a religious view of our nature that we were the children of a loving God who is in charge of this whole operation. But very few people actually believe that anymore. A great many people think they ought to believe it and would like to believe in it but they don't. Most ministers that I know don't believe it but they feel guilty about this because they feel they ought to. But it became implausible. There never was a serious argument against it. It simply became unthinkable in comparison with the dimensions of the universe as we now see it. So having lost a way of looking at the world, an image of the world which gave us some sense of meaning, we now have an image of the world which gives us none at all. And so we feel rather inclined to put up a fight against the whole show. Interestingly enough, when in the nineteenth century we switched our common sense from supernaturalism to naturalism, one would think that a naturalist would be a person who love nature. Just as a materialist ought to be a person who loves material but certainly isn't. With what is called a philosophy of scientific naturalism. Naturalism is used in a negative way. It has nothing to do with being natural it has something to do with being not

supernatural, Merely natural. And all sorts of phrases with coined in that epoch which I would call put down phrases. Freud spoke of the basic psychic energy as Libido, which means blind lust. People like Ernst Hegel spoke of the universe as being a manifestation of blind energy. Think of that put down word blind. And therefore we also speak of unconscious mental mechanisms. And the very word unconscious as being the deeper aspect of our psyche is a negative word and a put down word. So is to say what you are functioning as a rational ego with values and with a capacity to love, is simply the epiphenomenon of a purely mechanical process. To bad. So as a result of this so-called naturalism we began to put up the most whopping fight against nature that was ever engaged in. And that fight is an expression of our fury and of a feeling of being left out. So that the technological experiment which became possible as a result of the mechanical Sciences has largely been conducted in a spirit of rage. And the results are evident all around us. Here in Palm Springs. You are gradually getting all the smog from Los Angeles. This great cloud of poisonous gas put up by a city which is exemplary in this whole civilized world for fouling it's own nest. Perhaps only Calcutta could be a bit worse. Or some such terrible slum. But we have done it by technology. By ruthless beating about of nature without consideration for what the scientist would call our ecology.

Ecology is that aspect of science which deals with the relationship between organisms and their environments. Ecology is the study of the balance of nature. Of the way in which every living being depends upon innumerable other living beings of all species. And also upon inanimate forces. Air, water, temperature, gases, vegetation and all sorts of things. And this is one of the most important sciences that we can possibly study today. Because we are in a position where we realize that we cannot help interfering with the world. To be alive is to interfere. You must interfere. You cannot go back and say: Hands off nature. let's leave it all alone. Because you're stuck with it. Especially once you've started to interfere in a major way. We have so altered our environment that there is no hope for it but to go ahead. But we can, to some extent, change direction. But the only way that I can see of our effectively changing direction is through a transformation of the feeling that we have of our own existence and of what we mean by I. The reason for this is simply that all kinds of intelligent and even powerful people like,

say, Laurance Rockefeller who are interested in ecology and in conservation of our natural resources, they can scream their heads off but nobody pays any attention. There is as yet no really serious program at the government level to do anything radical about the pollution of water, the waste of water, pollution of air and the general ravaging of the United States of America. I'm amazed that congressman can pass a bill imposing severe penalties on anyone who burns the American flag, whereas they are responsible for burning that for which the flag stands. The United States as a territory, as a people, and as a biological manifestation. That is an example of our perennial confusion of symbols with realities. Which is in a way at the heart of the trouble because what we think of as I is much more a symbol than it is a reality. The living organism, the whole mind-body, is much more than anything we mean by I. I largely stands for your personality. Your role in life. And the very word person, as you probably know, comes from the Latin persona. A word originally used for the mask worn by actors in Graeco-Roman drama. That through which sound comes, because the mask had a mega phonic mouth to carry the voice an open air theaters. So when you speak of being a real person, it really means being a genuine fake. Because the personality is only the front. What is behind it? Well of course the organism is behind it. The whole organism. And we must be very careful not to confuse the organism with various symbols that we have for it, because those symbols can be extremely misleading. If we say the organism is the body, what we usually mean by the body, is an impoverished meaning. When we speak of my body that is to say my vehicle, my physical automobile. That is an unenriched meaning of the word body. Because what you really are as a body, as a living organism, is not some sort of separate existence coated by a skin which divides you from the rest of the world. Shakespeare has King John saying to Hubert: "Within this wall of flesh there is a soul counts thee her creditor." Within this wall of flesh: the skin considered as a barrier. When actually, from a biological point of view, the human skin and all skins are osmotic membranes. You know when you get something by osmosis. By sort of soaking it in. So in the same way one's skin is a spongy construction full of holes. Full of communicators, nerve endings. And your skin is simply a vibrating membrane through which the so-called external world flows into you and through you. So that you yourself actually are not so much an entity that moves around in an environment. You are much more like a whirlpool in a

stream. And, as you know, the whirlpool is constant only in its doing, that is to say in its whirling. And you could recognize individual whirlpools in a stream. But the water is flowing through them all the time. They are never the same but for a second. And so it is also with us. Or imagine it in another way supposing you have a rope and one foot of the rope is made of hemp, one foot of it is made of cotton, one foot of it is made of silk, one foot of it is made of nylon and so on. Now tie a simple knot in the rope. Now move the knot along the rope. And one minute it will be hemp, the next cotton, next silk, next nylon and so on. Same knot. It will be recognizable as a continuing knot, as that knot. The knot in that rope. But the constitution of it will change as it moves. And so our constitution is changing constantly. Imagine for example a university. The student body undergraduate changes every four years. The faculty changes every so often. The buildings keep changing more and more. What constitutes the University of California? It certainly isn't the faculty, it isn't the students, it isn't the governors, it isn't the administration, it isn't the buildings. What is it? Why a doing. A behavior. A university-ing process of study and experiment and so on. So it is exactly the same with you. You flow. You are a process.

But how do we draw the line about this process and its relationship to all other processes? We find that a very difficult thing to do the more you think about it. If you really felt with your whole organism, instead of just with that part of it called conscious attention, you would become aware of this flowing fact. And you would get a very strange feeling which at first might frighten you. It is possible of course to have this feeling. And the feeling is like this: You would not be quite sure how to interpret it. You might feel that you yourself were doing everything else that's happening. That would be one way of feeling. The other way of feeling it would be that you are doing nothing at all. But that everything else is doing you. And you would feel completely passive like a puppet on the end of strings. Although on the other hand if you got the feeling that you were doing it all you would feel like God Almighty. It is very easy for our consciousness to slip into this state of sensation. It can happen spontaneously, like measles. It can happen by training. As when someone practices yoga. It can happen chemically as when certain drugs are taken. And one has to be very careful about this feeling because it's enormously easy to misinterpret. Either as being omnipotent, being God in the personal, literal sense. Or as being helpless

and merely driven. Now what should be understood is that both these ways of feeling are right. Only they must both be taken together. To be simultaneously omnipotent and helpless. These are two poles, opposite poles of one and the same state. Because the message that is coming through, and that we find difficulty in understanding, because it's contrary to our common sense, contrary to our whole history and conditioning, the message that's coming through is: you as a living organism and all that is going on in your environment constitute a single process. What in physics we would call a unified field. A single process like a pattern but you know any pattern has all sorts of subsidiary wiggles in it. Like the organism itself is a unified pattern but it's full of wiggles. All sorts of tubes and organs and bones and nerves and so on. Working in this way. You know the body doesn't have a boss. We could pitch a big argument. Who is really the top dog in your body, your stomach or your brain? I can argue for both ways. Let's first argue for the stomach. The stomach is fundamental. That's what eats and eating is the fundamental thing of being alive. By putting food into the stomach it digests it and from there it goes out and energizes everything else. Obviously the stomach is the most important. The hands, the mouth, the feet all exist to serve the stomach and naturally as a final achievement of the stomach is the brain. Evolving later in the evolutionary process as a gadget up there to scavenge around and find stuff for the stomach to eat, that's the function the brain. But now let's take the argument to the side of the brain. The brain says: "Oh no no. I'm not. Just because I arrived late doesn't mean that I'm unimportant. I was being gotten ready for. Because I am the thing that is the flower at the top of this thing. And this tube with stomachs in it and things below was preparing for me and the stomach is my servant. It is doing all the dirty work and getting energy to put currents through my wonderful circuits. So that by the creation of all the goods of the mind of the Arts and Sciences and religion and philosophy and so on I shall be the true head of man. Well both arguments are right. Because you have a relationship between stomach and brain, which is a sort of polarity. The one exists for the other. It's like when you prop up two sticks against each other they will stand up so long as they lean on each other. Take one away and the other collapses. So chop off the head and the stomach is finished. Take out the stomach and the head is finished. So this is the way all organic life proceeds. It's different with mechanical life. Because the mechanism must invariably have a boss. The man who puts the machine

together, the person who constructs the computer, who designs it, who asks it questions, who programs it. He is the boss. But organisms don't have bosses. They are essentially, I would say, democratic arrangements. Where, somehow, in a marvelous way, an enormous company of cells are working together. But that isn't the way, the body wasn't sort of: one day a lot of cells all crept together and said: We are a body. That does sometimes happen in the biological domain, but much rather this: when you watch the gestation of a mammal, you see first of all a very simple little organism. Which swells. And as it swells, it becomes more and more complicated from within. No parts are added, nothing is screwed on, there's no welding done or anything like that. It bulges and of course it does absorb material, but it transforms it. But all of it works together at once like the legs of a centipede. Like you work all together at once. For, you see, when we come down to it, you think you decide things, but you don't know how you do it.

How do you open and close your hand? And you can decide I will now open my hand and do it, but you don't know how it's done. And yet in a sense you do know how it's done because you say I know how to open my hand. But you don't know in words. You can't explain it. Still less can you explain how you see, still less can you explain how you are conscious. How are you an ego? Well you don't know because the springs of being conscious, of being an ego are outside the surveillance of consciousness. They're somehow underneath. And that lets the cat out of the bag at once, because you see that what is I is something very very much deeper than the superficial consciousness. And what you call I in the sense of the voluntary willing center, ego, has very little to do with it. You are just a watchman on top of the mast or a radar on a ship that is scanning the environment by conscious attention looking out for trouble. Or looking for food. The real you is much too complicated to think about. Supposing when you woke up in the morning, you had to switch yourself on. That is to say, you had to, by an act of conscious attention, to go through your brain and turn on all the synapses necessary for wakeful life. It'd take you hours. Supposing you really had to be conscious of all the details involved in walking or in breathing or in circulation of the blood. You'd never get around to it. So you see when we inspect the physical world with conscious attention the first thing that strikes us is that the physical world is extraordinarily complicated. How can it possibly be organized. But actually the physical

world is not complicated at all. What is complicated is the task of trying to describe it in words. Or of trying to figure it out in numbers. Because that is analogous to the task of, say, removing the water from the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic with a beer mug. We can only take one mug at a time. And so we say in popular speech you can only think of one thing at a time. That's not exactly true but what it reveals is that thinking, that conscious thought is a kind of calculus in which we understand things bit by bit. And it leads us into the superstition that things really are bits. Now, when you eat chicken of course you have to bite it. And you take it in bits. And to make it easier to bite you order from the grocer a cut up fryer. But you don't get cut up fryers out of eggs. Because you see although we can speak of A chicken, AN egg, or A body, it is not actually a bit. It hasn't been bitten off except for purposes of thinking. Now.

This is beautifully brought out in a passage from Whitehead, which I will read to you. He is discussing the nineteenth century philosophy of science, which I was just discussing, too. And He's saying in this philosophy: All our impressions of nature are simply products of our minds. Nature gets credit which should in truth be reserved for ourselves. The rose for its sent the nightingale for his song and the sun for his radiance. The poets are entirely mistaken. They should address their lyrics to themselves and should turn them into odes of self congratulation on the excellency of the human mind. Nature is a dull affair. Soundless, scentless, colorless. Merely the hurrying of material, endlessly, meaninglessly. However you disguise it, this is the practical outcome of the characteristic scientific philosophy which closed even the seventeenth century. In the first place we must note its astounding efficiency as a system of concepts for the organization of scientific research. In this respect, it is fully worthy of the genius of the century which produced it. It has held its own as the guiding principle of scientific studies ever since. It is still raining. Every university in the world organizes itself in accordance with it. No alternative system of organizing the pursuit of scientific truth has been suggested. It is not only reigning, but it is without a rival. And yet it is quite unbelievable. This conception of the universe is surely framed in terms of high abstractions and the paradox only arises because we have mistaken our abstractions for concrete realities. He calls that, you see, the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. The attribution, in other words, to our bitty way of thinking to the world which we are biting.

That is misplaced concreteness. The separations between things are abstract. They are concepts. In the same way, for example, as lines of latitude and longitude are concepts. Even though a Russian poet has recently made a beautiful poem about the world being like a ball carried in a net bag. But you never expect to trip over the equator when you cross it. And although it is something quite abstract and does not exist in nature, it's extremely useful for purposes of navigation. So in the same way, bit-ing and having words to describe particular events or particular wiggles in the universal pattern are very useful. But they are very dangerous when you confuse things with natural events. Because then you get into this sort of trouble.

The trouble of the sorcerer. The surgeon who is too much of a specialist in one organ runs into that organ and alters it and does what he considers a better mechanical job than the Lord did. But then he discovers to his dismay and the even greater dismay of his patient that the operation has unforeseen consequences in some other part of the organism. Because he didn't realize the connection. When, likewise, we object to certain insect pests. Oh, we say, get rid of them. D.D.T.. So. Then we found we got rid of something else we didn't want to get rid of. And worse still that this insect that we didn't like was doing a job for us in some manner of which weren't aware and we only become aware of it when suddenly we find ourselves covered with another kind of fly altogether, or with some sort of bacteria which this insect kept down. Watch it, watch it, watch it because nature does not consist of separate things which you can just pull out like parts from an engine. Take the case of bees and flowers. Oh, we always use the bees and flowers to explain fundamental things about life but we're going to go deeper than sex this time. Fascinating thing about bees and flowers is they are very different looking things. A flower sits still and blooms and it smells, or stinks to be correct. The bee moves about and buzzes. But they are all one organism. You don't find flowers without bees, you don't find bees without flowers. They are just as much one as your head and your feet which also look very different. So in that sense you see we are one with the incredible complexity of processes and wiggles upon which we depend. Although to say "upon which we depend" is not quite accurate. Because that separates us from it as if I were hanging onto a beam and depending on it. It isn't like that. You don't depend on it, because it depends on you. It's a

mutual arrangement. And it isn't that one bit of this sort of came first. Although that sometimes happens. But it's always there in potentiality, what came later. But it's rather in the same way that, when a flower opens, you see all the different petals extending simultaneously. Especially when you watch a fast motion movie of a flower opening. And so in the same way there is a simultaneous arrival, or evolution, of the human organism and the human environment and thus biologists speak about the evolution of an environment as well as the evolution of an organism in it. In other words, human beings could not have appeared on this planet until its temperature had lowered to a certain degree, until the atmosphere contained certain gases as a result of vegetative development. And then the environment became evolved enough for human beings to appear in it. Evolved enough? I'll say if something further: intelligent enough for the appearance in it of intelligent beings. For your environment is intelligent. Otherwise you couldn't be. You see, as Jesus said, you don't gather figs off thistles or grapes from thorns. You won't get pears off an apple tree. So you won't find people except on a people tree. And this planet, this solar system, this galaxy is people-ing in exactly the same way that an apple tree apples.

Put our existence into verb language, as distinct from noun language, and you're much closer to the point. You see nouns have the difficulty of designating things. Verbs designate process. Now everything is a process, really. When we speak of housing for houses, matting for maps, we're getting there. The Nootka Indians have a language in which there are no nouns. So they say: it houses. And then they add an adverb to show whether it houses religiously, homeily or marketingly. And so they see the world as the flow. What is IT that houses. What is it that rains when we say it is raining. You see we always have a funny idea that to get a verb, that is to say, to get action you have to have an agent. Now this is the most ridiculous idea conceivable. How can a noun start a verb? How can a thing start an event? Because there's no action in a thing. Action can only come from action. Energy from energy. You can't get energy from a concept. Because nouns are all concepts, they're abstract, really. It's only verbs that are concrete. As the world is process. Now, common sense insists that the pattern of the world must be made of something. Because we still think with Aristotle's common sense. Or with the imagery of the Book of Genesis where God made Adam out of the clay. In other words he made a clay

figurine and breathed breath into it and it became alive. And so we constantly think that we are made of flesh as a flesh with some sort of stuff like clay out of which you shape bodies or like you make tables out of wood. Are trees made out of wood? What a ridiculous question. Trees are wood. They're not made of wood. And it is simply this artifact thing that gives us the idea of the well being made out of something. It isn't made out of anything. And so when physics tries to investigate what is the stuff of matter, it can't find any. Because you can never talk about anything except a process. You can describe what a process is doing, you can describe the structure, the nature of the dance, whether it's doing a waltz or a mazurka or the frog or whatever it is. Then you can describe that melody, shall we say, what it is performing. But there is nothing doing the performing at all. There is no stuff out of which it's being done because when you examine stuff you just find more pattern. What you mean by stuff is fuzz. When you look at something with a lens and you're out of focus you see fuzz. But when you come into focus you see structure. Right now the structure is made of all sorts of little lines and things. You can see them and you want to what are they made of. So you turn up the magnification and for a while you get a lot of fuzz but when you're clear again you see that those little lines are also made of more little lines and more structure. Big patterns have little patterns upon the backs to bite them, and so on. And that's the way it goes. So. Suddenly you feel rather insecure because stuff has disappeared there's a famous story about a physicist who understood this so well, but he always went about in the most enormous padded shoes because he was afraid of falling through the floor. Now look what's happened. Just look and see what has happened to us. If we go through everything that I've been saying, we find, first of all, that the thing that we thought was I is nothing more than a social institution. Just like the equator. Or an inch. And to mistake it, to reify it, as Whitehead would say, is the fallacy of misplaced concreteness. It's a strictly a hallucination. And any certain amount of psychological self-exploration shows this to be the case. But what we are is the organism. And what the organism is is a transactional interchange between the organism and the environment. It's not quite correct to say you're doing it and it's doing you because, you see, Whitehead, in describing the scientific philosophy, saying, for example, that blue is entirely our projection on the sky, he's half right, you see. Those scientists he's talking about are half right. But the part of it that is left out of

consideration is this: True, you with your optical nerves and eyes transform the sky into the blue feeling. But without the sky you wouldn't have any optical nerves. It works both ways you see. Without the air whose density gives the blue effect. It's mutual. You do it and it does you. But that's, as I said, a two-way, a clumsy way of talking about: it's all one process, a unified process. And furthermore from this process there has disappeared what we thought was solidity. What we thought was common sense, substance and stuff- it's just pattern. And at once one feels sort of ghostly. As if you could be easily blown away. And that's why the Hindus call the universe the Maya. Which means the illusion. Don't forget illusion is related to the Latin word ludere- to play. So the play. Big act. It also means magic. As in a conjuror's creation of an illusion. It also means creative power. It also means art. Finally it means the divine power. The Maya of the Lord. Lord is a bad translation of Bhagavan. Just the Divine One. Lord means boss and the Hindus don't do it that way. But now you see, having arranged this general introduction, which I'm afraid will be familiar to some of you who've attended my seminars before; but I've arranged this general introduction to raise the question: All right. If that's the way it is. How on earth are we going to arrange a transformation of man's consciousness so that he'll know it. Not just in theory but something he feels in the same way as you feel what you take to be I at the present moment, confronting an external world. How will you transform that sensation? Because if you don't transform that sensation, you are not ever be fit to use technology. We shall continue to use our technology in a hostile spirit towards the external world and we shall wreck the external world. We're busy doing it now. There is no necessity to abandon technology. We can't adapt. But we can certainly use it in a different spirit. I've just been in the island of Ceylon, which is a garden. A beautiful beautiful place. But it's completely undeveloped from a technical point of view and it's in very bad economic circumstances because nobody wants to buy natural rubber anymore. It has no foreign exchange. It is very peaceful. But the change has got to come. So I discussed with one of the high members of the government the possibility that we could set up in Ceylon an experimental station. Which would serve not only India eventually and Africa, but us, too. A an institute of ecological technology. Where we could in that experimental Island work out ways of production, of mechanization, automation and so on which would not ruin the island. And you have to do

that sort of thing with a certain dedication because one of the reasons why we make such a mess with technology. is that the shareholders in any given corporation want to make a fast buck. Now there's nothing wrong, you see, in wanting to be rich. There's nothing at all wrong in being rich, in fact I think the world without rich people would be extraordinarily boring. Point is, you have to understand what riches are. And they are not money. Riches are land, clothes, food, housing, intelligence, energy, skill, iron, forests, gardens- those are riches. But when you're concentrating, you see, only on making the buck. Doesn't occur to you that you're not really getting rich, you're just impoverishing yourself. Like, you know, when you're up up up up up prices, the value of the dollar goes down down down down down. You're just on a rat race, on a treadmill. The faster it moves, it doesn't get anywhere. Well it doesn't even stay in the same place. So it is that kind again, you see, this is another example of confusing the symbol with the reality, the fallacy of misplaced concreteness as Whitehead calls it. So we should devote the rest of the seminar to discussing the various ways in which it is proposed that we bring about or assist the bringing about of that change in our perception and conception of our own existence. So that we can feel ourselves the way we are. As distinct from the way in which we've been told to feel ourselves.

So, this morning was explaining the problem of the relation of the individual to the world, discussing it very largely in the terms of twentieth century science. And showing that there was a wide discrepancy between the organism-environment relationship as described in science and the subjective feeling of what it is to be an individual human being. And that the ordinary sensation we have of being an individual ego, confronting an alien and external world is a hallucination. And a dangerous hallucination because it leads to our using technology in a way that is antagonistic to the outside world and results in our destroying the very features of the world upon which we depend for our lives. We are polluting the world. And so it becomes necessary to find ways in which we can change the basic sensation of existence. And that therefore brings in some rather outlandish subjects. Because there is not within the tradition of Western culture any well known way of doing this. What do we have available? Well we have religion. Which is supposed in some respects to be capable of this. And we have

psychiatry. I don't know what else. Religion in the West is a peculiarly problematic thing. Because it's extremely talkative. It gives us a great deal of advice, many commandments, but it doesn't really tell us how to do what it tells us to do. It has been carefully worked over and statisticians of checked it. That way if you go through the sermon topics throughout the United States, that the vast majority of them are exaltations to goodness. That is to say, they are sermons about moral behavior. Usually within a rather restricted sphere of moral behavior. When we say of a certain person that he is living in sin, what do we mean by that? We would very rarely say of a crooked bookie that he is living in sin. You are much more liable to say it of somebody who's got an irregular sexual relationship. Well the fact of the matter is that, with some exceptions, the Christian churches and the Jewish synagogues are family and sexual regulation societies. And precious little else. We used to have, when I was school, a preacher who, came I don't know who he was aware he came from, but he came once a year. And he always preached a sermon, which had in it the refrain: "drink gambling and immorality!" Immorality only meant one thing. So. But the point is that the emphasis of preaching... Protestants, you see, when they go to church, mostly go to a preaching session. Catholics receive sacraments, Protestants do occasionally. But Catholics, when you get through the sacrament and you listen to what the priest has to say, he's usually raising money. And, you know, or saying something like: "This year it'll be a mortal sin not to send your child to church school." Things of this kind. So everybody knows that they ought to be good and unselfish and so on. We all recognize that as a highly reasonable idea, but nobody feels like it. Because if you feel that you are a separate ego, it must necessarily follow that your conduct is egocentric. And egotistic. There's no other way about it. If you feel that you don't love someone then no amount of pretense can make you love them. You cannot possibly love anyone out of a sense of duty. And if you do: Watch out! You'll start hating them. They'll start hating you in a secret and concealed way.

The relationships between husbands and wives and parents and children are absolutely haunted with fake love. It stirs up resentment and it leads people to expect things of you which you're never going to come through with. If I say, out of feeling, that I really have a solemn duty to love so-and- so and therefore, in the attempt to trap myself into the fulfillment of this duty, I

make rash promises, and I'm not going to fulfill them and the person is going to be terribly let down when I don't. So it's as if anything is a sin, it is emotional dishonesty. Saying I love you when I don't. Well of course your mother always told you: we all have to do certain things we don't feel like doing. Maybe. But let's make no bones about it. When somebody says to me: would you like to go out and to the market and bring it back so-and-so, I will answer: No I wouldn't but I will. And we need that sort of exchange between each other. Because we put children in awful positions with faking up their feelings for them by telling a child who simply enraged and mad that he's tired. Of by saying, you know, "what nice boy would like to clean the blackboard?" All this sort of thing you see leads to emotional dishonesty. So the problem then is this. That, when people preach moral behavior, and then out of a sense of guilt or out of a sense of fear, people try to be good, that is to say to do those things that are preached, all it does is it turns them into hypocrites. Preaching is a hypocrisy creating institution in that sense because it does not transform the consciousness of the individual. If, by any chance, consciousness could be so transformed that one is no longer felt as a separate ego, then you would not have to be so egotistic. If there is a way, in other words, of generating love within human beings as a kind of constant attitude to the environment, that is going to be far more effective in bringing about unselfish behavior than anything else. That's our problem, you see, to do just that. And no amount of talk is going to do it. Because it depends on something more happening than merely understanding words. Or even seeing the theoretical reasonableness of certain lines of conduct. We need a bomb under us, rather than intellectual persuasion. But church religion as we know it in the West doesn't provide the bomb. It's very demure, decorous. Except a negro revivals. Or Pentecostal outbursts. But no person of education and taste would attend such things. Bishop Pike was telling me the other day a very funny story which was that he's run into an awful lot of trouble with the trustees when he was bishop of California because he espoused some rather controversial causes and they began cutting down their contributions to the cathedral. But then they started to realize that if they did that have nowhere for their daughters to be married. Because they couldn't possibly go to the Methodist Church or the Pentecostal church. Because that with unbelievably low class. She either has to go to the Episcopal or the Presbyterian Church. Or you might be a Roman Catholic, which is the sort of a different thing, it's sort of

an Italian church. Or go to the synagogue. But the problem, you see, is therefore: Our churches are awfully nice and demure, but they're talking shops. So much so that when in any ordinary church service there's a moment of silence, it's invariably an awkward silence, unless it's a Quaker meeting. And so what happens is organists have a technique of what they call inkling. They improvise on the theme of the last hymn that was sung while there's a silence in which the Minister has forgotten his notes or there was some hitch in the ritual. And also, you see, when you look at the design of a church. It's perfectly clear that a Protestant church is a courtroom. It has in it boxes that are like witness boxes and jury boxes, pews, and the minister wears the same robe as a judge. Exactly the same robe. And everybody goes there and they look at the back of each other's necks and they smell of mothballs. Well that's no scene for anything to happen. You know, we're just not with it.

So it is a result of this sort of spiritual starvation, that enormous numbers of people, and now phenomenal numbers of young people, have become interested in having a religious expression of some completely different kind. But why is it that things that we have had that were in their own way exuberant, like holy rollers and Moral Re-armament, Foursquare gospel, Salvation Army hymn sings. All that seems awfully irrelevant, especially to the young of today. Why is it that, if you go to most people who have had a college education and say to them: Have you made Jesus Christ your personal savior? That they cringe. That that's somehow like making an indecent remark. Has the same sort of ill effect. Why is it that such phrases as "our heavenly Father", "our Lord Jesus Christ", "our very dear Lord", all these expressions give people the heebie-jeebies. Why does that happen? What does it do? I'm an experience one, I know all about it. I was a university chaplain. And I know all the problems in trying to communicate with intelligent college people. And more and more of us are just that. Face it, the university is turning out thousands and thousands and thousands of children. It's getting worse all the time. Well, go to Japan. And you'll find that the young Japanese have just the same feelings about Buddhism. You ask a young Japanese today: What's your religion? And he will say: my parents are Bhuddists. Or even: My parents are Christian. He has none. Because to him, the activity of religion is completely meaningless. And he knows nothing about it at all. The average young Japanese today knows less

about Buddhism than a young American knows about Christianity. To them it's just mumbo jumbo. It's an old fuddy duddy priest who their parents get together with under the superstition that if they pay the priest to recite a Sutra, something nice will happen to a dead ancestor. And the Priest will go: yoooyoooyoooyooo- Nobody knows what it means and that's it so far as the young are concerned. They see no glamour in it such as we see. Because to us, mysterious priests chanting in incense filled temples with dimly lit idols and things glimmering there, and all their robes and smell of the incense suggests magic and mystery and something way way out. Well now, a lot of people would say, well that's a lot of nonsense. That's just romanticism, that's just being beguiled by a dream about another culture that doesn't exist. But that's not altogether true. Because different cultures have always borrowed from each other. Always. There is no such thing as a sort of a simon-pure culture unless a people lived in total geographical isolation for several centuries. The Chinese borrowed from the Indians, the Japanese borrowed from the Chinese. The French borrowed from the Romans, the British and the Russians and everybody else borrowed from the French, and so it goes all the way around. Because we are always fascinated by the exotic. And the reason is that the exotics way of doing something shows us another approach to it than we had hitherto imagined. Just as in reverse. When we see Christianity as a Hindu sees it or as a Japanese like Kagawa sees it, we get rather a shock: There's a new way of looking at it. To locate the position of any object, you triangulate it. You look at it from two positions. And therefore, this triangulation in religion is a very good idea. Because the unfamiliarity of the other point of view will somehow revive things you never saw on your own.

But there's another thing to this that's tremendously important. Rather difficult to explain. One of the things that is oppressive about our own standard brand religions is their lack of humor. And also, I would say, their lack of a kind of glee. And glee and humor have to go together. Because you can get religious glee in a big hymn sing, you know, but it's often without humor. To understand a religion really well, you must be able to make jokes about it. And this is a kind of criterion which distinguishes the men from the boys. If you cannot joke about your own religion, you're very insecure in it. But what religions joke about themselves? Occasionally, a Catholic like G.K. Chesterton will be very funny indeed about Catholicism,

but this is quite rare. Hindus very rarely joke about Hinduism. The people who do joke about their religion are from China. And they are Taoists and Zen Buddhists. If you want to get the original joke book on religion, it is by a certain man by the name of Zhuangzi, or Zhuang Zhou. Who wrote probably about 350 A.D. in the tradition of Lao-Tze and the Tao Te Ching. Zhuangzi elaborated the doctrine, but his whole work is full of the most marvelous anecdotes in which one of his pedagogical devices is to make caricatures of his own point of view. For example he has a great deal to say about the value of the useless. That everybody who is aspiring to be useful will probably get eaten up. Because, after all, it's the healthy pigs that we take for food. So he has a parable about an exceedingly deformed hunchback. And he says this man was really skillful in his life because whenever the conscript officers came around they rejected him immediately but whenever the social service workers came around he was the first to get a hand out of food. And he describes a colossal tree that some travelers came across on a journey. And they said that must be the most remarkable tree and they went up to it and they found that its wood was all full of pith. And that the branches wouldn't even do for bean poles because they were all scraggly. That the leaves were rough and inedible and that the fruit was exceedingly bitter. So nobody wanted to eat this tree, as a result of which it grew with enormous size. And then he gave such illustrations as this: When a drunken man falls out of a cart, though he may suffer he does not die. Because his spirit is in a condition of security and he does not suffer from contact with objective existences. If such security may be obtained from wine how much more from the Tao, from being, you know, with it. He means this kind of relaxed, going-along with the course of nature. But you see, he exaggerates all the time. He makes these impossible illustrations. And there is always a very gentle humor in this. Now, you see, Zen comes from China and it is the result of a fusion of Buddhism without Taoism. Indian Buddhism arriving in China in this kind of style, oh, a little after 400 A.D., and then picking up a Taoist atmosphere. So. Humor, of course, is essentially laughter at oneself. Humor is really not taking yourself seriously. And therefore, naturally, as your religion is something very close to your heart, you mustn't take your religion seriously either. And so the zen masters have invariably depicted themselves in a humorous way. When you look at the drawings they did of themselves and even of Buddha they're all oafs and clowns and balloons. You know that marvelous character Hotei

who is the fat Buddha. He's not exactly- he shouldn't be called the fat Buddah. He's really a Zen tramp. With this terrific belly. And he carries around a big bag, and that bag is full of trash. It's all odds and ends which nobody else thought were important. But Hotei is like a child, he has no prejudice about things and anything might be important. And so he picks up old rags, bottles, bottle tops, discarded notebooks, all kinds of fascinating things. Don't you remember, as a child, how fascinating they were? And he puts them in this bag and it gives them away to children. And he is regarded with great respect in Zen. But he's not taken seriously. Now what do I mean? There is a difference between being serious and being sincere. And G.K. Chesterton, to go back to him, once said that in frivolity there is a lightness which can rise. But in seriousness is a gravity that falls, like a stone. And thus the angels fly because they take themselves lightly. So this is true of the of the Zen people. They take themselves lightly.

They say for example, of the teachings of Buddha: All the troubles in this world started when old golden face stuck out is three inches of iron. That means his tongue. Old golden face is Buddha. And of course, when you see Buddhist images of Buddha, they're gold, so old golden face. And if he has a tongue, it's an iron tongue. As if to say, Buddhism, the doctrine, this method- isn't serious. As a matter of fact, why do the troubles begin when the teaching begins? Why, for the simple reason, that, when you attempt to get yourself out of the difficulties caused by your own ego, you're on the wrong track. As we say: "anyone who goes to a psychiatrist ought to have his head examined."- and you see the many levels of meaning in that statement.- So they would say that the study of Zen is like putting legs on a snake. Or a beard on a eunuch. It is somehow, well we would say: "gilding the lily", is doing something unnecessary and by doing it making a mess of everything. Because, you know, lilies are not very happy when gilded. Snakes find legs inconvenient. So this is the the humor in the whole thing. That, when you catch yourself doing something such as looking all over the house for the spectacles you're wearing, there's nothing, when you find out what you done, but to laugh. And so in the same way when you are trying to get liberated, get yourself liberated from an ego which never existed in the first place. When you discover that that's the case, there's nothing for you to do but laugh at yourself. And the whole of Zen is based on this. Zen, you see, traps you, cunningly enough, into going through a great discipline.

And boy, it's not a case of somebody coming out and telling you: you come here and this discipline is good for you and you better crowd in around here and I'll take it. No, if you apply for admission to Zen school you'll get thrown out immediately. They don't want you. So you have to force your way in. You really have to lay your head on the block and say: I am in trouble. I firmly desire, I sincerely intend, I will curse and swear that I do indeed want to become a Buddha before anything else in the world. And unless you make that much fuss about it they will not let you in. And then what they do is, they fix you up with the funniest problems. There are two that I might illustrate this with. One is that you have to show the teacher who you really are. Not who you have been brought up to be. But who you are originally, before your father and mother conceived you. That is to say you must perform a completely sincere and spontaneous act. Or they will ask you to hear the sound of one hand. You know there's a Chinese proverb which says one hand doesn't make a clap. So what is the sound of one. You know those rascals, what they get away with. It but they get away with it, you see, just as long as a someone ready to be fooled. Just so long as you will allow yourself to be put down into pretending that you're just poor little me and that you're this little separate ego, that has all these problems and is disconnected and it isn't, after all, the whole universe. And as long as you feel in that way, some smart old Master can put you down and can trap you up by persuading you in some way or other that you haven't made it. And you've got to make it, you've got to attain that thing, you see? That's your egotism. So, they go through all this and it's just like someone being put in a squirrel cage. Or set to chasing his own tail. Or trying to catch his own shadow. But under the supervision of a teacher who knows just exactly what's going on. The teacher himself has been through it. And he's not like the other kind of teacher who is still a student and who is urging his students to keep on the rat race because he's still on it. Finally, it dawns. You see, when you when you persistently do something absurd, eventually you will have to see it. As Blake says: a fool who persists in his folly will become wise. But if you're really consistent about it, if you really go for that foolishness, then you will suddenly realize that you have made yourself absolutely absurd. Then there is nothing to do but laugh. And as for the teacher who traps you into this- you are very very grateful to him, but you see that after all he is a big hoax. Because here he is in his robes and in his dignity and he is just an old rice bag who tricked you into this. As Rinzai

himself put it, one of the great Chinese masters, it is like using a closed fist to deceive a child. His method of teaching is like that, you know, when you got a child and you got a closed fist, and you say: "What have I got here?" And the child's full of excitement, says: "Show me!" And you say: "Uh-uh, you gotta guess. What have I got here?". "Show me!" The child tries to pry our hand open and you hide it in every way in the child gets more and more fascinated and finally in the end: phuit. Nothing. Well it's all like that. Because, you see, taken another way: what are you holding on to? What are you protecting? What are you anxious about? What is it that you don't want to lose? And you discover eventually, that all you're defending is defensiveness. You know, you started defending something, you build up a wall, then you got worried about whether the wall would stand up so you build another wall around it. You build another one around that and really it's a sort of onion system in which there's no center. So we are defending our defenses. And when that is exposed and that's, you see, all you're doing, and there wasn't anything to defend in the first place, nor was there anything to be attained that you didn't already have. But you can't find this out by being told because you wouldn't believe it. You can only find it out by carrying your supposed predicament to its logical conclusion. So then, we take the ego. Now, how on earth are we to show that the ego is an abstraction to someone who firmly believes that that's himself. Well the only thing to do is to challenge it. So when the problem is put before a Zen novice: be sincere, show me your true self. He works like anything at it. But the circumstances under which this occurs are such as to make it practically impossible for him to do it. If you understand this, supposing you'll go and confront the teacher. And you go through some kind of formal salutation like a ritual and then at a certain minute you have to do something completely spontaneous and unpremeditated. How can you do that because here is the teacher sitting looking at you like this. Waiting for you to do it. Show me you. And he's looking right at you. And you think, Uh-oh, he sees right through me. And any kind of little guilt you have or any kind of thing like that, you feel that he's looking right at it. And just like a very skillful swordsman, if you think before you thrust he's caught you, because he's caught you thinking. You have to thrust before you think. Then you won't,- then you'll surprise it. But the moment is a little waiver of a, of intention, before the act- it's too late. He's read it, read your mind. So you mustn't have any thoughts and then he won't read your mind. It's like

when you want to go on the wagon. For goodness sake don't make a resolution. "I'm going on the wagon this year." Because then you published to the devil your intention. Never let him know. See? The same way if you're Lao-Tsi this is a story that Zhuangzi invented and has a certain typical humor to it. Lao-Tsi is supposed to have had a discussion with Confucius on the nature of love and benevolence. And when Confucius has given forth several pompositives as about this, Lao-Tsi is alleged to have said to him: What stuff! Surely your getting rid of self is a positive manifestation of self. You are like people beating drums in search of a fugitive. Or we would say, the police driving off to raid a night club with their sirens on. That announces that they're coming. So in order to surprise yourself you mustn't know what you're going to do. Now how can you do that is the paradox which the Hindus express by saying "if you think of a monkey while you're taking medicine the medicine won't work, therefore try not to think of a monkey while taking medicine".

So. How are you going to surprise yourself? See, we got back to that thing we were talking about this morning, that button with the word surprise on it. And if you're God, you know what the surprise is, how can you not? The problem for God, as well as for us: How do you surprise yourself? Because that's what you've got to do. If you're going to be spontaneous, you see, your action has to be a surprise to you, like having hiccups. But how are you going to arrange for yourself to do something surprising? So you really work at that. And you work and you work and you work and the teacher rejects all your efforts. Even some of your fairly good efforts get rejected. Because he's building up with you a fabulous frustration. He's making you feel that this task is like looking for a needle in a haystack. To discourage you in every possible way. And yet, at the same time, lead you on by saying, "Well you've got to work at it. In the past there were all those famous students who went before and they sweated blood to find this out. They were ready to give their lives to hear the sound of one hand. You can't expect to get anywhere near them unless you redouble your efforts." You see this is the come on. The sales pitch. Though finally you get to a point where you understand and see perfectly clearly that there's nothing you can do about it. Nothing at all. But there, where are you? Because as if there's nothing you can do about it, then nothing's going to happen. You mean you're going to sit around and wait for the grace of God? Maybe it will get

you one day and you say, well I'll just go along and do my daily work. It's nothing I can do. And if you indicate to the teacher that that is your attitude, he's got another curve to throw at you. Which is that this giving up is still a contrivance. You're still doing something. So there's nothing in it- so far as the transformation of the ego is concerned, there is nothing you can do about it. Also there's nothing you cannot do about it. You find you cannot abandon this quest once it's excited you and just go off and be an ordinary Philistine type person. Because if you do that, that too will be phony. So you're left in this frantic dilemma: there's nothing I can do and there's nothing I cannot do. But you see, you eventually get to the meaning of that situation: What does it mean that I'm in this situation? It means that the I, which I thought I was, since it can neither do anything nor not do anything, then it doesn't exist. You realize it for the abstraction that it is. That's the practical experiment. It's very frustrating. And why is it frustrating? You made it frustrating by swallowing the teacher's advice, which he knew you would fall for. And you were trying to do what the preachers tell you. To make yourself unselfish by either an active course or a passive course, and neither of them work because they're both redundant. There is no real self, no real ego. And then of course, when that's found out, everybody has a good laugh. So that is a kind of a spirit in spirituality and religion which is really rather rare. So. I think this is the feature of Zen which is attractive to most Westerners. On the one hand, it's extreme directness. And on the other, it's human. So it's very difficult, although a few people have achieved it, to be Zen and to be stuffy. Because it is essentially an un-stuffing process. A way of getting rid of. I think we have in our contemporary American slang some very wonderful words, such as hang up. Almost exact translation of what Buddhist mean by a Klesha, or worldly attachment. See when you talk about worldly attachments to Christians, they think it means enjoying your food and liking sex and having a beautiful car or something like that. That's what they call worldly attachments. Now in Buddhism all those things could be worldly attachments, or Klesha, but aren't necessarily so. It depends if you're hung up on it. And to be hung up means to be in a dither. In a state where you hesitate, not knowing should I go this way or that way. See that's a hang up. And so, the the tactics of a Zen teacher are to put all his students constantly into hang-up situations. To challenge them by such a procedure as this: you're in a conversation, you've just been introduced to the teacher and he says, "how you do? Where have you come

from?” “Oh, I came from Tokyo.”, “And where did you go to school?”, “Well I was at the University of Tokyo for a while.”, “Why is my hand so much like the Buddha’s hand?” Dead silence. See, he suddenly slips into this question, which nonpluses the student. Now the art of nonplusing is part of the whole technique of the teacher. And your problem is to get out of being non-plussed. And to be able to do that, you have to be able to act without ego. That is to say, without choice, without deliberation. How to act without deliberation is to all right-thinking people a very foolish thing to do. We say “look before you leap”, but we also say “he who hesitates is lost”. Now you see, what we’re getting down to here, really seriously, is that the Zen method is a way of teaching people to get with themselves in the larger sense of self and the ego. That is, shall I say, to have faith in yourself in that larger sense. If your brain and your nervous system is a most fabulous computer, which you had no hand whatever in constructing from the standpoint of conscious ego, but it is you- you should certainly learn to trust it. But we were all brought up not to trust yourself. And therefore, for us, brought up in that way, it’s a very dangerous thing to trust yourself to rashly. And therefore, to learn how to do it, we have to learn in protected circumstances. So the Zen school provides protected circumstances in which we can behave in unexpected ways, or we can try out a spontaneous behavior. Everybody around there understands that some very odd things may happen, but just because this is understood, there’s no problem about them. So. All those Zen stories that we read and laugh over, because they seem so idiotic, are stories in which the teacher hangs up the student and the student does or doesn’t get out of the hang up. If you can come on with that sort of instant but not hurried response to the challenge, that means his psychic energy is flowing unobstructedly. The whirlpool is just working beautifully and the energy is just flowing right through it. But on the other hand, if he’s hung up it means he’s in a state of insecurity. He’s afraid that if he doesn’t choose the right response to the situation, he may be in serious danger. Danger, maybe, of disapproval by the teacher or of actually risking his life in some way, or, you know as they say, “saying the wrong thing”. But the secret is, of course, to respond instantly in some way. If he says, why is my hand so much like the Buddha’s hand, you might slap it. Or you might just shake hands with it. Or you might put a penny in this palm. Or you might spit on it. Or you might kiss it. But immediately. That’s the answer. Now sometimes he will feel that

you're not really skillful at this, that your spontaneous answer is inappropriate. Or that it's a contrived spontaneous answer. You get to the point where you can detect the spirit in which it's done very easily, all sorts of cues give it to you. And therefore he rejects it. Try again. Because you cannot give that sort of answer until you come to the point that you get to when you learn to ride a bicycle. You remember when you try to learn to ride a bicycle you get to the point where you know that you're going to be the one damn stupid child who will never learn to ride a bicycle. And at that minute, suddenly, you find: It's doing it. It was the same with learning to swim. All those knacks are just like the study of Zen. So you will, in the study of Zen, get to the point where you know you're going to get one eternally stupid student who never never will get through that Koan. That's a Zen problem, in Japanese, Koan. Like, "What is the sound of one hand?", that's a Koan. And out of that intense frustration there occurs the transforming experience, because it is that intense frustration that reveals to you in an undeniable, immediate, sensuous way, the frustration of discovering that what you thought you were all along isn't really there at all. Do you remember that I described that state in which you discover that your actions are the actions of the environment, and what the environment is doing is what you are doing, and that both of these are true because it's all one process? And when you're so used to thinking about it the other way, and you get into a feeling of it being that way- it's frustrating. It's like the experience of talking into a microphone and then hearing your own voice a split second later. And you start doing this and this thing starts talking and then suddenly you find yourself waiting for it to go on. Very frustrating. But of course, it's you who's got to go on talking. It won't do, it won't work without you doing it. Although it sounds like it's coming from somewhere else. Well it's just like that, this feeling I'm describing. So you think. This is why a lot of people get into trouble with psychedelic chemicals. They get into this state. And when they suddenly find that it's all one process they begin to worry- now who's responsible? Am I responsible for my acts? But I'm not doing them. Is It responsible, so that I can say "well it wasn't my fault."? And then you suddenly see that you can't divide it from you. But since you don't feel in the ordinary old way, you feel that "How do I know that I'll still speak the English language or will remember how to do it ten seconds from now?" Because if it all depends on something that's not on the my control, I don't know that it will remember English. Or

might I commit a murder? Supposing I suddenly commit a murder. How can I trust myself not to commit a murder? Because there's no one in charge. But you find that it's really perfectly easy to go ahead and remember what English is and to act in an absolutely civilized way. But when people don't see that, they get panicky. And panic in this state just builds up and builds up and builds up and builds up into the most appalling vicious circles. But, on the other hand, if you get into this new situation and just go ahead, you find it works beautifully. And that is why the Zen poet speaks of drawing water and carrying fuel as a miraculous activity. "I walk on foot and yet I'm riding on the back of an Ox. Empty handed and yet a spade is in my hand. When I cross the bridge, the bridge flows and the waters still." That's the feeling. See: "Empty handed I go, and yet a spade is in my hand." How would you know your hand was empty unless you've seen it with a spade in it? If you've always seen a spade in a hand, you would think the spade was an extension of the hand like a finger. So in order to know what empty-handedness means, you must know what full-handedness means. Therefore the spade in the hand makes possible the realisation of an empty hand, and vice versa. So in the same way the Realization of something other makes possible the realisation of what you call you. So you can't know what you mean by you unless that is the experience of the other. Then you suddenly see, therefore, self and other and all that that implies, what you will and what you don't will, what you want and what you don't want- these are all going together. Like this. So it's like when you're driving a car. When you move the steering wheel are you pushing it or pulling it? Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth. You are, of course, pull-pushing it. So the same thing happens in this state of consciousness. What you ordinarily felt was pushing the world around, was it pulling you. What you ordinary felt as though the world pushing you around, is you pulling it. Only you always suppress one side of the awareness. So. Zen practice leads to bringing about that awareness of polarity between the organism in the environment. But getting around the problem, the false problem of "how do I get rid of myself?" "How do I transform myself?", when the I which I believe myself to be has no part of transform anything because it's a social convention and an abstraction. Let me start by a little bit of backtracking and revision, which I shall do with the help of A.N. Whitehead. I've been talking about the situation of man, of the individual, in the world of nature, and the complexity

introduced into this by technology, and further troubled by the way in which individuals generally experience themselves as confronting an alien universe. A form of experiencing our existence which is in flat contradiction to the scientific description of man as an organism-environment rather than an organism IN an environment. Whitehead puts it in this way: "The doctrine which I am maintaining is that the whole concept of materialism only applies to very abstract entities. The products of logical discernment. The concrete, enduring entities are organisms. So that the plan of the whole influences the very characters of the various subordinate organisms which enter into it. In the case of an animal, the mental states enter into the plan of the total organism and thus modify the plans of the successive subordinate organisms until the ultimate smallest organisms, such as electrons, are reached. Thus an electron within a living body is different from an electron outside it by reason of the plan of the body. The electron blindly runs either within or without the body. But it runs within the body in accordance with its character within the body. That is to say in accordance with the general plan of the body, and this plan includes the mental state. But the principle of modification is perfectly general throughout nature and represents no property peculiar to living bodies. In subsequent lectures it will be explained that this doctrine involves the abandonment of the traditional scientific materialism. And the substitution of an alternative doctrine of organism." In this passage, he is stating in another way what he calls "the fallacy of misplaced concreteness". That is to say, of attributing physical reality to the abstractions in terms of which we describe the natural world. Such as things which are, as I showed you, units of thought. THINKS, as inches, for example, are units of measurement. And through the confusion of the, as Korzybski would have said, "the map with the territory". Or, as it Wittgenstein would have said, the network with the world which we try to catch with the network. You see, in a certain sense, we throw networks over everything. Just as we throw the lines of latitude and longitude over the surface of the globe in imagination, just as we have celestial latitude and longitude, an imaginary net which we cast over the stars and discuss all the features of the physical world in terms of their positions within the network, which are easily measurable as was as if we had, for example, graph paper printed on cellophane. So, in doing this we tend increasingly to confuse the structure of the net with the structure of the world that the net is used to measure. And it is as a result of that, that

we are, as it were, hypnotized by the abstract sense of individuality, or rather the abstract definition of individuality. And are less and less aware of what it is to be an individual concretely. And so, in this sense, he says: My own criticism of our traditional educational methods is that they are far too much occupied with intellectual analysis and with the acquirement of formularised information. What I mean is that we neglect to strengthen the habits of concrete appreciation of the individual facts and their full interplay of emergent values and that we merely emphasise abstract formulations which ignore this aspect of the interplay of diverse values. We are too exclusively bookish in our scholastic routine. The general training should aim at eliciting our concrete apprehensions and should satisfy the itch of youth to be doing something. There should be some analysis even here but only just enough to illustrate the ways of thinking in diverse spheres. In the Garden of Eden, Adam saw all the animals before he named them. In the traditional educational system, children named the animals before they saw them. But when you understand all about the sun and all about the atmosphere and all about the rotation of the Earth, you may still miss the radiance of the sunset. There is no substitute for the direct perception of the concrete achievement of a thing in its actuality. We want concrete fact with a highlight thrown on what is relevant to its preciousness. I don't always approve of Whitehead's style of English, I think it's a little pompous. But it's very well said here. He is saying in a kind of pedantic and academic way what the Zen Buddhists demonstrate. For one of their principles is that when you ask a question about the abstract, that is to say, about philosophy or religion, you get an answer in the concrete. And when you ask a question about the concrete, you get an answer in terms of the abstract. So then, when those old Chinese masters were asked what is the fundamental principle of Buddhism, they would say something like "three pounds of flax". And when working in the fields they were pruning tea bushes and the monk said to the Master, "Will you give me the knife?", the master hands him the knife blade first. He says "Please give me the other end." Question is, what would you do with the other end? And the conversation, as it were, switches in that way. But when he says, in answer to "What is the part fundamental principle of Buddhism?", "Three pounds of flax.", one is not to suppose, as one might if habituated to ordinary philosophical or religious ways of thinking, one must not suppose that this is some kind of symbolism. As if three referred to the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha,

the three treasures of buddhism, or to the three bodies of Buddha, or anything like that. Three pounds of flax is just three pounds of flax. And even that is saying too much. It's very difficult to point, you see, to Reality itself. When you try to get a dog to go and look at something by pointing at it the dog will come to your finger. And will not understand the meaning of pointing. So it is with humans. And if we consider, that various kinds of religion, the teachings of religion, the rights, or the sacraments of religion are fingers pointing, human beings all too readily suck those fingers for comfort, instead of following or looking in the direction of the pointing. So, such stranger answers as three pounds of flax, or whatever it may be, try to jolt us out of our excessive thinking. As Whitehead says, our education is too bookish to come into direct contact with physical, material reality. But of course when I say these words, physical and material, they're abstract. And this isn't abstract. Nor, in that sense, is it material. In so far as material is an abstract idea, it's a concept. This is not a concept.

So, to wake people up, to look at that, requires, among other things, interior silence. Now, I've said some of this to you before, or said it to some of you before, but it cannot be stressed too often: The Chinese sage who was a Taoist, Zhouangzi, said once: "The perfect man employs his mind as a mirror. It grasps nothing. It refuses nothing. It receives but does not keep." And this attitude in Zen Buddhism is called mushin, which in Japanese means "no mind". We would say mindlessness or thoughtlessness. Except that those words in our cultural context have a pejorative sense. To say that someone is thoughtless is to say that he's inconsiderate or moronic. But in the Chinese sense of the term thoughtless, it means having a mirror-like mind. There's a verse which says: "The wild geese do not intend to cast their image. The water has no mind to retain their reflection." The same is sometimes said of the relationship of the moon to the water. Now this "no mind" means, really, mental silence. In the sense that the mind is highly alert and highly aware. But without talking to itself. When it hears whistling, it doesn't think bird. It doesn't think song, it doesn't think music it just thinks— whistling. And so that means the absence of chattering to yourself constantly inside your head. Whether you're doing it in words, whether you're doing it in numbers, or whether you're doing it in abstract images of some other kind. To become still, and to reflect the world as a clear pool reflects the sky. Well why is that important? Well I can give at

least two reasons. One is, that if I am to talk all the time, I will not have anything to talk about except my own verbiage. Because I won't listen to what anybody else has to say. In exactly the same way, if I think all the time, I won't have anything to think about except thoughts. So just as I have to stop talking occasionally to hear what others have to say, so I have to stop thinking occasionally to have something to think about. Otherwise I'm sort of like a bookworm, a person who never gets out of the library, who reads and reads and reads, but has no contact with the life that the books are about. Now, it's very difficult, you see, to have a silent mind, because we are creatures of habit. And we think incessantly. Now the second reason is, that we are very bothered by our thoughts. One reason why Americans in particular don't like to be alone, and like, even if they are alone, they turn on the radio or the television or read a magazine, is that they're disturbed by their thoughts. I'm left alone with my thoughts and I start worrying. Why? Because you live according to a world of conceptions. For example, let's say what we worry about. We worry about the future or we regret things we've done in the past. But the future is not here. And the past has disappeared. The future and the past, as it were, do not belong to the physical world. They are abstractions.

And what we remember of the past is a very attenuated image of it and what we predict for the future is never quite like what happens. In fact it's very unlike it. If I say to someone: "What did you do yesterday?", they say "Oh well I got up in the morning, I had some coffee, I went for a stroll, then I had breakfast and I dressed, then brush my teeth and I went up to the office and I saw Mr So-and-So" and so on, you know. But this is, you see, you're thinking of you of your past day in terms of abstractions which have are like the bones of events and have none of the flesh on them. When you draw an abstract picture of a human body in stick figures, you know, you draw a round blob for the head then arms and legs, but everybody knows at once: that's a human being. Or meant to be, or represents a human being but it's not really very like one. It has none of the color, none of the flesh, none of the beautiful texture of a human organism. So in thinking of our past as these rather attenuated, dried out memories, we always seem to have had a life of deprived richness. And therefore, the more we identify the succession of our days with these abstractions, the more we feel that it was something we're missing. As if you were to make a diet of dollar bills. You

would suffer from malnutrition. And if you were stubbornly convinced that what you needed was more, you would have not only have malnutrition, but serious indigestion. And so, in the same way, if you think that what you need is more time, then you panic about the future. You want more future. And you say of something which is no good, "it has no future". But what you should say is, "it has no present". Because when, you see, you have a silent mind, you are not thinking about the future. You are not thinking about the past. You are experiencing the present in a very complete way. You are not stopping to analyze each detail. You couldn't possibly ever do that. But you are getting all the details without focusing on certain details which exclude your apprehension of the whole. And so you are beginning to live a rich life and a real life that is completely here and now. Now, neither Whitehead certainly, nor I,- I'm taking in this an anti intellectual position- we are saying that if you do not know completely how to live in the present, you have no use for plans for the future. Because you will never be able to enjoy those plans when they mature, because you won't be there. You'll be thinking about some other future. So what's the point? And in the same way there is no purpose in the intellectual life unless you are fully aware of that, which the intellectual life is about. That is to say present, vivid, real life. The intellectual life is a commentary on that, is a way of measuring it, and as all measurements are useful for prediction and for control. That's fine. But don't get so involved in prediction and control that all you're doing is controlling, controlling. You know, like, "Is the meaning of life just to find out what the meaning of life is?" But that's what happens.

And one of the things that is explored in the meditations of the disciplines of Zen people and other types of Eastern philosophy, is the exploration of power. We've been into this a little. Would you really like to control everything, supposing you could. And every wise person of course comes to the conclusion, that that's not what they want. Because if you controlled everything, there would be no surprises. But we are at present, you see, dangerously living into an era of our civilization, in which we are over-controlled. In which, for example, the laws cannot operate because there is too much law. In which you cannot do the simplest thing in the way of an enterprise or of business or of anything, without having a battery of lawyers to tell you whether you may do it and how you may do it and the paperwork that goes with everything you do is absolutely intolerable. Academic

paperwork is overwhelming. And you will notice that the records in a registrar's office are kept in safes, they are so precious. But the books in the library are easily stolen. That the recording of what is done is more important than what is done. It's like some people who don't believe anything happens unless they've got a picture of it. And who obsessively take pictures of everything. We're having a lovely time and somebody comes in beautifully dressed and so on and we say, "oh what a pity no one brought a camera!" And I know the Japanese are obsessed with this because they, you see, they're reacting, they're copying all the terrible features of Western culture. When they go to a great monument, they photograph incessantly. They don't see a thing, except through the the viewfinder of the camera. And this little box is going, grab, grab, grab, grab. Instead of enjoying the gorgeous presence of this temple, this garden, this mountain landscape they're waiting till they get home and go through these measly little reproductions of. I sometimes wonder about this thing. I have myself never never listened to it, but I know other people like to have recordings of these things so that they they miss some point they can catch up with it again. I don't know, I sometimes have nightmares about a world of echoes. In which there are only echoes and echoes of echoes and echoes of echoes of echos. Reverberating forever down the empty corridors of my mind. Now, here comes a problem though. How do you make your mind still? The method in Zen is a method of exasperation. They of course advocate various technical aids to making your mind still, such as the practice of Zazen, which is sitting, usually cross-legged, on cushions in a long hall and counting your breath. So as to eliminate from consciousness any other thoughts than that of the counting of the breath. And this eventually results in a state of stillness. Only that's not enough. Because the skillful teacher feels that this kind of stillness is not yet true stillness. It's forced. And he's trying to get you to a point where it will never be necessary for you to force your mind to be still, but where it can be so quite naturally. And he can only do that by tricks which are called Upaya in Sanskrit, Hoben in Japanese, which means skillful means. In pedagogy, Upaya means the tricks of the teachers trade. How he gets attention, how helps you to understand something. In politics, Upaya means cunning, deceit. Has a sort of a bad meaning in politics. And so the Zen teacher uses all sorts of tricks to get you away from the fallacy of trying to make your mind still by force, which is like trying to smooth rough water with a flat on. All you do is stir it up.

I'm thinking that I'm trying not to think. I'm annoyed with myself because I'm not successful, etc etc. I should be successful. All these are disturbances. All these considerations, they're off the point. But how to get people off them You have to reach a point, in other words, where you learn to leave your mind alone as you leave rough water alone, so that it becomes smooth of itself. But while you conceive your waiting for this to happen, you're still staring it up. You therefore have to get rid of the sensation that there is you, the thinker, watching the thoughts. You, the feeler, separate from and trying to control the feelings. Because so long as that separation exists, you will have trouble. And therefore the function of the koans, the problems, like, what is the sound of one hand?, is to lead you to the natural seeing-through of, the debunking of the concept of the separate thinker and the separate experiencer. So that, when you find out that the thinker on the thoughts are not different, then you will have less and less trouble in allowing the thoughts to become quiet. It's difficult for us to understand this simply because of our language. When we say knowing or thinking, we always feel that this is a function or activity of someone who thinks and knows. That's because we are tied up with this subject-verb-predicate language structure.

Now, the same problem is approached from a somewhat different point of view and with a different style, but essentially the same principles, are being used in the philosophy of Krishnamurti. Only it comes from, it comes in a very different way. Because, although Krishnamurti is an Indian, and thus we would say in the United States, a Hindu, he doesn't present himself as affiliated with any kind of religious or philosophical organization. He comes on simply as Mr Krishnamurti. And he doesn't present any gimmicks, any obvious techniques. Because, according to his view, all these special practices are hindrances. In other words, supposing a group of people take up Zen Buddhism. Before you know where you are, they have become a club, a special in group, and they're the Zen people and they're gonna sell this thing. They're going to say: "You should try our Zen.", you know, you may be a Christian scientist, you may be a Catholic, you may be a Seventh Day Adventist, you may be a Theosophist, and all these ways have something to be said for them, BUT the real thing is our Zazen! And then of course they all start sitting in meditation posture and they put up hanging scrolls and burn incense and have Buddhas and gongs and so on,

and all that can be used. Just as a sort of social or cultural one-up-manship. And this is a very serious obstacle. Now then, Krishnamurti comes on without any bells or robes. He addresses his audience wearing gray flannel pants and a wide open shirt. That's it. And he talks without any spiritual technicalities or even philosophical technicalities. Absolutely dispenses with them. All he really does is ask questions. And therefore he seems to many people as a total debunker who has nothing positive to offer. His approach is invariably one of this: You propose the question. In other words, you asked him to come here. Why? What is it you're looking for? And you ask a question. For example, because, actually, many of his original followers came out of a Theosophical background, they perpetually asked the question like "Is there such a thing as reincarnation?", "Will I, did I have a past life?", "Will I have a future life?" And instead of either saying yes or no, he comes back with "Why do you ask?" "Is there a god?", "Why do you ask?" Go into it, go into the state of mind you have when you voice that question. Why are you voicing it? Well people will defend themselves for a long time when faced with that. They'll say, "Well I'm curious." Or isn't it one's purpose in life to find out these things? He said "What makes you think it's your purpose in life? Does someone tell you so and you believe that? Why do you think that's your purpose in life?" And you have to back off a little bit. Say "Well, I suppose the real reason why I want to know whether there's going to be a future life. is that I'm afraid of death." "Why are you afraid of death?" "Well I don't want to lose my continuity." AH-HA! So that's the reason, is it? You are clinging to yourself. Yea. Well he would say, "How can you possibly understand God or anything of a spiritual nature while you're clinging to yourself? Aren't these two activities mutually exclusive? If you want to know what truth is, you must be open to truth, whatever it is. But if you are, If you say, only that truth will be acceptable to me, which supports my conception of my ego then you are not open." And you say "Yes, I see." But then you say "How can I be open?" He says "Why do you want to be?" See, you're just doing the same old thing again. You ask me how to be unselfish. But what is your reason for only for wanting to be unselfish? You don't want to be unselfish at all. You want to find a new way of getting around it all. Now. In this manner he absolutely exasperates people. Because he'll never agree with anything anybody says. If they formulate it and say "Mr Krishnamurti, is that what you mean?" He says "No no no no! No, no. No, no. No. Now, look, go into

it again. Don't, don't, don't make a formulation," he says, "don't come to a conclusion. Don't want to have a resolution of this. Just be, if you can, open to to what is. To what you actually feel. Now. Don't judge it, don't say it should be, shouldn't be." What is. Say, when you're in a state of grief. What is grief? Now, don't say a word. Don't try to pin it down. Don't give a definition. Just experience whatever you have labeled as grief. I often ask people when they say they're anxious. "Where are you anxious?" And they say "All over." I say, "Come now. How do you know you are anxious? What symptoms are there going on when you that tell you you're anxious?" Then they begin to notice things in this stomach and headachy things, or whatever it may be. And then they come to a more concrete apprehension of the state of affairs that they have labelled anxiety. And in this way, which is really it isn't really very like Zen because it's frustrating, people come to see: there's absolutely nothing they can do at all to stop being selfish.

So they see after a while, that trying to stop being selfish is the same thing as selfishness. Trying to get rid of grief is grief. And so, when you see that, there comes a point at which we could best call giving up. Surrender.

William James pointed this out likewise in a study of the varieties of Religious Experience in the psychology of conversion. There's the point of absolute frustration, followed by surrender. And then, in that moment of surrender when you see you just can't do anything about it, you suddenly have quiet mind. There is no further effort, you see, to say the thinker and the thoughts are one. That's a formulation. The experienter and the experience are one experiencing. You don't need to say that. Because that's not the point. The formulation of it is not the point. It is the actual experiencing itself that is the point. But you can't come to that while you are going over in your mind all this chatter about: I should accept my experience I should not accept my experience etc. As a matter of fact when psychologists sometimes say, you should accept yourself: A lot of people just don't, you know, they're always fighting with themselves, clubbing themselves and their allegedly disciplining themselves. And then they get into a tremendous clutch-ups inside and a psychologist says "Now come, you're human, you should accept yourself,. You shouldn't feel guilty if you get angry, it's very natural to get angry. Accept yourself." So people try to accept themselves. Then they come across the fact that there are certain things they do not and cannot accept. And they have to accept the fact that

they can't accept them. Accept that you don't accept. And then that's the same bind that Buddha put people in when he said "In order not to suffer you must get rid of desire." But then people find out that they desire to get rid of desire. So you see, that saying "Accept yourself" is a gimmick. It's an Upaya. And the object of it is to bring you to the state where you see that the self which does the accepting is the one you need to accept. And in this state where you're confronted with the necessity of looking your own tongue, you suddenly see that what you thought was to be accepted and what was to do the accepting are all one. It's a very awkward feeling at this moment. R.H. Blythe described it beautifully: You're about to swat a fly. But the fly jumped up and sat on the swatter. You were about to punch the world in the nose. And the nose became the same as the fist. And of course in that moment one feels awkward, just as I described in the first talk that the situation of feeling that you in the environment are all one process- at first that is non-classic. You're just not used to feeling that way. Because if the stream of thought, or the stream of experience is the same as the experiencer- who is in control? Well, it controls itself it's what the Chinese call zi-ran- of itself so. Which is their word for nature. And in their organic theory of nature there is no one in control who stands outside and above the organic system itself. The organic consistent it controls itself. It's full of the same sort of balances that any organic system has. Because if it didn't have that it wouldn't be organic it would be merely chaotic. So we get back, you see, to what is fundamental in Chinese far eastern psychology. That any ongoing system must trust itself. And therefore the attitude of these people to human nature is rather different from ours. They would say human nature is basically to be trusted. Not that there's anyone outside it to trust or mistrust it. But they would say if you don't trust your own nature, how can you trust your mistrust? How can you know that even that's reliable? Because that's all part of you.

Now they will say, yes, in the in human nature there are passions. There is greed there is anger, there is an aggressive tendency. But what is good about human nature is it's good and bad. Confucius once said the goody-goodies are the thieves of virtue. And he exalted above mere goodness, in the sense of following a legal righteousness, something called in Chinese ren, which means human heartedness. Being a complete human. Now a complete human is always a little bit of a rascal. Not too much of a rascal. The point

is that you have a little rascality in you like you put salt in the stew. Now you certainly don't want the steel to be all salt. But when it's without salt it's sort of flat. And don't you feel that with very good people, they're awfully dull? You know where there's a certain kind of oppressive goodness about people of a certain kind. I won't make any labels. But when you come into that there's something about it that you know you're sitting on the edge of your chair. Jung once said that he met a man in whom he could find no human failings whatsoever. And he was terribly disturbed because he thought, really, if that's possible I should put my own life in order. But he said "Never again will I be deceived. A few days later I met his wife." Now it wasn't that his wife said "Ha! You think my husband is good. You should see him when no one else is around except me." Oh no, it wasn't that at all. It was the wife was living her husband's shadow. she was living out in her life all the things that he repressed in his. And that can easily happen in a very close human association. She, in other words, was the incarnation of his shadow. We all cast a shadow. And it's better to carry our own than to stick it on someone else. So. In talking to a great Zen master. He once said: "I really have no other ideal than to be a complete human being." And so that means not only flowers on the top, but manure around the roots. The totality. True humility is, after all, the recognition of this situation. And it's only when we get to be proud of our humility, you see, that we are in difficulty. So. I sometimes wonder a little bit with Krishnamurti. Whether he may not be sometimes too earnest. But I realize that that is his public facade. Because of the tremendous earnestness with which he is trying to get his listeners to be fully here and now. And when they escape from the moment either by comments, attempting to get definitions, or even by laughing, he keeps pulling them back to the absolutely immediate experience. Therefore he's really at his best in rather intimate sessions with people. Where he likes to sit around in a ring with people and instead of giving a lecture conduct this dialogue. Back and forth the questions come and then he throws the question back to the questioner. "Why did you ask? Look at it. Are you really listening?" He said most people don't listen. They wait for the speaker to express their own opinion. And when he doesn't, they don't listen. They try to make sense out of the words and I was saying to you earlier on: sometimes it's very important to listen to the sound of the speaker's voice rather than trying to follow the meaning of the words. Indians, American Indians very often do that. They want to know what a

man really is like and what his true character is. They listen to the sound of his voice, no matter what he has to say. You can be off to distracted by what a person has to say, and not see what kind of a villain is coming up against you. So in both these cases in the case of Zen and in the case of the work of Krishnamurti, we have two examples of, we could say, methods in a certain sense or methods of non method, by which we can do something to correct and overcome the divorce of the mind, the human mind from the physical world. But let me repeat: by saying the physical world I'm using a word for want of anything better. Korzybski called it the unspeakable world. It is really rather funny. That is to say the non-verbal world. Which is of course in a profound sense the spiritual world, because it's immaterial. That is to say immaterial in the sense of unmeasured. So these studies, practices, disciplines or whatever you want to call them, that are of very great and special value to a culture as powerful as ours, which is seriously suffering from alienation, splitness, divorce of consciousness from reality.

Well now. The general trend of this seminar has been from the theoretical to the practical. That is to say, I started in the first session talking to you in a very theoretical way about the relation of the individual to the world. And showing how our apprehension of our own existence is, when compared with the scientific description of our relation to nature, really a hallucination. And then the problem is the practical overcoming of this hallucination. And so I've discussed with you two approaches, which are very like each other, to that objective. One, the essential principles of the method of Zen. And the other the essential principles of the method, or the non-method of Krishnamurti. Because coming to the blaze the Institute are these people, Zen people and Krishnamurti. We hope. So but, you know, don't bruted around too much but that's what you're in for. But of course the work there has a particular relevance for students, for young people. And both these approaches, Krishnamurti's approach and the Zen approach, are very proper and appropriate for young people today. One of the most balancing factors in San Francisco life at this time is the existence of a very strong movement for the practice of Zen alongside the whole wide open world of hippiedom. And many, many young people who are what you might call in the general hippie direction and classification, are, as a matter of fact being beguiled by Suzuki Roshi with the Zen Center in San Francisco to go out to Tasajara springs at the end of the Carmel Valley and practice zen meditation. Now, this is a very extraordinary thing. Because the

sessions in Zen meditation out at the end of the valley are tough. And Mr Suzuki stands no nonsense. This is a very, very, I don't quite want to say serious, that's the wrong word because Zen isn't serious. Let's say a very sincere application which requires a great deal of work because you don't only meditate. You have to be responsible for the maintenance of the grounds of the buildings and everything.

So it's a wonderful training school for young people. But they will go for this, in a way that they wouldn't go for discipline under other and more traditional offices. This is something new, this has a new flavor. But this man Suzuki is doing wonders for young people in San Francisco. The difficulty, you see, is with people who get their introduction to mysticism through L.S.D. or marijuana and other chemicals. Is that they get suddenly flipped into a very high states of consciousness with no background, no way to comprehend it, no way to deal with it, no way to bring it down to earth. And therefore, since there are operating in the same area where these things are happening experienced people who have long, long training in knowing how to connect the mystical with the practical, this is a very good influence. And in the same way I would think Krishnamurti has a comparable influence, although he doesn't act as the leader of an ongoing community. As Suzuki does. This is more or less touch and go thing. A few meetings, a few encounters and that's the end of it. It's up to you after that. But both these directions are presenting the problem of self realisation. Are certainly not frivolous. And certainly require a great deal of self-examination. And this is a great problem which faces us now among young people who are in revolt against all sorts of things that in the lives of the fathers and mothers they feel to be false. They are in revolt against what Buddhists call Samsara. Samsara means the wheel of birth and death. But Samsara really is the same thing as squirrel cage, a rat race. Where you are working and working and working. For you really know not what. That process of gaining money or status or whatever it is not really to be enjoyed because one feels a little bit too guilty to enjoy it. But to bring up children, to give them expensive and glorious college education. So that they can bring up their children to do the same things and it just goes on and on and on and on like this and so against this rat race, against the absorption, say, of the of the executive in paperwork and in abstractions. Against the complete dissolution of the family by reason of husband's absorption in business,

wife's absorption in women's club, children's absorptions in a school where they're not cared for by their parents. The revolt against all that sort of thing is going on. But it's just not enough to revolt. It's just not enough to take various drugs which open your mind to new dimensions. It's not enough to challenge everybody's standards in clothing, in housing, in family arrangements and so on. Behind and beyond all that there must be some way out bringing it all to earth, grounding it. As I've intimated already, the fascination of young people today for the mystical and for chemical mysticism is very dangerous. Like every worthwhile enterprise, is dangerous. If they weren't doing that they'd be driving hotrods and perhaps skydiving. Anyway something dangerous. The young always have to be involved in something dangerous. But this adventure of exploration of the inner world is of peculiar danger simply because it goes into that aspect of our being about which we know least, our own inner life, our minds. But it is of the utmost importance that those adventures be accompanied with some kind of discipline. Now, discipline is a dirty word today among young people. When you say discipline it means, you know, don't do it. And so I substitute for the word discipline the word skill. Because there is no pleasure in this world without skill. And skill is an attractive word. Discipline is a push-away word. And, all of you, as I look around to estimate the ages of people in this room, you are all involved with young people. And you must be very conscious, as you all are very conscious, of the strife, the discord, the gap between generations. And so I myself regard my function to be a bridge person. I've worked all my life to be a bridge between east and west. And now is thrown in my lap the job of being a bridge between the young and the old. And so now I'm talking to a relatively older group and I want to say some very serious things to you about how to handle what is happening among young people. Especially since this is under the auspices of the Blaisdell Institute which is concerned with the university and therefore with the education of young people. In relation to everything I've been talking about. Because the young are interested, deeply and seriously interested, in the transformation of consciousness. In breaking out from the narrow situation of the alienated individual against the world. But in doing this, they are showing the usual excesses and imbalances of things that young people always do. They're not experienced, they're not mature. Therefore, just for the very reason that they're not mature, they have the guts, or the foolhardiness if you want to

call it that, to go out on these expeditions. But it was always so. In the six thousand B.C. an Egyptian priest was complaining of the decade and the responsibility and discipline of young. So what to do under these circumstances? You must not give up your own ground in the sense that there is, as I said, a very definite need for a discipline. For something that will act in the same way in as in radio the ground wire acts to the antenna. It's not enough to have a way-out experience and come back and say to your friends: "Man it was a gas." Because it is immemorial wisdom that everybody who takes a journey must bring something back. Because if he doesn't, nobody knows he's taken it. He may have lived. He may just have said that he went to the land of the demons and fought with the dragons and then crossed the perilous bridge and came into the fairy palace to. Bring back a fairy's feather. Proof it. This is not merely to prove it, it is also to do another thing which is the whole work of art. What is art? Art is what Christians call the process of incarnation. The making of the Divine Word into the flesh. The expression, in a material form, of vision. And to do that is very difficult. On one hundred micrograms of L.S.D. you may very well have seen the vision of God in a dirty old ashtray. Can you imagine that that's possible? But it is, because what is an ashtray? An ashtray is the decay of falling apart, the burning away. The turning of alive, more or less alive, or at least moist leaves of tobacco, into dust. And as you begin to think about that from a certain point of view it becomes a parable of the process of existence. What is this turning of everything into dust? At first sight it looks as if it were a kind of a doom. Everything is just going into dust, dust, dust, dust and blowing away. And you realize: that's what you're doing. And by smoking these cigarettes you're slowly committing suicide. Giving yourself lung cancer or something. Then you may remember the words of C.G. Jung, that life is an incurable disease with a very bad prognosis, which lingers on for years and invariably ends with death. Everything you do is bad for you. Like the little boy, four years old, who'd got sunburn and the skin was peeling and he looked in the mirror and said "so young and wearing out already." You know, all energy wears you out. Everything is going into dust. But, as I was suggesting this morning, when you understand that life, that your birth was being kicked off a precipice, and that you're going to ashes. Remember the ceremony in the Catholic Church on Ash Wednesday, and everybody else before the altar and the priest put cigarette ash or rather the burnt palm leaves from previous farm

Sunday on their foreheads and said, "Remember, oh man, the dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return. You remember the poem of G. K. Chesterton about dust? "What a vial of dust, the preacher said, he thought the whole world woke." And he goes on and he talks about everything being a kind of trembling dust. And he ends up by talking of that final day, oh no not the final day the first day, when God was with the angels. When God to all his paladins by his own splendor swore to make a fairer face than heaven from dust and nothing more. So it is to the extent, you see, there's a kind of a paradox in all this, to the extent that you completely accept the dissolution of everything into dust. That by doing that you let go of that clinging to permanence, to yourself, to security, which releases all the energies of life to the degree that you are willing to become dust, to that degree you are alive. And that's how a person could see the vision of God in an ashtray. Now I've spent a few minutes taking some trouble with words to explain the ashtray as a vehicle of the vision of God. Now if you're a painter it's not just enough to take... Let's say you're a sculptor, you're a person who presents objects of art. You can't just get away with putting a nice walnut cube, beautifully polished, filthy ashtray on it, enclose it in glass case, put a label on it and say "beatific vision". That will shock people a little bit. It might give them pause. But if you are really skillful you will understand how to paint an old ashtray, or photograph it, in such a way that people's hearts will stop. Say: Look at that. But to do that it will be necessary for you to show all the individual little pepper and salt patterns in Ash. As a collection of tiny jewels. Which is how you can see them. But you have to represent that and carry it out and bring it through. Just in the same way as the people who painted Persian miniatures, which are painted jewellery, would look at trees and grasses. And rocks. And suddenly show them as full of interior light, enchanted, divine. By a very skilful technique. But you have to have that technique to bring it through. Some form, some possession, some complete mastery of an artistic technique is necessary for the bringing-through of the vision. So then our young people have stumbled on a key to the vision. Psychedelic chemicals and such things. But they will not be able to bring it through unless they also have the skills. And therefore the attitude of the older generation in the situation will naturally be one of great concern and worry as to what this kind of easy mysticism, too easy mysticism shall we say, is going to bring about. All this has become terribly popular for the simple reason that human beings need

religion, are starved for it, and that the churches have not delivered. They have not delivered the experience therefore alternatives are being explored. It is quite natural. But, as I repeat, you are rightly and properly concerned as to what will be the outcome. And the only way to make a good job of it is, instead of saying: suppress the whole thing, which never works anyway. Is to emphasize the point: "All right, all right, you've done this, this is what you've seen, you've had these experiences. But. There is a great deal more to it than that." In my own study of these kind of experiences I could not have really, really enjoyed them unless I had, before that time, been trained in all sorts of ways. Not only to understand the doctrines and the symbolism of religions, mythologies, but also simply to speak and write. Because unless you know the art of language, or you know the art of numbers, or whatever it is whatever is the vehicle through which you express yourself, you can't bring it forth. That one of the great puzzles of life. Consider people who had a great love affair. Dante and Beatrice. Everybody knows about that love affair because Dante could express it so gorgeously. But supposing some people who had a love affair and all the guy could ever say to the girl was Urgh. That. This is a real puzzle because is that guy any less in love with the girl than Dante was with Beatrice? Perhaps it was the same degree of love. But obviously the effect for mankind of Dante's love was far greater than the guy who can only say Urgh. See? They both go into the paradise, they both go into the beatific vision. One brings it back and shares it. And this is the distinction which is made in Buddhism between two kinds of Buddhas. There's the Buddha who attains nirvana for himself, he's called a Pratyekabuddha. And there is the Buddha who crosses and sees Nirvana and comes back to share it with the whole universe, with everybody, with all sentient beings. He is called Bodhisattva. And it so turns out that in the literature of Mahayana Buddhism, Pratyekabuddha is almost a term of abuse, whereas a Bodhisattva is the ideal form of man. Because the Bodhisattva realizes that he does not have the vision, really. But let me put it this way: I don't have it if you don't have it. Because I have it only to the extent that I can give it away. That I can give it up and to. I'm quoting Gary Snyder, up and to all others. But in order that people may master these disciplines, and this is the responsibility of the older generations, it must be understood that working on the disciplines is fun. And this is the task of all good teachers. All really gifted and great teachers are people who never have to resort in their classes to artificial methods of imposing discipline.

They need no proctors, they need no punishments, they need no bribes. Because the good teacher is the person who makes the work of learning, the discipline, so completely fascinating, that the student is embroiled. The reason being that learning a discipline is not a matter of forcing yourself. And here the English language leaves a little bit to be desired. We have a paucity of words for effort. For application, for concentration. We can talk about, when we're talking with children: you must apply yourself! Now it's perfectly true, nothing in the way of a skill will be achieved without practice. But if practice is strained still nothing will be achieved by it, except resentment. And many a little boy learns to hate the violin or the piano because it was drummed into him: this is what you got to do, you got to apply yourself to it, Dududududu, driving it home. But, on the other hand, if there is a way of fascinating a child with the discipline of any musical instrument, or what have you, then they can apply themselves day after day after day after day. And be fascinated with the discipline. So this is the skill of the teacher. This is Upaya. I used the Sanskrit word this morning, skillful means, to get the student to love the art. Because remember this principle: if your student does not learn to love the discipline he will never be any good at what you're teaching him. Now, you may know that a certain kinds of scholars do work that most of us would think very tedious. Let's suppose I talk a few about which I know a few smatterings which is the study of Chinese. Chinese scholarship is very difficult. You have enormous amount of characters to study and you have to look up things in dictionaries and consult volumes of this and volumes of that, but the true scholar is a person who just loves doing that. He'll spend a whole afternoon going after one character through all sorts of things, sifting this reference and that reference, and he will he'll be having more fun than someone at a bowling alley. Doing just that. And from the standpoint of an external observer, who has no particular interest in this, they'll say "oh, how hard he's working." You know, in my private life, I must confess to you, I've had a terrible time with this because I love my work. And people who had absolutely, say, no comprehension or interest in what I'm doing would wonder how do I keep up the pace, how can I possibly do this that and the other. I love it. But then there are other people who say, "You never do a lick of work in your life. You're playing all the time. Just goofing off. It's too easy for me because you love it." But that's the only way to get it done. And done well, because if you have something that is, say, a good marriage.

A good marriage is not the result of forcing yourself into that marriage. Are you seriously supposing that if you say to your husband or wife, “Darling do you really love me?”, and your partner answers “I’m trying my best to do so.” This is a simply not a satisfactory marriage. We are not going to get beautiful work by mere effort against the grain. When you could tell a cook instantly by tasting one mouthful of a dish, whether it was cooked out of a sense of duty or cooked out of love. Now. A person, say, who cooks out of true love will of course encounter days on which it is difficult. But somehow the overall love of the art will manage to get in through those days when it’s difficult. And so with marriage, and so with the mastery of any other art. But it is on the end of the older people, it is up to the teachers, the parents. To present the disciplines of life as something not does that you ought to know. But as something that it is beautiful to understand.

Now, let’s look at the cold question from quite another point of view. One certain way of approach is appropriate for the young, but what what way of approach is appropriate for the older, so that they should be able to take this approach to the young? Many of us who are older inherit teachings of discipline which were all forced on us. And we’ve learned to grow up dull and rigid. And so I could say things to this audience that I would not possibly say in an audience of students. It’s up to you to loosen up and to become a little mad. There’s no point saying that to a younger audience because they’re going to do that anyway. But a great problem for the generation of parents and grandparents is psychic rigidity, because we have been indoctrinated for a long time in not being able to trust ourselves. And this morning I was discussing, you know, Chinese ideas about trusting human nature. About spontaneity, the disciplines of spontaneity and so on and so forth. Now, this becomes a peculiar importance to people who have passed the threshold of the middle of life. Because, in the first half of life, if you live your life properly, you are supposed to set up yourself in the world, have established your business, your profession or whatever it was. And in the second half of live you got to get ready to die. Now. Are you ready to die right now? Supposing, I mean, we were going to be annihilated by an atomic bomb in, say, five minutes. I’m supposing we’re going to be annihilated by an atomic bomb in five minutes. What would you think you ought to do between now and then? R.H. Blythe asked this question to a Zen master. What would you do? He said I would practice Zazen.

Meditation. Blythe was disappointed in this answer. Because he had put it: Would you like to listen to your favorite music? Would you like to make love to a beautiful woman? Or would you just go on a sort of with everyday life as if nothing happened like somebody winding up his watch on his way to execution. He once asked a Zen mistress, there are such great ladies, an old nun, you know, who was a great Zen teacher. "Where do you think you're going to go when you die?" She said, "I don't think I'm going to go anywhere." He said "In that case I'll go with you." She said "Oh, that's so nice, that's the first time a man is ever wanted to go anywhere with me."

But, you see, in the end it is traditional. All cultures have understood this in some way or another, when you enter the second half of life, the business of that part of life is to get ready to die. That sounds to us terrible. To prepare for death. It suggests preachers coming around and saying "Are you ready to meet your maker?" You know, urgh. And so, as a result of that, in our culture death is a thing that is completely swept under the carpet. You go to hospital and they don't tell you you're going to die. They pretend it's going to be all right. Uh-hu, don't worry. And all your friends and relatives come around when you're lying in bed with cancer on the end of a lot of tubes. And with a kind of weak smiles on their faces say, "Well wont it be nice and two weeks from now when you're feeling better we'll go down to the beach." and those that and the other. And you know very well, deep down, even if you want to admit it, that things are pretty rough. Especially when they start talking like that. We seriously need an entirely new approach to death. We need entirely new hospitals. We need sanitarium for the dying, where dying is made into a work of art and a real achievement. Where, when you're going to die, and it becomes fairly certain: this is the end. I'm talking about this specifically because if you understand the last minute, then you can kick it back into that whole of the second half of life, which is a preparation for the last minute. But the thing is to understand the last minute first. Let's say we take an entirely different attitude to death. Say now, look, quite different. The way we say to the young "build up your strengths and your skills so that you can take on responsibilities." But death is where you're going to be absolved of all responsibilities. They'll be no need for you anymore and. Quite a different scene. But a very liberating one. If you can learn to enjoy it. Now, a man, a British obstetrician like Grantley Dick Reid has taught women how to have children without

resisting it, so that they don't talk about the pangs of childbirth but they talk about the tensions. About really learning a kind of masochistic ecstasy from having a baby. Now, some new physician has got to come on to the scene now and tell us exactly the same thing about the pains of death. Death is not a disease. Death is very healthy. Just as childbirths. Everybody has to die, you can't possibly call it a disease. You may die as a result of a disease or of an accident or anything, but death itself is not a disease. It is simply the other end of life opposite birth. And instead of regarding it as something to be put off and simply really disregarded, death is something for which one should train oneself. As a very valuable experience, because death is the automatic taking away of all your attempts to cling on to life. All that frightened clutch is simply going to be broken. Well it's pretty rough to have it broken. Why don't you let go first? So, in that case then, when somebody is about to die, instead of the friends and relations coming around and consoling him and saying you're going to be all right. They come around instead and say Wowie. This is the great moment for you, you know? Here is the colossal opportunity for you to realize who you really are. Because all that you thought you were is going to disappear. What do you suppose is going to be left? So you can have your choice in my ideal sanitarium for the dying- the way you want to die. Whether you want to die in a religious way with candles and priests and chants and meditations, or whether you want to die in an enormous and glorious champagne party. The principle is pretty much the same. Do you really let yourself go? Do you cooperate with what nature is doing in you? Nature is giving you, by death, the opportunity to let go of all this nonsense. Now, when you have passed the middle point of life, you can see it coming. You begin to read the obituaries, and this friend and that friend has disappeared. And you know it's on the way.

Now instead of avoiding this, what about it? Because nature is in this fact assisting you to let go of yourself. Making it easy what is very difficult for the young. It's hard for the young to face death, because they feel there is a there's a timeliness about death. I'm too young to die. Cut off so soon, and there is so much promise and much potentiality. It's very tough. But as we get older, nature helps us. We realize that, well, we've had it. Past the middle of life every day is gravy. But you are being helped, you see, to this act of release. There was one of the Zen poets who said, while living be a

dead man, thoroughly dead. And then whatever you do just as you will will be right. So there's a kind of higher zombie-ism. Those who are dead while alive, those who have given themselves up to death. And will therefore look forward to death as the great enlightenment, the great awakening. And this requires no Hokuspokus. No beliefs in immortality that you can't really be convinced about. It's simply that it's even better for you if you have no beliefs in an afterlife. If you're willing to let the future go completely and abandon any future. Anything that you could want to grasp for yourself or to preserve yourself, recognize that you're being forced to let it go. There is no promise of any future beyond the grave, see? I'm not saying that there isn't. I'm saying that the psychological state of not expecting anything, of facing death as if it were really the end. And you don't resist this. You end, you have the ability to end, this is central in Krishnamurti's thought. You'll find that if you do that something slips inside you, as a result of which you have no further questions. You will say to yourself, "Well now for the first time I realize what life is, what it's all about." Because I'm not looking to the future to answer my question. I know there is no future. I end up, "clonk", like that and all future is cut off. So if you do that, you see, you then and let go of yourself. Now then if you can let go of yourself, especially in the second half of life, in that way you cease to be to be rigid. What young people don't like about old people is that they're rigid. They're stuffy. It's like Ogden Nash wrote: The trouble with a kitten is that eventually it becomes a cat. And one understands this to some extent. It's very hard for, let's say, a woman who was once very pretty and is now afflicted with rheumatism and what have you, pains all the time, to put up with a great deal of noise and dance and stuff going when it just racks through your head all the time. And therefore you put on an expression that makes you look stuffy. You can't help it, it's very it's very rough. But if you're not racked with pain all the time, you're enjoying a reasonably healthy old age: Don't be on the defensive. So, to this part of life one must say: it is important to be a little mad. When a bridge built of steel doesn't swing in the wind it's going to crash. It has no give. And so, likewise, people, who don't have any give, are in danger of being insane. In order to be sane, you must have a (coughing fit). Just as I said the stew has to have a little salt in it, the good human being has to have our little rascality in him. And so the sane person, especially the mature person, must have a little craziness. And just as it says in the book of Genesis that God ordered that

every seventh day should be a holiday, one seventh of your life should be madness. Otherwise you'll be crazy. Because too rigid. And therefore it's important for all of us who are set in our ways, who are habituated to certain patterns of life, and we cling to these, to get off it. Not all the time. But about a seventh of the time. And learn to swing. And that means that the art of meditation, shall we say, for the older people is not necessarily what the art of meditation is for the younger people. It's the older people who need to be present at a happening. Where you don't know what's going to happen. Where anything might happen. Where you simply allow what it is in you to do whatever it likes. Chinese say???. Old gentleman said: "I let my mouth say whatever it wanted to say. I let my ears hear whatever they wanted to hear, and let my eyes see whatever they wanted to see. I let my feet go wherever they wanted to go. And then I didn't know whether the wind was riding on me or whether I was riding on the wind." After all, you are all practiced people, mature people who can be trusted upon to behave themselves and not like the monk of Siberia in the cell and devour the father superior. You're all mature. And therefore you can trust yourselves to let go a bit. And to be a little mad. And so I've just written a book, published a book called nonsense. And it consists of a lot of ditties that are unashamedly absurd. I was saying that these are great ditties for people to use while driving cars and shaving and washing dishes and so on. And you can invent your own just like mine.

But don't do it within the hearing of a psychiatrist. Now I'm just giving a sort of trivial illustration of the principle. That in order to release your creative energy, you have first of all to get some something going. And it doesn't matter what you do, provided you get it going in the first place. In other words break up the crystallization, get the water flowing again. Then you can canalize it after that and do specific an intentional things with it. But the first thing that is necessary is to have some psychic freedom. Because our culture and age and habitude to certain ways of life give you one terrific hang up, one terrific block. And you work on a certain pattern of behavior and the stream simply isn't going through you. And this will, as a matter of fact, if you do let it out you live much longer. [Background: "Well maybe they should just make marijuana illegal for the young, and LSD illegal for the young (...)] I won't I won't argue that rather technical point at the moment. But all I'm saying is that however whatever the

relation of chemicals is to the scene, quite aside from that, it is more important for the older than for the younger to have disciplined craziness. Disciplined craziness. There is a group of people, for example who are called Subud. I don't belong to Subud, I hold no advocacy for them, but they have a wonderful idea. They have gatherings for what they call the Latihan. And they last for half an hour. And during that time, somebody who is what is called a helper, says begin. And from that moment on for half an hour you do anything you feel like doing. Except with one reservation, you don't touch anyone else. But otherwise you will make any noise you feel like making, you do any gestures, any movements, and everybody rolls around on the floor and chants and bellows and squeals and dances and some people just curl up in a corner and groan. And then at the end of half an hour the helper says finish and everybody immediately assumes their ordinary social role. Well things like that are excellent. Because what they do is this: they release in us again the stream of spontaneous life. Become again as a child. When children do things like that. And once you've got it going, once you've got it released and moving, you can canalize it. But if it isn't going, there's nothing to canalize. So I'm simply saying that this is all extracurricular what I'm saying in this fourth meeting. You see, this is the last session.

So it's strictly extracurricular. Everything that I said before in this, in the three things, has to do with the university and the Blaisdell institute and all that kind of thing. But this has to do with YOU, who have come here and we are all quietly here together. That if you don't have that safety valve, that outlet, which is not just a safety valve in the sense that it's blowing off something that's accumulated, that's too much. It's a safety valve in an entirely different sense, it's a way of revivifying again. And having something going to canalize and to express in a creative way. And it goes along, all that kind of thing, you see, that non-programmed, spontaneous activity, which is pure nonsense, goes along with everything that I've said heretofore about non-verbal experience. And the importance of re-establishing contact with the spontaneous world, the non-verbal world, the supra-rational world. Not merely as something to contemplate while sitting quietly in meditation, but something with which to participate actively. You can, you see, have thoughtless awareness. But you can also have thoughtless gestures. You can make thoughtless or meaningless noises.

Whatever. Now I know that such a proposal goes ill with many older people's images of themselves. As responsible citizens, mature people, so on and so forth. Ha. But you've always got to have that little secret part of your life. You don't have to do it out in front of god and everybody. That's asking too much. But you must have that secret corner in your life. Where you can be the skeleton in your own closet. And be crazy. Otherwise you won't be sane.

The Future

The Future of Religion

This weekend is devoted to the future of religion, and I've introduced one kind of paradoxical gimmick into the series of seminars by saying that the best kind of future we can envisage is one in which we get rid of the idea of the future as a an area of experience which solves problems.

It doesn't. Western man has been obsessed with history in a way that is quite unlike any other culture and has seen the course of human events as a series of progressive steps towards a goal in the beyond.

And you will see that this is absolutely basic to the theology of the Jewish and Christian religions as we now know them. Although it wasn't necessarily always so, but they are absolutely wedded to the idea that the significance of human life has historical significance.

That is to say that the present has in itself no justification. It's only justified what we do now in terms of the way in which it leads in some kind of progressive pattern towards tomorrow.

And therefore there is that to use Tennyson's phrase. The one far off divine event to which all creation moves. And we may never enjoy that.

Maybe our children will, maybe our children's children, although actually the result of this is going in exactly the opposite direction to that of its intention. Living in a historical society, the one far off divine event to which all creation moves is so far as anybody can see it. The explosion of a cobalt bomb which will get rid of all life on the planet. That's history for you.

And therefore, the urgent task of today is to stop history and to do this by creating a diversion, a diversion from history.

Now, I've explained this in past seminars, but because some of you are here for the first time today, I'm just going to go over this briefly. Let's suppose we get the sort of situation where you've got a gambling casino and there's been a very dangerous game with high stakes going on for most of the night. And the stakes are getting higher and higher. And there's a huge assemblage of people gathered around this table where the contestants are betting not only thousands and millions and billions of dollars, but they've finally brought out their nuclear weapons and they've said, I dare you to blow the scene up first. Wowee, what a gamble. Here, you know, it's like in a powder magazine. You are sitting with a box of matches and say, if you don't agree with me, I'll drop the match and blow us both up.

So that's the kind of game that's been going on.

And it's on a collision course. And no one can stop it because the mental set of the contestants is such that they can't give up. Unfortunately, both of them believe in the life hereafter, in some funny way that perhaps the Russians don't believe in the life hereafter, but they call the westerns. Christians tend to believe in it.

So once, many years ago, when Professor Uri of the University of Chicago gave a talk to the assembled Episcopal clergy of the Diocese of Chicago and raised all sorts of horrors about atomic bombs, an old man got up who was the bishop of the sufferer and bishop of Chicago, Bishop Randall, and said after the clergy had expressed great concern, I don't know what all you people are so disturbed about, because all this man has told us is that we're going to die.

And we knew that already. And as Christians, we are not afraid of death.

So the clergy got up and said, hey, all right, it's all right for you. Bishop Randall, you're an old man and you don't have the problems of us young people with children and families and all that kind of thing.

But you see, what a dangerous man, a man who believes in the life hereafter can be, because he can say, better be dead than red, because he believes in a future beyond the grave in which accounts will be settled and the rest will be proved wrong.

Now, I'm trying to indicate what I stand for myself as a sort of half baked representative of the traditions of the Orient, is not a future life beyond the grave in the ordinary sense of the word. But realization of the fact that our true life is timeless. That we don't have a future in the sense that we will not carry over into future manifestations of our existence our personal memories about the will be future manifestations of our existence. Only we won't know it. We will experience it again and again, just as we do now, without remembering any past. Because if we did carry over into the future and indefinite and indefinite memory, conscious memory of our past, we would be bored. We would say this is the same old thing over and over again, and we've had enough of it.

But nature, just as we have in our biology, our physiology and elimination system decides an eating system.

So in our psychology, we have a forgetting system as well as a memory.

And it's equally important if you cannot erase if you cannot wipe the slate clean. That's the whole. That's the real meaning of the Christian idea of forgiveness, of the Jewish idea of the year of Jubilee. Forget it.

And then we can begin life anew and see this familiar world with the eyes of children, who find it all absolutely astonishing.

As we get older, we say, oh, well, ho hum.

We've seen the sun rise many times and therefore we need to forget. And that's the mystery of death. And therefore, a style of life which sets the future always as the thing to be worked for.

It seems to me to be biologically, physiologically, psychologically unsound, because it's always preparation and lacks the verve as well as the nerve to live now.

So then, this is one of the reasons today why the most extraordinary changes are going on in people's thinking. See, basically, people really do know what's good for them. They have an obscure unconscious sense. De Tocqueville once said a democracy is always right, but for the wrong

reasons. And this is why our laws in the British and American tradition, are really so sane, insofar as they say, well, ultimately, the people must decide what they want. Nobody knows. No individual knows what is good for the people. The people themselves know they don't know why, but they know in an obscure way.

And therefore, you will find at a moment when human survival is in jeopardy that there begins to be from, as it were, the grassroots of society.

A rumbling revolution that something's got to be different.

And what has got to be different is, of course, that our consciousness has to be changed. That Western civilization and to some extent Oriental civilization has gone on these many centuries, with an experience of what it is to be alive, what it is to be human, what it is to be a person that is a hallucination.

Namely, that you are an independent center of consciousness and volition inside a capsule of skin looking out upon, as we say, confronting, a world that is not you, that is alien, and that insofar as that world is not a human world. And most of it isn't, it is stupid, mechanical, blind.

Therefore, there's the sense of intense hostility towards the external world and the idea of so much promoted by the Jewish and the Christian traditions that the valuable thing about being human is that you are a person.

We'll go into that word person. But the idea is that the supremely valuable thing about human life is that you are an individual ego. And that by the force of your psychological effort and your independent will, you are going to control and transform the world. And therefore any point of view which puts down in any way the individual ego and its power to exercise mind over matter is repugnant to our cultural tradition.

This is very strong in the United States. I've often said, scratch an American and find a Christian scientist.

Someone who believes that you should not be in any way obligated to dependent upon the physical aids of life.

You if you if you're in pain, if you had a headache. Well, you shouldn't take aspirin. You should use your willpower or your faith or your something, you know, and overcome it that way. And these people are always blind to the fact that they do have to eat every day. There are all sorts of fantasies, a half baked Oriental notions, too, about people who definitely need to eat, who are surviving on one banana and a glass of water per day and sort of thing.

And that strikes the imagination of our cultures. What would be the ideal? That's why we cook so badly. We do not eat with gusto like the French. We eat apologetically like the British.

So, this extraordinary fascination with the good of human life as being summed up in the ego and its energy and its independence is an idea that had something to be said for it.

But you can always have too much of a good thing.

Now, I must repeat something that is always necessary to understand. Anything I'm saying is that I exaggerate.

I, instead of being moderate and taking due consideration for all possible points of view whereby we come to a measured, mature and balanced view of things.

If you do that as a philosopher, nobody will listen to you.

So what you do is you make an exaggeration in a certain direction to balance and compensate an exaggeration that's gone in the other direction.

So with our culture, the exaggeration has gone in the direction of the value, sacredness, of the ego. So I'm pitching the cause in the other direction and saying ego is a hallucination.

And that's what's the trouble with us, is that we believe in this and that therefore we in the possession of our enormous technology are fighting the external world and destroying it.

Look around in every direction. That's lovely, Marin County is being destroyed. By smog, automobiles, tracks, dwellings, water pollution, air pollution. Disregard of the forests.

You could go a little further up north and take a take a plane ride to Seattle to see what's been happening. It's just terrible.

So, we then find ourselves in this situation that we have inherited religions which emphasize salvation in the future, beyond death, maybe, or the Jewish people don't so much emphasize the idea of immortality.

Jewish people think of the messianic hope that the day of the Lord is coming, someday, when there will be a general knocking of heads together and.

The wisdom of Moses and Solomon will be vindicated.

But it's all set for the future and therefore, in both the Jewish and the Christian traditions, mystical religion is suspect.

There are not many Jewish mystics. Yes, the Hasidim are a special sect, but among Christians, you will not find the mystical very much favorite. There are great Christian mystics, but the Catholic Church.

Always says of mystical experience that it is an extraordinary grace.

And they mean by using the word extraordinary extra, ordinary. That is to say, it is something of a peculiarity.

Like a miracle that safe to certain individuals outside ordinary Christianity, ordinary Christianity. Way back in. The fourth century def definitely rejected Gnosticism in favor of faith.

Knowledge was rejected. One should not have knowledge of divine things. One should believe.

Because wherever anybody claim to knowledge, they were in danger of the sin of spiritual pride.

But you can equally be proud of my faith is stronger and your faith makes no difference.

So, the emphasis in the whole of the Christian tradition in religion has been knowledge of God in terms of belief, belief and a revelation, belief in a dogma. And so Christianity has not only not encouraged, but actually suppressed any religious manifestation which emphasized the primacy of experience, of knowing the divine as distinct from believing in the divine. Oriental religion, Hindu, Buddhist, is concerned not with belief at all.

Not with dogma, because it would say immediately. How can you express divine things in words?

All words are invalid when it comes to the ultimate reality. But it would say, on the other hand, the words may be invalid. There is the possibility of experiencing it.

And so the right experience, rather than the right belief, is the concern of Oriental religion.

So the the goal of the Buddhist and the Hindu is not salvation. It is liberation. Liberation in terms of an experience which is called Bodhi or Awakening. Samadhi or unity of consciousness. Moksha Liberation Nirvana. Letting go. That's what it really means. Breathing out, letting go of your grasp on the breath of life.

Now, therefore, the religion's so-called religions of the Orient have therefore become of extraordinary fascination to Western people since the 19th century.

Publishers are selling literally millions of books throughout the Western world on yoga, Vedanta, Zen, Daoism, especially to young people.

People under 25, if they have any pretensions to education at all, have read this about interest in. Because, as I said, they have, what Carl Rogers calls, positive growth potential. That is to say, knowing fundamentally when to get in out of the rain.

And that what need what is needed for Western culture, for technological culture, whether Western or Eastern. Is a new kind of human being. Not though, not as a moral necessity.

You know what we see when we talk about a new man in the Christian or in a Jewish context, it's always in terms of the preaching.

That you should reform. You should take yourself in hand. You should talk seriously to yourself and be converted. It doesn't work anymore.

Never did really work.

Because a person who is converted to an unselfish style of life by preaching is always a hypocrite.

Because he's not really been changed. He's trying to change.

He knows he ought to change. He feels guilty because of the style of life which he has lived in the past. And out of the energy of that sense of guilt, tries to reform.

But because he still experiences himself fundamentally as a separate ego.

All his new style of life is attempted love of other people, his morality, is a fake. And that's why it is so true that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. That is why do-gooders create so much trouble.

That is why eventually the do-gooder results of violence.

And employs the police. To do for you what is good for you. To shoot you for your own best interest.

That's where it ends up.

So therefore, Western religion, as we have known it in the standard brands of the Jewish and the Christian religions, is falling apart.

It is becoming of no interest, it's becoming a joke. And it's happening faster and faster and faster.

Despite the strong stance taken by the lunatic fringe of Protestantism, mostly in the southern and central United States, people like Jehovah's Witnesses and hard-shell Baptists.

That has all become incredible. In fact, ministers, rabbis. Do not believe what they're saying.

Some of them are honest enough to come out and say so. In talking about the death of God. If, for example, you really felt.

That, shall we say, a fundamentalist Protestantism is the truth. And the people who didn't believe in Jesus Christ.

We're going to fry in hell forever, and you really you really honestly believe that you would be screaming in the streets.

Because most of your friends. And not to mention your relations would be destined for eternal hellfire.

And you ought to be concerned about that. But they are not screaming in the streets.

They'll say, issue polite warnings over a few radio stations tracked.

But even Jehovah's Witnesses are reasonably well behaved and they knock at your door.

They don't believe it. They think they ought to. They're trying to con themselves into believing what they think they're supposed to believe, but nobody does. Most of the clergy who've been through a sophisticated theological training and I'm thinking particularly of Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, congregation lists, Methodists and all respectable religions.

They don't believe what they're talking about. The great problem is that they think that the lay people want them to hand out the old time religion? And we'll be offended and we'll leave church if they don't.

I like that joke in The New Yorker the other day, a couple of Episcopalian type clergy in the vestry with a collection plate, which is practically nothing in its.

And they're shrugging their shoulders and say, well, well, back to the good old generalities.

See what's happening is this. I've been very intimately involved with the problems of Bishop Pike, and his successor and the Episcopal clergy in this diocese, as I know them all rather well.

And they're having a terrible time. The reason is this: they're all very theologically sophisticated and extremely intelligent people, but they depend for their financial support on a very few wealthy individuals, most of whom are reactionaries. Therefore, by it, because of their liberal and far-out policies, they they're losing their financial support.

You would think that they would by being so far out, recruit an enormous new following, of young people, forward looking people and so on, but they don't because those people aren't interested in the church at all. And therefore, they are completely falling between two stools. Why, for heaven's sakes, aren't those people interested in the church at all? There's nothing that can be done about the church as far as I can see. Except let it evaporate.

Because by a curious principle, which we don't really understand. Symbols and myth have a vitality, which is like by biological things. They are born and they die. And the mythology of the Judeo-Christian tradition is dead. God is dead in the sense of God, conceived as personal.

Father of the universe, who cares about you? And upon whom you can rely.

It was an excellent article on this by Rabbi Rubinstein from Pittsburgh and Playboy's just recently. I think it was the June issue of Playboy. Because he made the point it was it was a surprising article, because when I started, I thought, oh, my God. Here's this dreary old stuff. There is no God. And the Jewish, the Jews are still his chosen people.

The Christian version is there is no God and Jesus Christ is his only son. I thought this was what was going to come up, but it wasn't. He switched towards the end of the article, and said now the death of God means the revival of mysticism, of the experience of the nothingness, which is the ground of the world. Or what Tillich called the ground of being. Now, of course, but he, in his article wouldn't have carried weight with somebody who wasn't theologically sophisticated. They would have thought he was saying, well, we ought to believe in nothingness instead of God not understanding the special theological meaning of the word nothings.

No thickness. Not nothingness in the sense is just 'blah'.

But the notion that the ground of the world, which is your center and your being, as well as that of everybody and everything else, is not a thing in the same way that the diaphragm in the speaker is not a noise.

Very much there. But it's not any of the noises that it makes. In a way, it's all the noises it makes, but yet somehow something else.

And so naturally, therefore, we can have no concept because all our concepts are concepts of things, concepts of events. We can have no concept of God. What is the meaning of the death of God theology is that the conceptual God is dead.

Nobody can any more. Talk the human race into. Some sort of concept of God, because the development of Christianity, Judaism and so on through their theologies have come to the point where nobody is gonna buy that anymore, actually. Of course, the concept of God in the Jewish and Christian traditions, as in the Islamic tradition, is based on.

The conception of kingship in the ancient Near East, monotheism is political. It is the elevation to the universe of people like Hammurabi, of the Cyrus's of Persia and of the pharaohs of Egypt and of King David.

And the title of God. King of kings..there's collect in the Episcopal prayer, especially, say, in the Church of England, where, of course, the politics is a constitutional monarchy. Priest gets up and says. Oh, mighty and everlasting God, the king of kings, Lord of Lords, the only ruler of princes

who dust from by throne behold as well as the former most graciously deign to behold our sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth. You have plenty history with heavenly gifts, health and wealth, long, etc..

And so what you see is a court official addressing the throne.

So this time the title King of Kings was borrowed from the Persian Shah.

Cyrus was called the John Kahn, which means the king of kings.

And so that those royal honors, which the Jews didn't believe should be given to Cyrus, although they they had a special liking for him because he liberated them from the Babylonians. So they they just transferred the titles of Cyrus to God. To Jehovah.

So we've been hung up for centuries, with this political theory of the government of the universe as a dictatorship, it and be a constitutional monarchy insofar as God suspends his omnipotence and allows you a certain degree of free will, only you'd better behave in the right way.

You must choose to love God, say.

Because if you don't, there's gonna be trouble. But it's up to you. And I have a chance. It's really a very funny system.

But as a result of that, the most curious things develop into.

Let me just take a little side tracked into legal theory in the United States of America.

How can you as members of a group of the United States, where you believe and you do solemnly swear that you believe this to be the best form of government. When I moved into this country, I had to.

Face the immigration officers and they sat on a important looking desk with Stars and stripes behind them, and they said, what do you think of the former government of the United States? Well, I said, I think it's a very good form of government. [laughs] OK, so but when you actually become a citizen.

That was a later process. You renounce all other allegiances and you do solemnly swear. Cross your heart and hope to die. That the American flag represents the ideal form of government. And it's a republic.

How, then, can you believe that the universe is a monarchy? You just can't do that. One nation under God is an absolute contradiction. Because then when you say it's under God, it's not a republic anymore, it's a monarchy.

So now what happens? You were. Our young man and you are called to the colors to fight.

And you find it against your conscience to do so.

You don't believe in killing people.

What do you have to do? Well, this has been modified recently, but what you always had to do was to appeal over the head of the nation and the president to a superior authority, called the supreme being. They didn't actually say God because they wanted to allow that. Not only Christians, but maybe some Mohammedans and people like that also might do this, and a few rationalists who believed in a supreme being like Woostya [sic].

But you had to, in other words, to accept the military view of the world that there's a chain of command going down from the highest bus and you say to the commander in chief of the United States since President Johnson. I have word from a higher authority than you personally conveyed to me that I am not to fight in this war or any war.

And they have to say it because of freedom of religion. And it's always complicated game. OK. You're accepted. You don't have to fight because you've appealed to a higher court.

So therefore, a Buddhist or a Dallas finds himself in a very funny position because he doesn't like this word supreme being. Because he doesn't view the universe as a military operation with a commander in chief or a monarch at the top. He looks at it as an organism in which all of us are, as it were, the arms of God, like the legs on a centipede. So there isn't a chain of command. It doesn't work that way.

Well, the courts have recently more or less decided the word supreme being can be taken extremely vaguely. Like the famous story of the House of Commons when they were debating in 1928 on the revision of the prayer book for the Church of England, somebody got up and said, it seems ridiculous that this house, which contains a number of atheists, should be debating on the whether the Church of England should have a new prayer book or not.

Somebody got up and said, Oh, I don't think there are rarely any atheists [here]. We all believe in some sort of something somewhere.

There it is. Now, so the political theory of the universe as a monarchy, as a patriarchy simply does not make sense to people anymore.

It's worn out, the view of the cosmos delivered to us by modern astronomy and modern physics.

It is so magnificent and so. Stones the mind.

That's the real meaning. To be astounded.

A stone in everybody's gonna get stones that it it just doesn't jibe anymore.

We've seen it's like style in works of art. You very well know when you listen to Shostakovich that it wasn't written by Bach.

And when you look at the universe as revealed to us through modern science, you know, it wasn't written by Jehovah.

It's too big, it's too amazing.

And some people just abandon everything and say, well. For heaven sakes, let's let's let's keep control of this thing. Let's not get stoned. Let's say it was just a mechanism. See, it's stupid. It's just that just the thing going on, not going on like Newton's village games.

And that's simply self-defense. Against allowing your reason to be bulled over, by amazement at the nature of the world, of reality, of yourself, of

your organism, of your brain, your nervous system, everything and control around here.

Oh, yes, we all understand what's going on. It's just nerves, just protoplasm, molecules, stuff.

We understand at all. This is a you know, this is a defense mechanism. So that doesn't work.

That doesn't appeal to anyone today. Monarchical theory of the world doesn't appeal to anyone today. I mean, it's it's it's fizzling. There are still a few people who dig it, but it's on its way out.

So what's gonna take its place? We see this fantastic growth of interest, therefore, in experiential as distinct from dogmatic religion. Now, I may have a slightly prejudiced position in this because I've been involved for years and years in trying to explain Oriental philosophy and religion to Western people, and therefore, naturally, it would have pleased me to think that all kinds of people were interested in this. But what I have today is a very odd feeling that I'm slightly alarmed that what I said has been taken so literally by young people.

And suddenly they really say you meant that. Yeah. You know, they're coming on and though, hey, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. You say. Don't take me too seriously.

But this is always the case.

When the older generation has taught the younger generation this, that and the other and the younger generation says, yeah. The older generation is now. Now, wait a minute.

We are not quite such good authorities, as you may have thought, because you see the amazing vitality with which a change comes to pass and you think, well, maybe it is immature and will overstep itself and is being a little bit unwise in this way and that way, it was ever thus.

Young people were always immoderate. You know, hurray!

Otherwise, they wouldn't be young.

So, what I think. The death of God, movement in the existing churches, is something like this.

The individual clergy have at last got to be honest.

They can't go on going through the motions and preaching a religion that they themselves don't believe in. But they've got to make a jump. It's not enough to say God is dead, and therefore life is nothing more than a trip from the maternity ward to the crematorium. And how in that interim, shall we apply some semblance of Christian principles? That's what many of them are trying to wrestle with, what we call secularized Christianity or religion-less Christianity. To use the phrase of vote man and a bunch of money. Both man calls it the D mythologized Bible. I have tried to have this out the some of the important figures in this movement and notably the bishop of Woolwich.

And Hamilton and Alltizza [sic]

And there is a chance. Pike to. It isn't that.

We're saying, there is nothing at all that transcends. What we call common or garden reality.

As a matter of fact, what we call everyday reality is pretty much a myth.

Psychiatrist believe in it and in that effect have a sort of vested interest in maintaining that everyday life is dull.

That it's just a matter of like a hospital where you've got scrubbed white tiles and bottles that clank and so on. And that's that's reality. You see, hard floors Monday morning, rather depressing. Get on with your work.

That's supposed to be the real world. Face it.

Well, that's simply again, that's a form of the same self-defense against the marvel of the real world.

As you know, the theory [that] it's nothing but molecules.

It's all nothing buttery.

Thing is, we don't know what it is. And we are scared stiff to admit.

We don't know that we are in the grip of a fantastic miracle and that the biggest miracle in the whole thing is what we call your-self.

That's the thing you should be scared to death of. You just immediately, because what can it do can frighten itself. It can run up behind itself and shriek 'boo', move and jump out of its skin and go through all sorts of things. But fundamentally, what else is that?

It always has to look as if it wasn't there. All that was out of control or that otherwise would be no fun.

So, what, what would be a very constructive thing to happen is if the death of God. Theology. Would. Ally itself with the ancient tradition of mystical theology which in both India and reasonably early Christianity. Would say every positive idea about God is wrong. See, they in Greek. You have two kinds of theological language. One kind is called cataphatic.

From Cata. Fehmi Fehmi is to speak.

So cata, the particle, means to speak according to, metaphor.

God may be spoken of according to he was like a father, but he is not a father. God is not a cosmic male parent, but we say God the father, because there is a certain analogy between God's relationship to the world and the father's relationship to his children. So to speak of God as power, as justice, as kingship, as light, as whatever was catafalque language. Then they said there is apophatic language.

Now Apo is a particle meaning away from. Away from, speaking so apophatic words are eternal.

Which means non-temporal in finite, unlimited, formless modulus, etc., etc. all those negative words are the apathetic language. And so these people

held that the apathetic language was the truer language of the two. Even some Thomas Aquinas and nobody reads anymore said in order to speak of God, it is necessary to proceed. By the way of emotion. Because God, by his immensity, exceeds every concept which our mind can form and therefore we speak of God as limitless a tunnel in much the same way that a sculptor reveals an image by knocking stone away.

He doesn't add anything, he just takes away, and the image is revealed.

So in the same way these mystics of the very ancient Christianity particularly Dionysus

Was actually Shankara. The great writer or nondualist Vedanta interpreter, actually, Shankara and St. Thomas Aquinas are just about contemporaries.

And if they had ever been able to meet, they would have understood each other perfectly. They talk the same language, they reasoned in the same way.

But Shankara went a little further over the precipice.

In. Not feeling the necessity to cling to any fixed conception of the divine. But there you see the point is now is not simply that you are getting rid of an idea.

And doing without as if it were an impoverishment. Getting rid of the idea of God is an enrichment. Because it opens you up to experience the reality instead of the idea.

I call it spiritual window cleaning. You take the image that you've painted of the sun off the glass.

And by getting rid of it, the sunlight itself can come into the room.

So by the act of getting rid of all idols, that is to say, intellectual images.

Of God that you cling to and think this makes me feel safe. This makes me able to go on living, etc.. There is nothing.

See. And when there is nothing to cling to.

No way of pinning it all down, pinning the universe down, pinning you down. That I say, well, I really know who I am now. That's safe. Isn't any such way.

So that's that's why, for example, a person who is neurotic, who is going through a psychotic crisis is actually in a very positive state if the doctors would get around to seeing it that way.

Because there are people who have the jitters because they don't know who they are.

Anything might happen. How do I know I'm going to be able in the next five minutes to continue the mastery of the English language.

It's just that I've been doing it all these years and I suppose it goes on. But I could very well talk myself into a great worry that I might not be able to do it. Then how would I earn a living? [laughs]

Would you see you never do. No, not really. Oh.

Because you don't even know how you make a decision. How does your brain enable you to make an act that will, you know.

So the psychotic is the person on the edge suddenly realized how scary it all is.

So what then?

The guru does for a psychotic is saying, instead of you've got to be put away.

You're dangerous, you're awful, he says. Come on. Come on. Make it. Make it, make it. You're just just getting warm.

Let go. Stop being frightened of insanity. Chaos plunge into it.

That's the only way you'll recover. That's the act of faith.

Well, now the next question that arises in discussing the future of religion is whether Judaism and Christianity can in some way be saved? And this is a question with many aspects to it. It isn't only a question of the reinterpretation of doctrines, what [the] Pope Paul, Pope John called *aggiornamento*, the updating of Christianity. The question of the institution. What are we going to do with the church buildings? What are we going to do with the organization? What about all these people employed as ministers? What function have they could they have in the future development of religion? If we agree to the idea that the gospel is no longer good news, but just a bore, is there any way in which this can. This whole thing can be salvaged? I've had myself different changing views about this. First of all, I would say that.

The function of a priest is to destroy the church, because the church, if we can I can restate this, you see in the classical terms of Christian theology. The church is the body of Christ.

What does that mean?

Well, if you go back to. Classical Christian theology. Here's your idea.

What is Christ?

Christ is the incarnation. Of God, the son, the second person of the Trinity. The second person of the Trinity. Well, we have to go back and explain the Trinity.

You have to have a Trinity conception of God, if you think in a language based on sentences, whether a subject's verbs and predicates, because the basic structure of the sentence. Is I love you. So I is one aspect of it. You is the country aspect of it. And love is the joining aspect. So if God is love, then I is the father. You is God the son, and love is God the Holy Spirit.

All the reasoning about the Trinity, why there was a doctrine of the Trinity goes back to that. And you see that all the thoughts that were moving in the minds of those early theologians, they didn't understand this themselves. They didn't realize that they were hooked on a three parts sentence and

therefore had to think that way. But that's why it emerged. And so if you, a wise theologian, you don't knock down the doctrine of the Trinity.

You merely realize the obvious reasons why it arose. Because if God was only one. God could not be love, unless the object of God's love were his creations, that if his creations were the objects of his love, then he could not be love without his creations. Therefore, God was not a self-supporting system. Therefore, they had to find out reasons for God being love in his own right. That meant the Trinity. And that's led to endless complications, which I will sidestep at the moment and go on with the main theme that Jesus of Nazareth was supposed to be the second person of the Trinity, God, as the object of his own love and of his own knowledge. Embracing and becoming finite, the finite state, the human state with the suffering, with the difficulties, with the limitations that all that involved.

And this is called in Greek theology. Kenosis, this K noses k e n o a s I s it means self abandonment or self emptying.

Now, by virtue of that the whole physical universe is believed to be altered, insofar as the creator became the creature through the body, the physical body of Christ.

All physical bodies whatsoever are touched.

So that St. Paul uses the resurrection of Christ and he calls it the first fruits of those who slept. Christ rises from the dead. Overcomes death by accepting death.

And by this means then all the physical universe is in process of being changed into the body of Christ, that is to say, the union of creator and creature. And so, the church doesn't mean buildings, it doesn't mean clergymen, the church, the ecclesial meaning the assembly of those called together, the original idea of it is that this is the leaven. Like you put yeast into bread and eleven elevens the whole lump using Jesus's own illustration. The church is the leaven, the organization.

Oh, let's better say the organism through which the entire universe is in process of becoming converted into the divine.

You call this apotheosis, meaning the divine-ization of something.

And so when the original meaning behind the Christian mysteries is that when a person is baptized, he is joined to this leavening process, which is ultimately going to extend not simply to people, but to weeds and grubs and birds and stones. That ultimately, through the leavening influence of the church, the whole physical universe will be converted into Christ. Where the word Christ means. Not only the historical character Jesus of Nazareth, who is regarded as the beginning of the process, but where Christ means the created world and the divine world in perfect harmony and union. So here you see, is it is a fundamental notion of Christianity. That the world is in process of becoming the body of Christ.

So then the question, you see, that I posed at the beginning is that the priest of the Church of the institutional church will in fact further this process of becoming the body of Christ by destroying the institutional church.

Why? Because the institutional church. Has become a purely political power. What do you do? Let's let's take this problem in a very practical way where I speak from long experience. I have a friend, a good friend who is the. Rector, Vicar or whatever of the Episcopal Church here in Sausalito, and he's a wise man. But what are his problems? He has an expensive plan that he has to maintain. Not only a church building, but a parish hall room, Martin. And he has to be sure that there are enough people in the community who annually pledge so much money to maintain this operation. And therefore, he is interested in upholding the building. And yet he knows in his own heart that that's not the way things should work.

So then, I've often wanted to preach a sermon at the laying of the foundation stone of a church where the stone is ceremoniously laid. And I will take as my text from the Gospel of St. Matthew. If a man's son ask him bread, will he give him a stone? The answer is yes. You will find again and again, that if you want to raise money for a project, you can far more easily raise money for the erection of a building.

And you can for the support of living people in their work as scholars or priests, physicians or psychiatrists or whatever it may be that they do, you can't get money for people. You can get money for buildings.

And so, the priest then has to say we must destroy the church, burn the buildings down. Deny all the doctrines. Because the whole symbolism is that it was by the breaking of the body of Christ that the salvation of the world was delivered. When Jesus predicted his own death to his disciples, they were scandalized. They said, but it is written in the tradition that the Messiah is not subject to death. This is in the gospel of St. John, and Jesus replied, If a grain of corn does not fall into the ground and die, it remains lifeless and isolated. But if it dies, it brings forth much fruit. So therefore, it is only through letting go of the process of clinging to life, which is all our fixation on immortality, on preserving the valuable things, etc., this huge anxiety that we hold on.

So he was saying, let it go. So then when the priest celebrates mass, what happens? Was it easy to understand this? We have to go back to the very meaning of the mass in the civilization of the ancient Near East, the Mediterranean world.

The staple food was bread. From wheat. And the staple drink was wine. You didn't, if you were in your right mind, drink water. Because it was polluted. And therefore, an alcoholic content in the water was a safeguard against infection.

So they had a way of making wine, not quite like our wine today. It was a very sick mixture. It was like concentrated port. And they served at table what is called a cratya in which we get our word crater, which was a shallow bowl like cup. And they poured wine into this and they mixed it with water.

And this was the staple drink as today children in Greece, in France always drink wine. They don't consider it alcoholic luxury. They consider it food. So then, in this state of civilization, bread and wine were the staple food and drink. Now, bread is made from crushed wheat and wine is made from crushed grapes. So there's an idea of sacrifice that the life of the wheat and the life of the grapes is sacrificed that we may live.

And therefore, Jesus identified himself with the sacrifice, with the universal process of biology, whereby all biological beings live in a mutual eating society, and we are only sustained by feeding on other forms of life. But he

switched it. Instead of saying this is a situation in which we are predators and we clobber these other forms of life, and alas, you know, he put himself in the position of everything clobbered and said, I am all those creatures that you destroy and eat, therefore taking the bread.

This is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. And then taking the cup. This is my blood of the New Testament. That is to say, the New Testament means relationship, really.

DRC key in Greek, the new dialog, the new interchange between man and reality.

And the New Testament is that it's not that you clobber the world and feel terribly guilty because you've eaten fish and cows and wheat. But that I, God, gives myself to you through the wheat, through the grapes, through the cows, so the blood is shed for you for the remission of sins. In other words, please take this offering and don't feel guilty about it anymore. Because the I, in the form of the victims, give myself to you voluntarily.

So then, the idea of the mass of Holy Communion or whatever you want to call it, is the breaking of the bread and the crushing of the grapes. That through the sacrificial act, this destroying act, life has given. Therefore, when a priest repeats the sacrifice and at the altar, he takes the bread in the form of the host and breaks it and pours out the blood, pours out the wine, all that becomes merely ridiculous symbolism.

If he is not also ready to break up the church. That means to knock down the idols, first of all. That is to say, the dogmas upon which people rely and lean suddenly discover the death of God, you see?

Suddenly discover the historical Jesus is something you can't put your finger on. Maybe the resurrection didn't happen. You know, there's nothing to cling to, no miracles possible, perhaps. Break it up. And above all, break up the organization which is a political institution with enormous property holdings, generally exploiting the public.

Then on on those conditions, if the if the clergy, if the ministry were so to break up the church, the church would come to life. It would become a

significant institution again, which it now is not.

So, the next thing is this. There is another aspect to the breaking up of the church. I spent some time this morning on going through the political analogy of the kingdom of God. God, as the big boss whom everyone must obey. Now, there are two themes in Christianity.

One of which is political and the other of which is organic. The political image is the kingdom of God. The organic image is the body of Christ. Or the symbolism of the vine. I am the vine and you are the branches. Indeed, one of the most extraordinary books in the Bible. That love poem called The Song of Songs has a theme of a love relationship between the creator and the creature in which all the imagery is vegetative as distinct from urbane. So a transformation of the church from the political urbane institution to the vegetative organic institution where the image of the government or the land no, not the government, let me say the order of the world changes from that of the palace, the city, the kingdom to that of the vine and the body, the organism.

This is the inner meaning of the incarnation of the union of God and man, while God and man are not truly united. Then order must be imposed from above. When God and man are truly united, in the spirit of the prophet Jeremiah, who said no more, shall every one teach his brother saying, no-God.

But they shall all know me, for I will write my law in their hearts.

And the law written in the heart, you see, is entirely different from the law imposed from above. The law written in the heart means what comes naturally.

Now, Jesus was a very clever guru. And in order to get people to have the law come naturally. He parroted the law imposed, and he did this in the gospel of Matthew, which is never read correctly.

You know how it begins with the Beatitudes.

And when he says blessed are the pure in heart, in much higher ups, in Greek means happy, not blessed in the sort of unctuous sense of which that word as an English, it means happy.

My kairos are the pure. It doesn't mean the people who don't tell dirty jokes. Pure means clear, transparent. Hip, aware, not hung-up. Now, he then does a very strange thing.

He says. I have not come to destroy the nonprofit's. Not to destroy, but to fulfill.

For I tell you, that not one ornamental serif or punctuation mark shall be taken away from the law until the end of the world. Therefore, you've got to obey all those forms.

The the scribes and the Pharisees pride themselves because they obey the law very thoroughly. But you must be more righteous than they are. Unless your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and the Pharisees. You will not be able to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

So to underline this and exemplified you have heard it said of all time. There are series now of crimes. One is to be angry with your brother. Another crime is to call him something that would correspond to our way of saying to a person, you bastard. Another way would correspond to our way of saying to someone, you're a fool. Now, obviously, to be very angry is the major crime.

So what he does is he reverses the order of courts. We might say we have a magistrates court. Or let's say we have the Marin County courts in San Rafael. We have the state of California Superior Courts in San Francisco and we have the federal courts leading up to the Supreme Court. Now what he does is a funny thing. He switches the order. The for the major crime, which is being really angry, he assigns you to the lowest court. For this, the minor crime, which is calling someone a fool, he assigns you to the major court, which is held fire Gana.

And then if you keep reading on in the Gospel, you know, everybody reads in the King James Bible, whoever says thou fool shall be in danger of

hellfire. And because they instead of using quotation marks, it uses a capital letter for the beginning of what would ordinarily be in quotes? People think the sayings are full means calling God a fool. It doesn't mean that at all. It means if you read it in Greek. Myra in the vocative means fool thing to some your brother, fool, you shall be in danger of hellfire.

But later on in the same gospel, he addresses the whole crowd and uses the same expression in the plural. My right. You fools and blind, following blind guys.

You see. He doesn't even obey his own precepts, so his precept must be taken, ironically. He's a humorist here. He's saying, you Pharisees, you you think you're so great because you obey the law.

Now, look, I'm going to give you a law. And you obey that other words, it's the technique of reductio ad absurdum because what does he do next?

He says you've heard it said of old time. That. You shall not commit adultery.

Ha-ha. Did I tell you that anybody who looks at a woman to lust after her has already committed adultery in his heart?

So all these pious fakes think, oh, we shouldn't have lustful thoughts about women. That's awful.

Who doesn't have lustful thoughts about women? You don't always have to act them out. So then he goes on in this joke. Therefore, if your eye offends you, you know, you. You looked at that girl and kind of thing, pluck it out.

Has a better view that you enter into the kingdom of heaven with one eye rather than I have to go into hell with two eyes.

You know, really, this these ministers, these theologians have absolutely no humor at all. Well, the whole thing is a joke.

So likewise, your adversary wants to take away your coat, give him your cloak also. You're gonna be so he says, you know God. It's absolute

perfection. Makes his son to shine on the evil on the good and sends his reign on the dust and on the unjust. You do the same thing. Well, nobody can.

Can you love your enemies? Can you take no thought for the morrow? Can you be as carefree as the birds and the bees? Can you really sincerely love God and your neighbor with all your heart, with all your soul and all your mind? Who can?

Here's the thing he's doing. He challenges he throws this whole thing at you as a koan, pretending it's a commandment. And everybody in Christianity has tried sincerely to obey these things, except that every minister gives up on that take no thought for the morrow. Britain says it's not practical. Why? So the meaning of it is it is to. You shall love God. You shall love your neighbor. And no faking, please.

That is a fake. Come on. It's a test. It's a, it's a reduction ad absurdum of the whole idea of law. Of enforced goodness, because one must obey out of fear of divine power.

Because if you obey out of the fear of divine power, your actions are not significantly moral. Their actions are significantly moral only if they are done out of love, and love would not be motivated by fear. How are we to love?

You can't love. Possibly, not possibly why you while you still think you're an ego.

Why you still think you're separate from other people in the rest of the world. You can't love it all. How then do you overcome being an ego? Why? Obviously you can only overcome it if you in some experimental way find out, that the ego is a delusion. So therefore, Jesus proposes as a way of finding out that your ego is an illusion, that you live up to these ideals.

Now, I can go on further. I don't know if anybody reads the Bible anymore. Whether this means anything to you. St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans has an argument which is very clever. He says that God did not give Moses

the law with the expectation that it would be obeyed. Indeed, he says, I learned sin through the law. I had not known covetousness except the law had said thou shalt not covet.

Then he poses this funny problem. Shall we then sin that grace may abound. This is I don't know, heaven forbid. Methu Cannito bias and now look. The reason why God gave the law was to convict us of sin. It was not in the expectation that the law would be obeyed, but only to show us how far short we fell of the Divine Life.

So, exactly the same reasoning this therefore applied to the precepts of Jesus. Not given in the expectation that they would be obeyed, but in the expectation that through trying to obey them, we would discover that we were in a mess of some kind. That we couldn't obey them.

Well, why not? Why can't you do it? Why can't you love? Really, genuinely, completely. The answer is you are hung up. On the idea that you are. A separate ego. Cut off alone.

You really believe you're that? So let's test this ego out by trying to get it to do this and trying to get it to do that, all those things it's supposed to be capable of doing. You discover that you're not capable of doing them. And the reason you're not capable of doing them is that you as a separate individual don't exist.

You're a hallucination in that sense, and that's what has to be discovered. You can't find that out by just telling people that itself. They won't believe it.

You can only dissolve an illusion by getting people to act on it as if it were true and act on it consistently, persistently and thoroughly when it all falls apart. It doesn't work.

So in this way, Jesus is using a guru technique...where like a Zen master gives a koan. What is the sound of one hand?

Who are you authentically and genuinely before your father and mother see you? Show me. In other words, act perfectly sincerely. Without any social

conditioning, what your parents told you you were?

Nobody can do it. Why can't they do it? Because there's no authentic separate you.

When you find that out naturally, you know that what you really are is your one with the universe, like Jesus would say, I am the father are one. Before Abraham was I am. I am the way, the truth and the lie is what you really are.

Only then the whole Christian church managed to circumvent this and shut it up. It was too true to be good. And they said I only Jesus was the way, the truth and the life. Not you, baby. Not you. Not you.

But in a way, that's put such a burden on Western man. And it's taken just under two thousand years to see through it and the change is coming. Everybody is beginning to realize. What the whole trick was about. Jesus, you see, was an individual who got enlightened. Only he knew it was in the context of the Hebrew world, and he had the puzzle of how to express his state of consciousness in terms of his own time.

He couldn't very well come out and say directly, I've just discovered that I'm the Lord God. Not in a context of Jewish theology. Because of the political imagery.

If he said in the context of Jewish theology, I am the Lord God, that would have been like saying you all should bow down and worship me. When some people, including many of his disciples, caught on that he was indeed the Lord God, that was their response. They bowed down and worshiped him when he tried to turn them off that, saying, why do you call me good? There is none. Good God.

And why he insistently prevented them from the political involvement, which was that if he was truly the son of God, which means simply son of means, that the nature of, why didn't he lead the revolution against the Roman Empire? He threw all that aside as a temptation in exactly the same way as the Buddha threw aside all magical powers. And said don't. That's a sidetrack, that doesn't lead to understanding.

When the Buddha was walking along a stream Monday, there was a yogi, who suddenly started walking across the water, because of his miraculous powers and the Buddha said to him, hey, hey, hey, come back. There's a Ford just 50 yards up the river.

So in the same way, Jesus would not give signs of divine dominance to those who asked for them. But the church in later times, you see has put him on a pedestal, so that the whole doctrine is rendered ineffective. Just like that. And has tried and tried and tried and tried to insist that these commandments: You must love God. You must take no thought for the morrow. It's tried equivalently at that to say these are commands, and you ought to feel terribly guilty because you don't love God with all your heart. You do take thought for the morrow. You don't really trust in God.

For 2000 years, it's taken to realize that, maybe Jesus had a sense of humor. It was ironical. Was trying to get his students disciples to realize they were just as much incarnations of God as he was because he said. When? They Jews took up stones to stone him. This again in the gospel of St. John. They said many good works I have shown you. What do you do?

And they said, we don't stone you for a good work, but for blasphemy, because you being a man, make yourself God. And he replied, Is it not written in your law, quote, I have said you are God's. And he's quoting the 83rd psalm, it says, you are gods and the children of the most high. But you shall die like men.

He said if, I say I am a son of God, which means son of in Hebrew or in Arabic, it means of the nature of when you say we say you're a son of a bitch.

It means you're, you're bitchy.

So when they say Ebony killed, which means son of a dog, Ebony El Omar, son of a donkey or son of below the mean off the nature of so son of God means like son of a bitch. And in the opposite way, your divine.

It has nothing to do with paternity. It's simply an expression.

So when he said, if I say I am a son of God. And then the King James translation, it's all lost up by going. I am the son of God, which is not in the original Greek. Simply, I am a son of God. So you, only you can't realize this, that you're a son of God while you're still hooked up on the idea of legal righteousness, that you can, by the effort of your own separate conscious will do the divine act. You have to let go of yourself. You have to abandon that situation before you can be enthused. Transformed and inflamed with the divine spirit. So what he does throughout that whole Sermon on the Mount is to make a caricature of legal righteousness.

One of the funniest ways in which he did this was in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. This is most ingenious. He tells a story, see of the Pharisee goes into the temple.

Go straight up to the front seat, stands up before the altar and says, Oh, God, I am not as other men are. I have paid my tithes regularly. I fulfill this obligation. I feel that that obligation and I'm feeling very good about it.

You know, just like the senior warden of the vestry in the Episcopal Church or a Knight of Columbus, then they says this publican, who a disreputable character creeps into the back of the synagogue, beats himself on the breast and says, God, be merciful to me as the.

I tell you that that man went down to his house justified rather than the Pharisee.

Now what happened? Everybody tries to imitate the public. Now the Pharisees creep into the back of the church, beat themselves on the breast and say, God, be merciful to me a sinner, because they think that's the way to do it.

Now you see telling that story has an effect. It has taken away the possibility of being the genuine publican as distinct from the phony Pharisee, because now the moment you are trying to be genuine, you're being phony.

And I don't know. I've never seen anybody except, I think Roddick whose, whose writing on this showed me the idea who saw through what a subtle

teacher Jesus was. But you have to read between the lines. You have to get the humor of it. You have to get all the plays that are going on in this. Because he is fully aware of the effect that his stories have on his audience.

Well, they didn't know what to do with it. They just had to get rid of it. First of all, the problem of the death of God. Theology. And secondly, the problem of whether the Jewish and Christian traditions can be in some way revived. Today, I am going to talk about the future of religion in the first session from a social point of view. And in this afternoon session from an individual point of view.

And what we are going to look at is a rather strange idea, which Frederick Spiegelberg, who has taught the history of religions at Stanford for many years, calls the religion of no-religion.

Curious thing that has many aspects to it. He wrote a very interesting book about it years ago, which has unfortunately sort of disappeared from the market.

I met Spiegelberg in 1936, originally as a refugee from Hitler in England.

And he had just come out with the idea of the religion of no religion. And it immediately struck a responsive chord in me because I was involved with the study of Zen which in a way is the religion of no religion. In Zen, for example. A famous story tells of one of the monks who was pestering his teacher as to how he was making progress in his study of Zen? And the teacher said, you're all right, but you have a trivial fault.

And what is that? He said you have too much as zen.

Well, the student said, don't you take it for granted that a person who is studying Zen would be interested in it, thinking about it, talking about it. And he said the teacher said no. It turns one's stomach.

So another monk who was standing by said, well, why does it? Why is this? He said, when it's like an ordinary, everyday conversation, it's much better. And so it has been a principle of Zen, throughout its whole history, that if somebody asks you a religious question, you give a secular answer. What is

the ultimate meaning of Buddhism? There's enough breeze in the sand to keep me cool. Or if somebody says. Why do you have a fan? The answer is. See, that's a secular question. So the answer is this fan will ascend to the 15th heaven and hit the nose of the presiding deity. The answer is sacred.

There is a Latin saying from the poet Lucretius. Tanto, really, Gil Berkowitz, father in Malone.

Too much religion is apt to encourage evil.

And so somehow, always I'm suspicious of religious people.

When somebody comes on with a great deal about idealism and what you ought to do and this and that.

I know he's a rascal, but when I meet someone who from the very beginning of our association admits that he's a rascal, I feel safer.

And that's the reason why when men are friendly with each other, I don't know about women because that's their private world and I'm not privy to it. That men who are fond of each other. Call each others bastards and all sorts of uncomplimentary names. Hey, you son of a bitch, how you doing? See?

That means that we recognize that we have in common something which in Hebrew theology is called the yetzer hara. This word in Hebrew means the wayward spirit, and it, according to Hebrew theology, when God created Adam in the beginning of time, he put in his heart the yet Saharan. And that was, in other words, a predisposition to be ornery, to be difficult, to be non-cooperative, to go off on his own in some way.

Christians don't admit this. They have no doctrine of the yetzer hara. Which is why Hebrews has more humor in religion than Christians do. There are some exceptions to this. For example, G.K. Chesterton, the great Catholic, had wonderful humor and some Catholics have this. But by and large, the Christian religion is serious about the Hebrew religion has always a slight twinkle to it.

If you see a play like the Fiddler on the Roof of the Hebrew can talk to God on kind of a man to man basis. But the Christian is always cowering fundamentally. Too big a load of guilt because of not admitting not realizing that it was God himself who was responsible for the way witness of human nature for the Sahara. I call the Sahara in English. Translation The element of irreducible rascality that is in us all.

And Young spoke of this a great deal when he called, when he addressed himself to the problem.

Of the assimilation of the evil in us. Once upon a time, Young met a man in whom he could find no human failing whatsoever. And this man seriously disturbed him. He said that I have at last met a genuine saint, and he was so worried that he thought that he should take his own life in order and reform himself. He said a few days later, I met the man's wife. Never again have I been subject to this temptation, not because his wife is the sort of person who said, well, you should try and live with my husband. That wasn't the idea at all.

It was that his wife contained the Saints shadow-side. He drove her to desperation. Because she had to reflect all the repressed things in her husband. So if you only saw through it. And never again was tempted to be a saint. I have a most amusing friend who lives with me here on this boat. The artist Joel Varda, and he is always in danger of being beguiled by saints. Someone comes around who is sure is a completely saintly person. And then suddenly there's a frightful disillusionment. It always turns out that that wasn't that way at all. So one has to be very suspicious of all pretensions to goodness. And the sanctity, because they do not recognize the yet, Sara, or the element of irreducible rascality that is in his all.

And this then is why. Preaching, [the] preached religion is a failure. The whole lesson of history is that preaching doesn't work. That preaching is really a form of moral violence. Of trying to change human conduct by saying 'Look, if you don't mend your ways, those are going to be a terrible thing happen.'

Either the police are going to catch you or hellfire, which is, of course, the celestial police force is going to catch you. Or a dreadful doom is going to

occur. You realize that before the Second World War, beginning with remark book all quiet on the Western Front, there was an enormous propaganda against war based on the horrors of war.

And in Japan, they had innumerable movies taken during the First World War, which was an unbelievably brutal Holocaust, where there was British and French generals really sacrificed men. Do you know that on the day that the armistice was declared and the victory was announced for the allied forces when the commanding officers ordered three cheers for His Majesty the King?

A great many of the men blew raspberries instead. It was an absolutely inhuman thing. Well, the Japanese had all these very uncensored photographs and movies, but this did not deter the Japanese from trying it themselves. Because horror, the doom, has a fascination for everybody. The same thing, kind of vertigo, which one gets looking over a precipice, the temptation to jump.

I know a young man. I did know him. He's dead. He had tried everything.

He had tried all possible changes of consciousness, all possible drugs and experiments. And finally, he did something to die. And I am sure I know why. He had to find out what death was about. It found out everything else. But he was completely fascinated, and so always when you paint the picture of doom. Say this is what's going to happen to you if you are simply asking for trouble. People will go to their tombs.

And so the preaching lesson is no good. The only way to change human behavior is to woo. Instead of preach. To make love, instead of threatening disaster. To point out how glorious something could be. And in some way to live it. And this is the real. If it has any meaning and if it has any guts, do it. The idea of make love, not war, would be, to live here and now, starting today, a magnificent life. And you don't need a great deal of money to do it. You need more imagination than money. I know innumerable people who've got lots and lots of money and were absolutely miserable because they have no imagination and they are full of fears because of their wealth. They always think someone's going to take it away and instead of, now, will I starve? Will I get sick? There's no protection against that. Who knows

when anything strikes, when any accident strikes. We have no real defense against that.

So from a social point of view, the important thing in religion is no longer preaching the possibility of doom, because nobody is threatened by doom, doom doesn't deter anyone because we know we're all doomed anyway. Why rub it in? We're all going to die.

And of course the Christians and the Islamic people. And to some extent, the Hindus and Buddhists tried to rub it in and say, you think death is the bad thing here. You just wait till when you are dead. Because we've got eons of time in which you can be tortured in our very special hells. Stop and consider that! Well, everybody read about us, it's like people think about the atom bomb.

Nobody is any more deterred by thinking about that. We're so used to it. And at the same time, it's inconceivable. Is there nothing anyone can do about it? There is no way of defending San Francisco against an atomic attack.

So therefore, everybody stops thinking about it, because it's insoluble.

So the terror thing does nothing, if anything at all, that we would say, OK, let's get it over with. So we don't have to dread this anymore, push the button. And end [it].

So what is necessary to do instead and not for any reason that there might be death and hell at last.

But to get up the nerve to live the joyous, good life today. Using imagination rather than money. And the difficulty for Jews and Christians in particular. Other people have difficulties, too. But the difficulty for them is their feeling that if you do presume to live the good life today, you will make the gods mad.

Years is like saying it, people, you may well laugh now.

But you just wait. What's going to happen to you.

So then we we have to see an enormous terror of pleasure. Of enjoying ourselves. Because when we enjoy ourselves, we feel guilty. We know I mean, if you eat a good dinner, there's an obscure feeling that somebody somewhere is not having a good day. Therefore, what right have you to enjoy your dinner when somebody's going hungry? Well, what are you going to do about that? If it just gives you a bad digestion, because you can't assimilate your own dinner that does no one any good. It doesn't do the hungry person any good. It doesn't do you any good.

Guilt, in other words, is an absolutely 100 percent destructive emotion.

And one of the real reasons why people don't do anything about the hungry, and something could be done about it. Is there guilt hangup? They'd rather be guilty than practical. It's perfectly possible to abolish starvation throughout the world. People would spend as much energy doing that as they would do, motivated by groundless fears, getting together to cooperate, to defend themselves against the unspeakable threat of yellow communism or something like that.

It is to me absolutely unbelievable, the wealth that is wasted and poured into projects of violence. When any practical person. Would have seen that for half the cost. You could have everybody.

In Asia, all the millions of Chinese, Vietnamese, Hindus living a nice, prosperous life for half the cost of what is taking to defend ourselves against the alleged menace.

But it is curious you see, that people will be united for reasons of terror. Not for reasons of love. And yet the union, the associations they form to defend themselves against an alleged terror are, in the end, always and invariably destructive. They solve nothing and build up massive historical hatreds.

So, if there is to be any sort of future for religion, it's one of the most obvious lessons of history that it must stop preaching, and do something else. I was a minister in the Episcopal Church, I was a university chaplain at Northwestern for five years. Finally, when I got through with it, the thing that embarrassed me most of all was preaching.

You see the problem of being a minister. You have your color turnaround. So is that once you set yourself up in that position, people look at you and say they start respecting you. Cops don't give you tickets. They give you a discount at the liquor store. Oh, you get all these funny little privileges. And why? Well, people would say you're living vicariously for us. The good life that we don't live. See?

Now, what does that mean? It means essentially this: that you don't screw around, that's all. And that's all.

Because if you take the practical test, what do the churches do socially today? They are not interested in anything. They are not interested in mysticism. They're not interested in God. They're not interested in abolishing poverty.

A few of them are: the Quakers. A few people get mad about war and really try to do something. But by and large, all the churches are doing is they are family and sexual regulation societies. And the truth of the matter is the test for what can a preacher get kicked out? For owning shares in an armaments corporation, General Dynamics, not on your life.

You can live, as I say, quoting the litany of the Church of England in a state of envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitable in hardness of heart and contempt of God's word and commandment and be a bishop in good standing. But the minute you sleep with your secretary, you're out. That's the test.

After all, even sleeping with somebody in a written irregular way is a loving thing to do. It's not a hateful thing to do. It's an action of affection. However, whatever rationalization you may bring forth to show that it shouldn't be done. Jesus certainly, regarded it as one of the minor sins and was far more angered by the money changers and that courts of the temple than he was about the woman taken in the sin of adultery. And yet this is magnified. This is the thing.

So this whole position, of a religion geared to repression.

Essentially, what it is Freud was right. But Freud didn't have the courage of his convictions. This is why Norman Browne's book, *Life A Life Against Death* is such a marvelous piece of work as here you'll get a very sophisticated classical scholar putting forward the preposterous notion that repression is a bad thing. And he's he's advocating it with all the the historical knowledge and literary expertise of a professor of his standing. [It's] very funny indeed.

Not in so far then, as our religion has been repressive. It has one thing to be said for it.

And the moment you understand this, the bubble is broken. The one thing that can be said for repression is the tighter the squeeze, the stronger the jet. And so in a way, sex has been made more exciting by making it forbidden. [But] that's the purpose.

In other words, in the way if we go back to the origins of Christianity in Rome, the civilization of Rome, where depending on your social level, you had different kinds of sex life. You if you could, if you were rich enough to attend the baths, you could have anything you wanted. Plenty of it. If you weren't rich enough to go to the bars, you had the circus. And in the circus, you could be entertained with any kind of sadism, masochism, weird bestiality and goings on.

Finally, everybody got sexually flaccid, and therefore the revolution of Christianity to stop all this with eventually a disgust for sex, was a biological process. However rationalized theologically, it was a biological process to restore sexual interest by making it forbidden. Only they didn't know it. But once you see that, you see, you can see what Christianity did, what its function was. But also you can see that it went too far. Instead of simply recreating interest in sex by making it forbidden, it warped all sorts of people's lives because they didn't have any sexual delight without guilt at all. And it created what is called lever sex which is a sadomasochistic women in black boots and all that kind of thing. And that's again, where love through its frustration turns into violence. And where orgasm is confused with pain.

There's always that possibility, you see, we, our getting our wires crossed. For example, many people who have got their wires crossed in their heads when they see something that excites sexual excitement. They feel the emotion or the sensation of disgust. Because they can't distinguish the nauseating feeling of I want to vomit. They can't clearly distinguish that from the orgiastic feeling of I want to convulse. They've got their wires crossed so they feel disgust. Then they should be feeling lost. That's what we call being mixed up.

So then, from a social point of view, it's it seems to me obvious that a social community must have a religion. And above all, a religion about which we all agree. There's no point in having a religion about which we don't agree. I mean, you know, you have the Baptist Church, the Episcopal Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the synagogue, Jehovah's Witnesses and all these people fighting with each other. And playing their various one-upmanship games with each other and the vast majority of the public who couldn't care less. Don't go anyway. So there is no religion today.

We've got all these survivals from the past and they fight with each other. To belong to a religion today is to my mind, not intellectually respectable. Because all you do when you join a church. You become a divisive force. This is where Krishnamurti is so clear and marvelous in his discussion of this problem. He shows again and again. He asks people, you want to believe in a God. You want to believe in a life beyond death. Why? Why really do you want to believe this? And he drums it in and drums it in. He says the reason is you want to protect yourself. And so long as you're trying to protect yourself, you have put up a shell between you and everything you define as not being you.

And for this reason, then all your beliefs are simply sources of strife and disharmony. And then he puts himself in a very odd position. Because you can't be a disciple of Krishnamurti. You can't join anything. He has no organization. And so he's surrounded with non-disciples.

And he gets terribly frustrated. Because he keeps seeing that the people who follow him and who come and listen to him, they just don't understand what he is trying to get across. The smart people would leave, you know, they would get the word and disappear. How fast can you get out? But they think

that there's still some special secret he's got up his sleeve. And if they hang around long enough, they'll get it. They won't. He said everything right from the start. So then, we cannot or that much as there is need for a religion in society. A religion which believes in something won't work. Because the moment you put out a belief. People start to argue. The moment you lay down a law, people start to argue.

Should it be this way? Should it be that way? Then there's this group that says we think it should be this, that you should eat meat. Then the other group says, no, you shouldn't eat meat. And so they start yammering at each other. So there is a possibility then, that there could be an entirely different basis of religion.

Let's think of some things that we agree about and don't argue about. There's a pretty close agreement among people living in the United States of whatever racial origin to speak the English language. Because no one enforces it. People don't go around saying you will be damned forever if you split an infinitive. Or if you use the word baluka instead of cup, nobody fights about that. Therefore, more or less, everybody agrees to talk English. It's convenient. Another thing that we don't fight much about is music. There are indeed some parties in music. There are people, the classical people that are the rock people, there are the jazz people or the barbershop quartet people.

But there's a pretty easy tolerance about this. We don't really take people to law. And to get the cops after them because they differ in musical tastes from us. Oh, well, well, well, there's plenty of room now music. Is something, therefore, about which people can unite. With no argument. What is there to argue about?

You just get with it and you swing.

So then this indicates to me that the only possibly a harmonious religion for mankind could be one which has in it no ideology. It would have no doctrines. So there would be nothing to argue about. In the principle of Zen is always, of course.

Instead of theorizing about what is the nature of the universe to point directly. And say if you want to understand, see into it directly. In other words, here I am talking anyway, look into the nature of life without thinking. And see for yourself that when you don't think, you don't make any division between yourself and the rest of the world.

You cannot point to the distinction between your five fingers. You can't lay your finger on the difference between your fingers, and in the same way, you cannot touch the difference between yourself and someone else. The difference is a concept. A propriety. A churlish propriety that. This is mine, this is yours. Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

But when you stop the theorizing, you stop the thinking, then you don't divide. Then the world is what Buddhists call in its state of such-ness, just like that. So then it is for this reason that if there were to be a religion about which people could really unite, it would have to have no, no doctrine. No law. That is put in words. But people could unite. Around what we might at the moment call a nonsense religion.

I call it hun. Hun. Which is the religion that is starting. It has no hierarchy. Nobody's in charge. No offices. No organization. It has no doctrine. It doesn't say any words that mean anything. It has only music and ritual.

Because people like to get together and dance according to the Hindus, the whole universe is the dance of the Godhead. [So] join in. Get with it. And so this is what we need in American life in particular.

We don't have any joyous social assemblage.

Figure that we don't. You may occasionally go to a nightclub, at a price to dance on a small little tiny floor and really not much fun.

There is no dancing in the streets. Why it would be considered somehow subversive.

There is no pageantry except the occasional military pageantry on the Fourth of July. There is absolutely no occasion upon which anyone and everyone, as people who live on this geographical expression called the

United States. There is no occasion on which we get together for a kind of ritual of mutual agreement and love and so on. Doesn't exist.

That's what the rites of a religion were supposed to be. They were the orgies. We think now we misuse the word orgy. We think orgy means simply and all the sexual rules are suspended. Did you do anything you like? That's because we've made such a big repression out of sex. The real meaning of the orgy, it goes back to the idea that God created the world in six days and then took the seventh day off. That's the holiday, which means holy day. So we have the Sabbath for the Jews and the sun for the Christians. But what did they don't take a day off. They don't really celebrate. When I was a minister, I used to tell the students at Northwestern University.

Now I'm going to be a celebration of the Holy Communion. Seven o'clock makes Sunday. Eleven o'clock. I said, now look, I said celebration. And if you come here because you think you ought to come, we don't want you. Better stay in bed. Go for a swim or something else.

But if you want to join with us in this act of celestial woooopee, you're very welcome. I came right out and said that I see. So I had to leave the church.

This is this is the essential thing that we lack. We just don't have the social institution. And it's, we would find each other out. For example, let me tell you this story. There was once a retreat meeting for Christians of many different denominations for a discussion of how they could get together. Well, the first time they held this meeting, they talked and they all argued and it was a nothing came of it. So they decided to do a different the next way they would spend the first day of the conference in total silence, which they did.

And then the following meeting, they really got to understand each other because they associate it together in a non verbal, non discursive way to begin with. With no ideology, no theories.

And then they could at last see each other as living human beings and expressions of the divine nature, et cetera, et cetera, and know it. Instead of merely thinking.

So what we should do if we want to get together the various discordant religions and races and whatsoever, is suspend all discussions. And meet in a strictly physical, earthy way, and realize, that what is the very earthy what is the very physical is, after all, not different from not separate from the spiritual. This is the terrible hang up of Western men, this distinction of the physical and the spiritual. They are the same.

One might say that the spiritual is more concrete than matter.

Now, that's the kind of a tricky, paradoxical saying, and mystics are always putting out tricky, paradoxical things. But a paradox is a truth standing on its head to attract attention.

When you say, is it real, most people mean, is it hard? See, the sense, in other words, that reality is, is the concrete. But spirits like ghosts aren't very concrete and they move right through walls. So I've often wondered how a body can be moved by a spirit.

This is one of the great philosophical problems, but because the thickets that what is the very hard.

From one point of view. Why is matter hard? Because it's moving so fast. When you get an airplane propeller going, you can't put your finger through it. It resists you more solidly than a wall of granite. These student push against leaning on the wall of granite. You sure can't lean on an airplane propeller. [It would] knock you to bits.

But let's get that propeller going still faster. Much faster. Why? It doesn't even have time to catch you. It becomes a wall of granite. You can't get through it. So all matter is in such tremendously fast agitation. That when you lean on it, it's it's hard.

But that's because it's so alive, it's going so fast. So energy and matter. The more energy, the more matter. The more spirit, the more matter. They come from the same thing.

So the thing is that when we realize this when we stop our thoughts and stop our ideas and come to it without without thinking.

We have a basis for agreement. We will never agree. So long as we talk. That's why talking never leads to any conclusions.

People sit around, you know, you always remember how to spell committed to M's, two T's and two E's because they always discuss everything at least twice, and it's interminable.

Now, there are two ways out. You see of this dilemma. On the one hand, you can say, all right, the talking is over. Let's fight.

Because we are so frustrated and we are so sick of this argument that the only thing is to hit people.

Nobody ever suggested the other alternate. When talking comes to an end, let's make love. Might work.

In this morning's seminar, I was talking about the religion of no religion. From a social point of view, I said that this afternoon I would talk about it from an individual or personal point of view. And I was suggesting that society as a cohesive force needs a religion what we call today religions, act simply as divisive forces around which we play all kinds of one-upmanship games. And therefore, if there would be a religion which was socially univ instead of divisive.

It would have to be one without doctrines and without organization. In other words, one of the real problems of organized religion today is its commitment to real estate.

You may have read an article by Bishop Pike in Playboy. About taxing the churches. And I'm highly in favor of taxing the churches, even though I run a nonprofit organization.

Point is that our nonprofit organization is educational and if we don't own enormous blocks of real estate out of which we derive income by virtue of being a nonprofit organization or we own is what we need to operate with. So nobody wants to tax the church building, but they want to tax the hotels, the apartments, the stores, the enormous real estate, including 51 percent of the Stock of United Fruit owned by the Catholic Church and other organizations of a similar nature, which they can own tax free. And have

this as a separate income as distinct from that which is given by their regular contributors.

So as I as I said in this previous session, I've always wanted to preach a sermon at the laying of the foundation stone of a church, where I would take the text from the Bible if a man's son asked him bread, will he give him a stone?

The answer is yes. That's what you've got. It's no joke that when Peter acknowledged Jesus as the Christ. He said thou art Peter, which in Greek means stone. Petrus, Petrified. Now, Peter, and upon this rock, I will build my church. As I've explained, Jesus was a great utter of koans.

And this was one of the best cavos us in Hebrew, Peter means same thing. Rock. And the good disciple. Is always the rock upon which the church founders. The church, one foundation of. You know, it's always the good disciple who ruins the teaching. Because he is a follower. Because he doesn't have it in himself. He therefore follows somebody else.

And anyone, therefore, who is a really effective guru always separates his students from himself. And sets them free, so that you don't have to say, oh, I am a follower of this man and that man, and the other thing. No, go free. Don't founder upon the rock.

And therefore, this is the case of the religion of no-religion. There is a saying in Latin about religion. Christianity, of course, revolves around the symbolism of the cross. And in Latin, it is said Crooks Medi Chino Mundi, the cross, the medicine of the world. Now, never make your medicine a diet.

One shot is enough. And that's goes not only for religion but for LSD, for all these things, don't make it a diet.

Once you've I don't say literally one time, but enough of it to see, and that's it. If after that you keep coming back, it means you never got the point. So in Zen, there is the saying, To know your original mind, to understand your essential nature, that is the great disease of our school.

In other words, to have some thing, that is religion and that is special and that it is over and above everyday experience, and to insist on that, is a disease. It means you're playing games.

[You're] wanting to one up yourself and everybody else by saying, well, we have an in on something here that you don't have. We know what it's really all about. And you outsiders. Well, you may be all right. You may be Muslims, you may be Hasidic Jews, you may be philosophers or Christian scientists, and therefore, as a result of that, you have a partial glimpse of the truth.

But we, of course, is the real insiders have the whole thing.

Or put down that is. And everybody does it.

So what are we to do? What are what what a predicament? Supposing we say now our school here says that you don't have to do all that. You don't have to play one-upmanship. You don't have to have anything special.

Last time almost I met Suzuki. Not San Francisco's Suzuki, but Japan's Suzuki He signed his name Bujimin, which means a man who is nothing special. Now, what was Suzuki doing? Was he making a special case as himself, as a man who was nothing special? This phrase buji in Japanese or Wu Shu in Chinese means no business, no fuss, no special claim, no nothing important.

And this is used as a characteristic flavor of a person who is experienced in Zen.

But then all the Zen people who have learned to be nothing special, to be natural, to constitute themselves a particular class of one upping everybody else. Well, they do that.

Now, what if they didn't do it? Nobody would know they were around. I think the best psychotherapist I know is a man who teaches photography. Nobody knows he's a psychotherapist, and he has saved the sanity in the lives of seriously disturbed people that I've known just by teaching them how to take pictures.

No claim, to be anything special. Marvelous. But I'm not going to give his name out because that would spoil the whole show.

Now, here is the predicament of what is called in Buddhism, the Bodhisattva. They make a distinction in Buddhist philosophy between a body staffer and a project, a Buddha. Pratyekabuddha means a private Buddha. That is to say, somebody who gets enlightenment, who sees through all the markers of life, all the illusions, who attains the final awakening. And then he sits down and enjoys it. The bodhisattva feels, however, that he can't sit down and enjoy it unless everybody else is in on it. And so he comes back into the world looking like an ordinary, everyday person. And through doing this helps everybody else to become enlightened. But how is he to get it across? Without making a little difference, and saying, well, listen to it this way in the form of a Zen story.

A man came to become a monk at a Zen monastery and the master said to him. Where do you come from?

And he said gave the name of his hometown a village. He said, what did you then do?

He said, I was a cowherd. How did you take care of the cows? He said in the morning I took them out into the fields and in the night I restored them to the pen. And the master said, splendid is your ignorance. In other words, here is the perfectly ordinary human being doing his stuff.

Now in a certain way, the highest enlightened human being is exactly like that, but there is some funny kind of a difference. And the whole quality of this difference is that it mustn't look too different. [Here's] another Zen poem says it is like the salt and water and the glue in ink.

Chinese ink as glue in it to hold this stick together. But the salt and water and the glue in ink, they're invisible. Yet you can taste the salt and water. And the transparent glue holds the ink stick together. So there's some kind of a difference between ordinary, everyday life with its anxieties, attachments and problems, and something that looks exactly like ordinary, everyday life. But doesn't have the anxieties.

Let me press that just one step further, if you will allow me. You are still anxious if you're anxious about being anxious. See? You say, well, I feel a guilty every time I'm anxious, as I really ought to be spiritually evolved enough not to have any further anxieties. And so at last I find myself with a neurotic problem. So if you find with the great masters that I've known in Zen. They don't have that hang up at all. They're not afraid to admit that they have toothaches and I have to go to the dentist. No. It's a nuisance that. Sometimes get hot and bothered and lose their tempers and are just human like everybody else.

And so you could very well say. You might almost be justified in saying to these masters, you're putting over a big hoax on us all

You are just like everybody else and you know it. And yet in another way, you're claiming to be special. Did you have some special inside information so that you're not a man of no special at all?

Bujimin. You're just a human beings, can't everybody else, although. In fact, you are a confidence man, that trickster. And the funny thing about this is that the word that is used in Buddhist philosophy for the method of enlightening people. Which is called Upaya. It means trickery.

When that word is used in politics in the political context empire, which means the skill of the teacher in Buddhism means trickery in politics, and the Buddhists laugh back at themselves and say, we are just tricksters, we are people who... Rinzai, the great Chinese master of Zen said My teaching is like using a yellow leaf to stop a child crying for gold, for an empty fist.

The empty fist trick. See, is you suddenly say to a child, what have I got here?

See, see, see? But it behind your back. And the more excited the child gets to find out what is in that fist. And after a long wrestle.

There's nothing in. Or when a child says, I want some gold.

You give it a yellow leaf.

So in the same way. The Zen teacher is saying, there is really nothing in Zen to be understood. The secret is the secret of life is that there is no secret.

Only you think there has to be a secret, and since you've insisted on the idea that I as a teacher have some secret.

OK, let's try the closed fist technique with you in every conceivable way. When you penetrate this closed fist and you find out there's nothing in it, then the teacher will bring on you another closed fist in a different form.

There is always a new koan following every other koan.

And you think, oh, maybe something that I ought to get through to. There's some special thing and when you suddenly find out that.

The whole trick is that there isn't anything to cling to. That is to say life is falling apart. It is a totally insecure situation. We'll accept it, for heaven's sakes, accept it and get with it. See, that's only the beginning of Zen study. Then they come up with something else. And you think, well, if I really honestly accepted my insecurity and had no hang ups at all, I would be capable of all sorts of miraculous performances.

Somebody leads you on to the idea that then you would acquire these psychic powers and be able to do these all super normal things. And you're intrigued. Maybe if I really understood. I would be as God. And so you hang around the master, who keeps fooling you.

Until in the end, you discover you don't need any miraculous powers. You don't need to be able to change water into wine. You don't need to be able to change lead into gold, because what you have is what you really want. Always. And if you want to put up an objection and say, I don't want it that way. That's because you want to object. You know, get with yourself. This is always the teaching and all these things that seem to hang out, some goal. Something you should pursue. Something you should be. Over and above what you are here and now at this moment. They're all tricks.

And the object of the tricks is to get you to see that here and now as you are. This moment is fine. Only, if you make that an objective. And they say, well, we here accept ourselves as we are here and now at this moment and all you common followers who don't really understand that you're kind of on the out. So you still haven't got it.

So then this is this is why always in the history of religion, there is the theme of the religion of being natural the religion of no religion. You don't need an idol. Because there is the living God.

It's only one step from that to say, as the Quakers say to the Catholics, 'Why do you have a sacrament?'

Why should the sacrament of the altar in this special service that you have in the mass? Be anything special? If you really understood Christianity, every meal would be the mass.

The Catholics turned back for the Quakers and say, yeah, that may be true, but when everybody is somebody that no one's anybody.

If you don't have a special meal that is the special mass, then everybody will forget that there was anything at all. In other words, they will come to a view of life where nothing is sacred.

There's that line in one of Bob Dylan's songs. It's pretty obvious that nothing around here is particularly sacred, and so the people who want to say no, no, no, no, no. Now, wait a minute. There must be something special, must be something sacred. We must set off a certain part of life. Hey, come off it now. We can't make everything common property. I am. Must be something special. Here. See? Specially guarded. You keep out. Well, what are you doing? Why? Obviously, by saying there's something special, something sacred. You keep out of this. That's your identity. That's your ego.

Then there are other people who come along and say, to hell with everything sacred. Oh, you're all just a bunch of crooks. That's another false technique. This is the Democratic parody of mysticism. Everybody is equally inferior. You're all a bunch of bastards fundamentally, you haven't

got anything you want to know. You do. You don't need any privacy. That's the life you live when you're in jail, when you're in a mental hospital or in the army. Where everybody is equally a shit.

But you see, that misses the point just as much in that direction as holding something sacred misses it in the other direction.

How can you be natural? See either, either of those two ways are unnatural. So the challenge which the teacher of Zen gives you is he's saying to you, OK. Be natural.

Now, so long as you feel that you have to prove that you're natural, he can defeat you. Because he can catch you off guard all the time. It's only when you feel that you don't have to prove that you're natural. That you can get by his tricks. Only. He's got this one underlying you. That you can say well I don't have to prove anything. And he says, well, what are you doing around here anyway? I mean, why? Why are you coming to see me? And then you're embarrassed you see. You're still out after something as if there was something to be. Something to awry that more than what you are. At this moment and what you are at this moment is, of course, the perfect expression of the universe in exactly the same way that the tree is or a fish's or a mountain or a star or anything else. Only it's because people don't believe this, that they do all their excessive things, that they have to have extra power, extra possessions, extra this, that and the other, they want to be loved more than anybody else because they don't know, don't realize that as you are at this moment, you're the complete works. And they don't want to know it, because the whole game is pretending you're not.

Hide and seek. So you're all right. Even when you're not all right. You see, you can think this in circles. You can go round and round with this with this game indefinitely and hang yourself up and hang everybody else up.

The meaning then is, that so long as we're dealing with ideas and with words and with everything we can say in words about realizing buddhahood and liberation. We never get there. Because there's always games within games, within games within games. So it's only as you get beyond words that the thing is clear. But so long as I say that in words, I'm designating a special class of people who get beyond words, when you're beyond words,

you're not in a special class of people. You are only so long as we're talking about it.

So then here's the problem that, for example, when people go and practice yoga or Zen or whatever, and they define themselves as such and such a group meeting at such and such a place, and they do this, that's the verbal side of the thing. And so long as that is going on, it must always seem that they are one upping other people were not in this in group. But on the other hand, the moment they are actually doing the yoga or the Zen meditation, they are not one-upping anyone. Because they're not they're not verbalizing. It is through verbalizing, through measuring, and so on, that you see that you dissect life and break it down into its separate parts and say this part is better than that. But when you're not doing that, it isn't happening. If somebody says, look, it's like supposing I say to you, everything in this world is relative.

You only know to be, in relation to not to be. You only know what it means to move in relation to stillness. You only know time, the measure of change in relation to a constant. So on. Then somebody comes and says to me, well, if you say everything is relative, then you are an absolute relativist.

I say, because so long as you think about it, you always go around in circles. Cos you can't conceive the idea of the relative without the idea of the absolute. But when you actually do the thing. And you don't verbalize it. That's a different situation.

And the people who are not verbalizing, who do indeed realize the suchness, the Buddha nature in all things. All those people. Can be talked about by others. And they can say, well, are you a special class? Are you a special in group, aren't you really making claims to something and they can't answer and say, no, we are not? Because if they say no, we are not. They say, well, then you're putting your class in the people who are on the class of non hypocrites and you are one upping everybody else who is a hypocrite by saying you're not a hypocrite.

So long as you talk, say this. This game goes on and on and on and on.

But if you genuinely are in the state where you don't think. And I must qualify this for anybody who came in on this discussion late. When I say you don't think, I don't mean that I'm an anti-intellectual. That there is a way of living your life all the time without ever thinking. It says the point is, rather, that it too get out of the game business of thinking.

Thinking you have to spend some of your time not thinking just in the same way as you have to spend some of your time not talking if you're going to listen to what other people have to say.

To have something to think about, you must sometimes not think. That is to say, you experience directly without symbolizing the experiences with words. In other words, to pick this up and not say to yourself, it's a beer can or it has beer in it. But with your hands and your eyes.

See? You know this directly. Whatever that is. And you don't make any comment about it. You can make a comment later. But if you're commenting all the time, you never in relation to it.

So then. I'm trying to say what you cannot say. Because so long as you talk about the class of people who know how to suspend thinking, how to relate to the world directly, how therefore to transcend the division between I and thou. Ego and universe. So long as you're talking about it, you always make those people a special class.

And as it were. Project upon them that they are playing the special game. I am holier than you are.

And that's religion.

The religion, we call it in the West, we say, oh, he yes, he has a religion, but it's a Sunday only religion.

He does this special activity goes and makes weird noises in a church on Sunday and listens to all sorts of sermons and loves his neighbor in the church, but when he gets back to work. His irreligious. It's just in a watertight compartment. So we know, don't we, that what his religion is

supposed to be identical with everyday life. But we don't get this across because we think of religion in a very narrow way as morality.

We say, all right. If this businessman is so religious that he never makes dirty deals, he never cheats anyone. He is always on the level with say he is truly practicing his religion. He is a genuine Christian. But this is only a fragment of it. It isn't a question of how you deal with the morals of business. What is the religious way of brushing your teeth? With 10 strokes on each position, you might say this is the devoted, determined way of brushing your teeth. But then I say this is still in the realm of moralism. Let's get beyond that. We've got to get beyond this point. All right.

There's a saying whatsoever thy hand find us to do do it with all my might. I went to a school in England, the motto of which was I gave them I use, which means in Latin, when you do it, do it. And this is either an awful platitude. Whatever worth doing is worth doing well. That's a terrible polarity. All the Protestant ethic is in that. But there's another sense to it.

Now, we can't say what it is. There's this other sense to argem arges. Which is not the moralistic sense, not the preacher's sense, not what you would say as a father to a boy or a mother to a daughter. You know, do your bit. A good scout. There is another sense to it and I cannot tell you what that other sense is. Until I stopped off. And then you can see the act that has done.

Without somebody commenting on it and saying this is the right way to do it, this is the wrong way to do it. This is really doing it. This is not really doing it. Because when you don't, you get into the nonverbal world. There is no difference between the act and the doer. There is no difference between the good and the bad.

There's no difference between, in other words, the secular and the sacred, the religious and non-religious. Once you step over the border. And that's why the entrance to this is, in Zen parlance, called the no-gate barrier, or the gate. This gate. Because it looks like a gate, a barrier. Something to be attained. Some entrance to a special in group, so long as you're standing outside it. But the moment you cross the border, the gate vanishes. So does the wall. And you see everybody at all. Everybody in the world as manifestations of the Buddha nature, or we'd say in western terms of the

divine power. And you see they're all just behaving marvelously in their ignorance. Splendid is your ignorance. So like Kabir, when he was an old man, he was a great Hindu, Buddhist, Mohammed and Mystic all rolled into one poet. He would look around and say, to whom shall I preach? Because he saw the beloved the divine face wherever he looked. He had no recommendations to make.

And so in the same way you see everyone as doing it in the same way as the pattern of the flag flapping in the wind out there is doing it. The waves are doing. Fronds of the trees are doing it.

What's so special about us that we aren't? Only, of course, if you want to make a difference.

Time and the Future

So this is the first of a series of four weekends devoted to the subject of the future. And each session is pretty much each weekend is pretty much self-contained. There's a certain continuity but it's moving towards the center point from various different points on a circumference. And in the first weekend this weekend, we are considering the subject of time and the whole concept of the future. And the point of departure that I would like to suggest to you is that time is a social institution and not a physical reality. There is, in other words, no such thing as time in the natural world the world of stars. And waters and mountains and clouds and living organism. There is such a thing as rhythm, rhythm of tides, the rhythm of biological processes. But time as such as a social institution. In the same way that language is, that number is. That concepts are. And all measurements; inches, meters, lines of latitude and longitude, all those things are social institutions all conventions the word Convention from the Latin convenere, to come together. To agree about something. To hold a convention. And that's of course, in its deteriorated sense, and we said something is clearly conventional That is to say you, needn't take it seriously.

Now of course, are we going to take time seriously that is the big question and it depends what you mean. If you don't understand the time is a convention of course you take it seriously. And you're driven by time. Time

is Money. Time is of the essence. And we do don't we live in a culture or a complex of cultures in the Western world where we are literally driven by time. If you read a book like Jules Henry's marvelous work Culture Against Man. He documents in the most extraordinary way to what extent this particular culture is driven. So that, even the psychologists have altered. The old fashioned word instincts, and now they call them drives. Because there's this feeling you've got to make that deadline is something that you've got to get to, and people feel driven even when. Something's going to happen you've got an appointment coming up and some people find that in a strange way unsettling they're so eager to make this thing also anxious about it that in-between time they can't do anything else they're incapacitated until it happens, until the blessed event or whatever occurs. That in the natural physical world, there is resuming there is motion. And time then obviously is a way of measuring motion. By comparing motion with some sort of constant. Now the constant in the question of time is a sec. Knocked out in three hundred sixty or sixty degrees. And that is time. We cause a and a pointer to revolve around that circle at a regular speed and that gives us a constant. With which we compare all kinds of motions and rhythms. And so, the clock is just like a ruler, and is as abstract as a ruler. And must be taken, just for that which means in a way not seriously using. That doesn't mean of course that you say Well from now on we're going to melt down all trucks. And use them for something else. Because, conventions, social institutions, are very valuable. Corresponding to the watch there is the compass. And that also is a circle. Divided four always north south east and west. The Buddhist speak of ten directions because they have not only the eight points of the compass but they add to that about them below. And in their mythology they have Guardian Kings whose duty it is to God the ten directions and you see them at the entrances to temples and places like that all assists an aspect of the cosmic traffic cops. Who are that fear Sanaa that certain about it all because it is after all important that I can meet you at four o'clock in the afternoon at the corner of forty second Street and Fifth Avenue. As if we couldn't make that sort of agreement that sort of convention we couldn't convene.

And in so far as it is important to us to meet, we require these sorts of compass is and time is in the vast emptiness of the cosmos. But we must recognize that these things are as it were written across vast emptiness. The

ground of being is to live coals God has nothing in it where you can stand you can't catch hold of it you can't describe it but you can imagine all sorts of things in it indeed perhaps the whole physical universe is such an imagination. That don't take it for being ultimately real. There are of course sort of gradations of reality. One could say the truck the lines of latitude and longitude and with some things like that abstractions have a rather flimsy kind of reality. Next in order will come of course what we call ordinarily the physical world we say well that's material that matters and so it has a little hard a kind of reality. And that most people stop that they think there's nothing at a deeper level than that. And that simply because of the limitations of man's a to of consciousness of his conscious attention. Conscious attention is so worked out that it tends to ignore all constants. In other words. When you move from the Middle West and come and live in California, at first when you get here you think this is fantastic they think it is so beautiful and so lush, and so on and you stay here after a while and in a few years you stop taking the place for granted, because it's a constant stimulation of consciousness. Also for example, when you're listening to recorded music, there is always a kind of electronic hum. But we screen that out and ignore it. And so it becomes unconscious. Well so any similar way there is what you might call a continuum, a something or other, in which all because of who phenomena exist. And you ignore it. Unless in some way or other you can make it hum. And so various practices like performing yoga exercises or zen meditations, or certain kinds of chemicals can cause your entire sensorium to hum and this draws your attention to the ground the background of everything that you are perceiving which you ordinarily ignore. I think there is going around an entirely new religion called hum. And Hum has no organization no hierarchy, no doctrines, only music and ritual. And just hum. If anybody asks What's it all about is a well come see. Come and see, come along. That would be kind of nice to have something like that I don't know whether it exists or not but it ought.

At any rate the the continuum in which everything occurs, is of course basically what you are. Only because we get absorbed in details we do we forget all about it. Deep down. Within yourself you know the area well indeed that you are that. And that what we call consciousness and unconsciousness coming and going life and death are changing mode. It is within this whatever it is we are. And your identity is come and go. Your

forms your bodies your this your that it's all oscillating like everything isolates it wouldn't harm if it didn't. And so, though we are each one of us, all this cosmos and all this universe it's ground. We don't know it. Because we can't make it an item of knowledge a particular. And we think the only kind of knowledge there is is knowledge of particulars. A logical positivist will argue this to the death. And say well because your York thing that is common to all makes no difference it's true in a mathematical equation you cancel out as irrelevant terms that are equivalent on both sides of the equation. You remove them as redundant. But you know, these things aren't redundant. While it's is perfectly true that a statement about the ground of being is from the standpoint of formal logic quite meaningless. It makes an enormous difference to the way it doesn't actually feels and behaves whether he's aware of the ground of being on not the ground of being in the logical proposition. It enters a human life is an extremely vivid experience. And the difference between a person who sees that a person who doesn't is quite startling. They behave differently. It may not be the way you want them to behave that show different. And so it's like being in love. It's quite unreasonable to be in love, but when you're in love you're entirely changed then you behave differently, even though you may be crazy.

So, certain crazy things like being in love or like being aware of the ground being are immense factors in human life even though from the standpoint of academic philosophy and the kind of the scientists Santa wants a scientific I want to say scientistismic make a phony science and they don't they should be masters of scholarly attention. Nevertheless they're tremendously important. So, within this enormous so-called void call it void not because it's nothing in the literal sense but because you can't pin it down. But you can experience. And you when you do experience it you wonder why the devil you didn't see it all along there's a bizarre because nothing is more obvious than this. So within that void you see, we set up these two great circles the time circle and the space circle. And we notch them all of a round and we use these concepts in which are really in our heads as constants by which we regulate all sorts of events.

Now then, when you lose sight of the conventionality of these things because you are absorbed in details and have become unconscious of the totality, you begin to invest emotions in them. You may for example go to a

game of some kind, football, basketball or chess you know and you watch the game and you know it's only a game, is that, was what you understood when you went in but as it progresses and you become more absorbed in the back and forth of the game your emotions begin to be affected, and you start cheering for one side or getting want to take the part of the underdog. Something of this kind. And that's what happened to us when we were bomb. We got into a gaming room. And we we it was only a game but we begin to take it all terribly seriously. And each one of us is given a part in the game. And people tell us who we are we're from babyhood up say this is the way you are it's not like you to do a thing like that see your mother says because she is that this is an identity for you and this identity is something you have to make because you've got to remember something you're going to be someone. I mean this if. It was in the beginning I suppose really we're nobody. But that simply means nobody.

But we are persuaded all along and also life we begin to build up this precious identity which is our part in the game like your play Black I'm playing white. I'm diamonds, you're clubs or whatever it is. And so we get a tremendous emotional investment in this identity. And its fortunes on a kind of game you know like the old fashioned snakes and ladders when you land on a certain square you have to go back and so on all this, all sorts of this. And then finally we discover that the props that we've all put together constitute this identity wearing out. And we're not able to keep up this identity. And gradually we get old and. We begin to fail and then there's all this thought that well this is too bad it's all over because we've got them both over the thinking that that what was really going on. So, one of the greatest hoaxes in this whole thing is the future. I don't watch we're giving a whole series of seminars on the future but it's important to understand thoroughly the nature of hoaxes. Now, when I'm talking in this sort of way don't take me too seriously. I, in all my writing and lecturing, I exaggerate. Because if I don't exaggerate no one will listen. Because all philosophers who take a moderate tone of voice and say on the one hand this and on the other hand that and after all we should realize that all parts of you should be taken into consideration one reveres them for their calmness and their family but when you listen to it all how they stimulated you have they given you a new idea no. Two to teach in any way you have to make outrageous statements, but with a warning to your listeners that you're only doing this

for effect to get a point across to provoke thought. Because with my position as a philosopher is not a verbal position. My position is a philosopher whose experience will not exist until experience. That is to say, the experience of the ground. And I will take any side. We've all kinds of patterns but the whole point of doing that is by showing you how various opinions cancel each other out you can come to the no-opinion, to the ground underneath, and experience that which is as good if not better than falling in love.

So, but it's important that you see to understand that to some extent you see this is a hoax. That we believe. That future is what we are responsible for what was causing it. And that we say other thing which we don't think is any good it has no future. Now when you contrast that which is absolute common sense to most people living in the Western world. It's the future we've got to worry about. Contrast that with the Indian Hindu Buddhist idea of time. Where as where in which they feel that in the course of time. Everything falls apart. And that therefore there is nothing to be hoped from hoped for from the future. Now they would say to us isn't that obvious to you because after all don't you see that all going isms all entities whatsoever fall apart in the end some go fast some go slow. What do you mean, the future. Individuals all fall apart, eventually whole species fall apart. Something else comes true but for each thing that you can consider as an entity as an individual as a species. Its future is death. And then they say to us Furthermore you think of time as a progress as something like a stairway or an ascending letter that goes on and on and up and up maybe it has bugs in it were the case because dumb but it's like a graph you know of a successful business cooperation of like this say that's how they want their graph to look they view says this is your absurd the very thing you use for telling time is wrong. Don't you see, it just goes round. And so, look at the stars isn't everything going round on the galaxies going round it is going round and round it isn't going anywhere except around. And we say to them. Oh you poor Hindus. The trouble with you is you don't have enough technology. You have a terrible economy most of you are starving you think life is just terrible and therefore you have a pessimistic view of it. Well that makes them laugh themselves silly. They have a pessimistic view. Well, because mine is we're not as a mystic because we know that the whole thing is a hoax we know who we really are and you poor Westerners you

know bugger you you rush around with long noses you have deep set eyes and you go poking your noses into everything. You send out missionaries because you are so uncertain of your own opinions that you have to convert everyone else to agree with you. And you're quite mad. But you live for the future. And poor suckers. All you do cost by living for the future is you create a great deal of trouble because you think you're involved in a process called history. Now here comes another very important matter, history. I've had the most amusing discussions with Orientals. And they have really no sense of history at all. For them, life goes around and one year instead of pretty much the same as the next year. There are reasons that their rhythms and rulers and revolutions and this and that but they don't they don't regard it as as having some important progression. They have chronicles, at least the Chinese kept Chronicles but keeping Chronicles is like keeping a diary or a day book it's a very different thing from writing history where you're trying to make out some sort of sense in the course of events it was just keep the records. And the Hindus didn't even bother to keep chronicles probably. So it's it practically impossible to establish the date of a document from India, unless it was quite recent because every time they really recited it or recall that they had update the names because the king in it was an archetype a king and every king is an example of the archetype looking about him a story is told all these Hindu scriptures like a fairy tales Once upon a time who knows when a million years ago twenty years ago it's all the say because the cost of events and the rhythm is psychic.

So, we on the other hand. From St Augustan, was the real trouble maker. I don't really I'm not absolutely sure that the Hebrews had a linear theory of time. It's questionable. They might have had, because they did look forward to the coming of the Messiah because the day of the law had to they had this apocalyptic idea that they were in such a wretched situation that there was going to come a day when the divine power would intervene in human events and set everything to right and to be ahead knocking session called The Last Judgment, and everybody would be put in a lot of. Well what sent Augustan did with that you see. He rejected the psychic theory of time. Not quite so much on account of the day of the Lord. Coming at the end of time but on account of the Incarnation. He was somehow fixed on the idea that when Jesus was crucified that was the one full perfect sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. It happened once and if time is cyclic he

argued, this would have to happen again and again and again and that couldn't be that's all there is only one time one progression of time from the creation of the world through its redemption by the sacrifice of the cross and all. On to the final judgment then time would cease and we should be in eternity. And from this, theologians increasing it again think about the historicity of Jesus. And to emphasize that it was a historical fact and that history as worked out in the Bible stories from the creation through the fall to the doings of non Abraham and the captivity of the Israelites in Egypt and the giving of the fall by Moses All this was worked out as being the mighty acts of God which revealed the divine passion for the cause of human events. And the funny thing is, that although many many historians living today are not Christians and not Jews and don't believe in anything that they still think of history as a significant momentum towards progress, something that children's children's children's children are going to get we all suffered and live for then just go to and has this good on the end of the line. Now, we really don't know, and can't talk about progress. Unless we know where we're going. And making progress towards that desired object. But most people involved in what they call progress haven't the faintest idea where they're going. I have found increasingly that businessmen and military men are astoundingly impractical. They just don't know what they want. They think they know. I had a long discussion with Air Force strategic people They asked me and some other philosophers. What is your basis for moral behavior. So I pulled their legs and said they says my moral behavior is pure selfishness. And very practical self. Said Of course. I am talking like this because you're all hard headed people I'm not going to give you any sentimentality and stupid stuff about love and so on because you say sorry ality you're military man and you have to see that the United States of America as a collective selfishness is properly looked after. Now I said of course, in my own personal life when I'm selfish I'm not too crude about it I don't run around hitting people over the head and in the gimme gimme gimme I pretend like I'm a public servant that I'm out for the best interests and all I saw the thing that's come up. So that that's not going to trouble about this is that to be effectively selfish, you've got out of the two questions the first is what do you want? And the second is what do you mean by yourself? Well you know that this pulls the carpet out from under everything else what do I want. Well if I answer this kind of a sensible human being what do I want in life. The really important thing I've had

from the beginning, which is that I'm an incarnation of the ground of being like everybody else. And that's the most important thing because you can't get rid of that. The next thing is, of course I want food. I want friendship. Companions. Love. And General singing and dancing and so on. And these are more or less attainable material realities. But then I look at my very wealthy friends who ought to be able to have all these things especially those who are extremely active in business and I realize they don't have them. They're the most miserable people.

Here, you're a great executive of a very very important corporation. Begin with you are drowned in paper. You do nothing but scam paper and make decisions about paper all day you may be the director of an oil company you never get within sight of oil except when you drive your car mostly you are surrounded with statistics about oil finances about oil and you are smothered in this and you have to spend almost all day in a wretched office building in a place like New York. You dress like a funeral director. You... I've had lunch or the part of directors of a very important oil company that will shall be nameless, and it's like eating in a college cafeteria. The food was just I mean it was good food that was extremely ordinary, but you would expect these great millionaires to be having caviar and the glorious fish in Aspen, and wines and beautiful waitresses serving them and to be lounging at tables like Romans knows.

And then if you've read an article in Look this week by Marshall McLuhan and George Lemmon on the sex, the future of sex, and asked brings up some information. That what they call the narrow gauge specialized male. That is the sort of guy who gets out there and sells you know and he he mustn't have any feelings. Because that would be our Mamet anything except think of a kind of rough. And that so many of these men are like that, and it says that that role playing of that kind of male gives you arses and all kinds of complaints and is more deadly than facing the bullets in Vietnam. And they all die before their wives. Because they are engaged in the pursuit of a completely fatuous go. This fatuous goal is the future. And it is symbolized, above all, by money. They make lots of it and have it much more than they can even think about and they have no idea what to do with it except make more except invest it in bigger and bigger units of something. And while they're harassed about that they're wondering about

the antitrust boys Internal Revenue their competitors and all these ghouls who are involved in the game. They lie awake nights. They can't go home and throw the whole thing off they have to get completely boozed. That's one way out or tranquilized which is another way out or something or other. In order to take it, and they call themselves realists. You see their utterly unrelated to the physical universe. As a part of cos because of the education they've received you see if you go to an ordinary school such as we've had since they. Know the early nineteenth century. You discover that your education is purely cerebral. You are prepared to be an executive, a bureaucrat. Some kind of clerk. You know the word clerk, originally means clever. Because the terrorists were the only people who were clever the word clever cleric, is all the same word originally. They were the literate people. Therefore they did all the cooking and the records. They got away with and they convinced us that the records and the book Eating his mind part and then the actual goods being transacted. So that now people you see a much happier with money than with wealth I think they are trying to persuade themselves that they are, when they bought a lemon. So this guy who thinks he works for the future of this great captain of industry. Condemns himself mostly to misery there are a few exceptions naturally as I said I always exaggerate everything I know a few important business men who have some conception of how to enjoy themselves. But I was amused to meet a young one little while ago who had created one big corporation which had been bought up by another of the biggest shows going today he was a member of the body of directors and he said now and thirty five years ago I made an awful lot of money and I'm going to drop out. So we took off for India. Well, then that's going to look at we've had a little look at business let's go and look at the the military people. And they don't know what they want either. First of all, they invented a weapon, which was completely insane because it isn't a weapon. It's simply a contrivance for planetary suicide. And our weapon is a very specific thing. Now, a sword as a weapon and notice it's pointed in shop and directional. Because then you learn first thing you have to know about using a sword is where to put it where to point it. And so it is selective. But things like biological warfare or isn't gas and nuclear bombs are not selected and you don't know when they're going to blow back on which way they're going what the consequences of them are the only thing you can do with is you can pile them up and start playing lighting matches in the powder magazine this is a

very dangerous game people might play with each other. Where with her sitting in a powder magazine, and I dare you to drop that thing he. Ha ha ha you know, we'll blow ourselves both up if you don't do what I want. And this is a strategy it's madness. Beyond that, they don't they they they don't have any objective it would be understandable if we were going to Vietnam. The cause of all those gorgeous little oriental girls we were going to capture the whole lot and bring them back. But we're not. We are out to destroy something called communists. And nobody really can figure out what it is. As if Russia is a communist country all it is is a one great big corporate business. It's one corporation instead of a cluster of corporations and it's did it works rather miserably and. I wouldn't think if you need to fight it it just fall apart because it's so boring. Of course, things in Russia if you go back to the whole history of the thing there were a lot worse when the brutal barons govern the country. And they are no sort of better in a measly way like in China. Things are pretty terrible ever since the British and their friends made a mess of China many years ago and China's been an awful place and things again in China and dowdy and uniform and dull, but it's so far as the basic subsistence is concerned it's probably better than an cause. But my point is, that we are fighting abstractions. Far abstractions recently the Congress of the United States passed an act against burning the American flag. [whistles] Stiff penalties, for burning the flag, and those same people who passed that act with a great flurry of patriotic speeches were actively burning up the country for which the flag stands they are allowing every kind of scoundrelly use of the water the air the natural resources and exploitation of the people until the whole thing is being converted into a smog boat. I flew not a few days ago from New York right across the country to Los Angeles and from New York to Denver there was smog over the whole country as far as I could see from thirty thousand feet. And this is America the Beautiful. You know blown up the flag is terrible but the country is quite OK because these people are confused completely confused between the symbolic world and the real world.

And so, this historical thing, you see, which is a destiny in the future always been perceived is completely destructive. Because technology clocks, instruments, measurements are fine for people who know how to use them. For people who know what they want. But the people who don't know what they want and who think that. The clock is the thing that's what you need I

mean the Russians are insane about this moment they move into a place with the army the design has some kind of technical civilization they capture all the responses in sight and the cover themselves with wrist watches like bracelets. Because they're time-crazy too. But those things are very wonderful for people who as I say, know how to use them. Because you can make significant plans. If and only if you are alive today and now know how to live and know what to do with now. But if you don't you never will. Because the only other time to start living is immediately do it I mean you know why wait around for something to happen let's let live it up now let's have a ball, you see. We don't. We think that if we have it now, something...we won't have it tomorrow. But if you always saving up for tomorrow, you'll never have it at all. Well let's take an intermission. I was discussing this morning. The way in which time which is a measure of motion, involves us in certain illusions. Principally what I call the historical illusion. That is to say, that the meaning of human life lies in living through a progression of events, which culminates and finds its satisfaction in the future. And trying to show you how in various ways. The illusion of history as been extremely destructive to people. How, for example, it fascinates us with symbols. They may be symbols of wealth such as money or symbols of status. So that the people who are in our world highly successful cannot understand why their lives are so empty. Because they lack presence, they lack the full rich rich relationship to the physical world in the here and now. And because they don't understand why they're so miserable, they think they can cure their situation by more of the same that is to say by bigger and better futures, more money, more power, more status and so they go on compounding the problem and still failing to understand why they're increasingly miserable. And they don't know what they want because there wants to have as it were grown to dimensions whether inconceivable. And so they also don't know who they are because they have confused. The true organic living being. With the mask, the persona the role, constipated around the ego which they have. Been taught to believe themselves to be.

None of this is to underwrite the real uses of time that is to say of clocks because all time is a matter of flux there is no time in nature there is risen in nature yes there is motion in the region but the clock as a measure of motion is a human artifact. The world as it spins on its axis doesn't tick.

And I also pointed out that the calibration of the clock. Whereby we have hairlines to designate the point at which a certain second because is symbolic of the emptiness of our moments. When the moment is reduced to a hairline, you feel that it's here and gone. That you can't ever really be now because it's all flying away all flying away and you can never sit down and be there. This was fast problem is easy when he attains his highest moment and his calling are still to lay thou art so fair. The moment is a curious thing. It isn't fleeting at all. It looks as if it is but it isn't. The moment is always with you. And this is the point to understand this is the point of all those spiritual exercises which are concerned with concentrating on what you are doing now and keeping your mind on it. For example, in the practice of the Japanese tea ceremony, the entire art of it is to have complete presence of mind. To be completely with doing just this thing so likewise in all sorts of yoga exercises try and be completely now. The whole training of a Zen monk day in and day out, throughout his discipline whether it's meditation or whether it's work or sweeping or cooking or eating or whatever it is they can they keep insisting do what you're doing eat when you're hungry, sleep when you're tired. And do that. But the point of that exercise is that after you practice it for a while it suddenly occurs to you with a great shock which is a sort of satori. That there is no where else to be but the moment, you cannot be anywhere else. It doesn't flow away it's always here. Maybe a lot of things flow through it. Forms change, experiences change rhythms change and so on but it's always there. So you have plenty of time, in the sense of real time, which is the moment. To have time is to have the moment.

And you remember the story that Flora told at the end of last session where the Dalai Lama's brother says that yes it was very nice to come to the United States but the problem of. The difference between here and Tibet was that here you have all sorts of power and whatnot but you have no time. In Tibet you have a very primitive existence and lots of time. And it's so interesting to get into a culture that is so-called primitive. It's very easy because you can now take a jet plane to Puerto Vallarta, in a matter of a very short time you can be. In touch with a culture that is ageless. Because you only have to go from part of I outed on north or south to the Indian villages along the coast which you can only reach by boat. Or by a jeep through jungle roads which are just terrible. And you get up to these people.

And suddenly everything stops. You know where they going. They are doing the things they've always done. And it's sort of it we we we always say it's a sleepy village. Not very exciting.

So actually, Zen is the art of combining an exciting life with living in the complete present. Very curious, it's not sleepy at all it's not like you think of a sleepy village. When you watch Zen monks walking. They don't dawdle. They're like cats and know how a cat crosses the road. It has a complete kind of. Knows where it's going, it's just like that.. And that's like a Zen monk walking. It's a most curious combination of what you would call the virtues of economy of expertness in doing what you do and that the same time not being any hungry and anyhow very this zen master in San Francisco Suzuki Roshi is particularly at my by his students for achieving an enormous amount of work. Without ever seeming to make the slightest effort. And he can move they've just been working down at Tassajara Springs, and they have rearranged a rocky stream to make it look more natural. And he can move bigger rocks than any of the tough young men who are working along with him that the fantastic. But it's all based on the real relationship to the material, especially to the material moment. And working in such a way that you never strain yourself because you never rush. You don't have in mind the goal. And of being wanting to get there in the greatest possible. You have in mind simply, that every phase of doing the work which will eventually arrive at that goal is as much worth doing as when you're playing music. You are involved completely in the production of the sounds as they go along without hiring them to reach the end. It's the same as sex. A lot of people are in a hurry to reach them and therefore they don't and they never have sex all that satisfaction as they have nothing but orgasms. And all the people stopped a great deal about the importance of the orgasm and that's true and right and perfectly proper It's worth nothing without the build up. You know, if it were to be the same thing as taking dietetic pills where you have a few pills which contain all the essential nutrition thrown down get on with real life or by having some substitute for sleep. That you could take a pill and not have to sleep. Incidentally, I just want to put in a parenthesis here about the importance of sleep. There is a very special kind of sleep which the Hindus call Soshipi [sic]. Sleep without dreams, and very deep. And it's it isn't isn't sleep funny that you go to bed

and time is totally eliminated until you wake up and you seem to wake up immediately after you went to sleep and yet something happened.

Now, there is there is a way of getting into a completely profound sleep. Which I call I don't know where I got the word I call it a temple sleep. And it I found it best in a protected area out of doors. On a sunny afternoon or at night, where you get under a tree, and you get a suitable Pad. And you live your back. And you simply open up like a cat does a dog that sometimes you stretch in every direction like this and you surrender to the. And you sink, you let go, you imagine your body is extremely heavy so that it's dropping into the area and you just let yourself go to the night. With a kind of feeling that you are being moved through by immensely powerful life energy, healing energy or whatever, and you give give give give to this letting go of everything letting go of all control of all consciousness of all anxiety of all care about anything. And if you go right down into this immense depth. And then you wake up a little before dawn, and the sky is a deep deep blue, and you can see the stars through the leaves and I know and that feeling that you get when morning comes and everything is awakening, and there's a kind of extraordinary freshness to the world that you really thoroughly get with the dawn. It's a magnificent experience. But you see, it the trouble is that sleep strikes our whole culture as a waste of time. Why I have to take this out to see why I have to cut it up but what I'm indicating by giving you this little imagery is how it's possible to enjoy unconsciousness. And what restorative value unconsciousness can have. In just the same way a death you know. Stevenson's poem. Under the wide and starry sky dig me a grave and let me lie glad that I live and gladly die and I laid me down with a will. If you can see death in that way as the just as when you went to sleep you abandoned all the cares and so on, so in death, you abandon all responsibilities. People in the moment of death have had a great marvelous experiences with this if they got with it. Just think, you don't have to pay any more bills. You don't have to watch the clock enema you're not responsible for anyone you don't have to solve anybody's problems you don't have to solve your own problems, you don't have to avoid evil, you don't have to do good nothing the whole thing the whole strain of being somebody is abandoned. And when that happens some people before they die have this enormous excess of delight. And suddenly see the point of everything. And so, for that reason all forms of initiation. In

every place I can think of have invariably been connected with the art of dying in the middle of life. Die now. And give up. Give up the compulsion to go on. Give up protecting yourself. Looking for security, looking for all those things which when you get them but then you know that when you get security it hurts. Because you're worried you're going to lose. This is terribly true and so when you die in the middle of life they used to have of course in some religions ceremonies where you underwent a ritual death you were put in a coffin you went down into a deep pit. Some symbolism of death in Christianity your drowned, that's the Baptism and that's supposed to be but they forgotten to see what it was all about and. Then, when you come up. You would think now I have been relieved of all responsibility I have been relieved of all necessity to be anything because I become nobody. So they give you a new name, but they give you a nobody name instead of a somebody name. In Christianity when they baptized somebody they gave him the name of one of the archetype of angels or disciples. So that you were no longer. Say Laitius, you became Peter. And Peter is one of the nobodies the great nobodies.

So, I've noticed recently I've met a few young people who have abandoned the ordinary idea of naming themselves I met a young man just the other night and they said What is your name he said it's You. And I remember a story about Dr Spiegel when he visited my son in law and my son in law was very young and he got this formidable Professor Friedrich Spiegel and said I don't know what to call you and Spielberg said Just call me Hey You. So this kid's name was you and I found of various is that there's a man going around calls himself the Plastic Man and that's all anybody knows him by. Somebody came by the other day and suggested that it would really disturb the whole nation if an enormous number of young people all changed their names to Harry Krishna. And so that driver's license you go to what you do is you just go to the Department of Motor Vehicles and you say I've changed my name we're doing this through this license that Harry Krishna everybody would be angry.

This is see is the thing of this death death to the row that you thought you were playing. Giving up all these responsibilities to amount to anything to be something not here then comes this absolutely critical point which is why. It every initiated discipline there is a discipline now the words the

individual is in some way nurtured for that moment. Because obviously, the moment you have given up all the cares and responsibilities, you get an immense excess of psychic energy. As all the energy which you've been expending defending yourself is available for something else. So you become quite potentially dangerous. And so always, the society as been concerned about what will become a free people. Will they use the energy destructively, or constructively. But I mean the first thing to realize that to understand if one is concerned about this is that there is a great deal of energy attached to this. One normally supposes that human beings are naturally lazy they're not the people we call lazy are just tired. Or they're undernourished although the organism isn't working properly for reasons of that either tired they've been fighting themselves too much they can't stand it or else they don't have the right vitamins or something a human being is not lazy naturally. The human being is a very strange creature it has an enormous amount of surplus energy also does the stickleback fish. This particular fish dances a great deal to get off it's getting rid of its surplus energy. And so, in the same way human beings have all this energy at their disposal and the question is how to canalize it in such a way that they don't cause trouble with it.

So then, you have, in other words, to be ready with something to do with it. So as to canalize it and not just blow it all off. But it is all it's all contingent upon this huge gamble. Let me put it in this way, the that the initiation death is a gamble. Will you bet me? That if you completely abandon, all control. You know where you are the ordinary kind of ego control will control give it up completely see you're not responsible for any where you bet me that if you make that gamble. You will suddenly discover that you are full of great great stuff, great energy. And a lot of people will not accept that gamble under any circumstances, they're scared to death of it. Some people will make the gamble. And then be like the guy who won the Irish sweepstakes and is ruined for life. Because they don't know how to handle it. And this is one of the great problems of today when mystical experiences and things like that are so easily and readily available. For all sorts of reasons. That a lot of people who are very immature get hold of this kind of experience and don't know what to do with it, because they don't have the skills, with which and in terms of which this kind of experience experience can be beautifully and creatively used. It isn't just a matter of good will. The

proverb says the road to hell is paved with good intentions. It isn't enough to be a person of good will it isn't enough to be gentle as a dove. You also have to be wise as a serpent.

So I say this in a general preface about getting out of history. This is the real drop-out situation. For example in a certain way of talking is a drop out because he dropped off the wheel of Samsara, the rat race of birth and death where you are always living for a future. That you see in nature, you cause a vacuum. If you drop out of one situation you drop into another. And so observe where you drop-in when you drop out.

Well now, that brings me then to this point that I will call the great diversion. The future is something you cannot work for, for exactly the same reason that you cannot work to be happy. Happiness it's always said is a by product. And it will accrue to you through becoming absorbed in something else altogether in some other quest altogether. The quest for the vision, a quest for doing something, anything. May bring happiness. And so in exactly the same way, the good future the Great Society the grand tomorrow is never going to be attained by working for it directly. When you've got that idea which is embodied just as much in the five year plan as it is in the great society, of working for that thing. You will never make it. Eat only way you can get the good future is by a diversion from time altogether at right angles to the course of history.

So what is important now today is to create a diversion of such splendor that people will forget about the things they think are important. All their squabbles all their ridiculous projects for destroying the planet in the name of progress. And give it up because they see something else is going on which is. A great deal more fun. It's like you know you would have gambling tables at Las Vegas and in some great casino, there's been a terrible game going on all night where people are getting more and more emotionally upset and they're all in the out and there are tremendous stakes and there's a huge crowd gathered around. And water that doesn't come out and so on the sun is somewhere over in another corner of the casino something starts up and all the people here are threatening to shoot each other it's all over there they're all laughing and someone sitting at the back of the crowd a few characters of the big crowd you know the big serious

game going on they're all looking over suddenly hear this thing going on they started another and looking at the other table and I get to play off and go over there and start joining in that game and finally just at the moment when the immense crash is going to come out and these two great gamblers have gambled the whole universe on what they were doing as if they owned it, and they're about to we've got the bomb ready to though each other up they suddenly look around nobody's watching. They start looking over there, what's going on over there see so this is the only way in which we can do anything about the future at all is to create a diversion. Of doing things. And living in a way that is non-historical. And that is instead of preparing to live the great life as a result of all sorts of preparation use what capacities you now already have for living the great life to do it. Don't wait. And this will create a fantastic diversion from history. Then you see, man can attain sanity once again becoming non-historical. Like the bees. Like the ants. Like the birds. Now we look at ants and say oh ants we don't to be like that reminds a minute. But that's only because we're not close enough to the sea that different personalities if there are a bunch of dancing around. And they are apparently to us doing very very simple things like nurturing eggs and milking green fly. But they answer themselves all the different to each other. They have slightly different colorings slightly different wiggles on their antennae which are just as important to them as our facial differences are to us. And they have ways of communicating and they think that this is the very very good life. I mean they have occasional troubles and was and so on but they don't they they've lived that way so far as we know, for millions and millions of years, without any progress. Now you would say that could be very dull. Yes, it would be dollars if you kept keeping records and reading them. Because then you would say Oh oh well you would get too much memory. Now, one this is a very important thing again did let me warn you that I always exaggerate and therefore you must take it with certain reservation which we call a grain of salt. And memory is a good thing, sure. But it equally important is a forgettery. We have, in the human organism fortunately and massively a whole at each end. One for nutrition and one for elimination. And people don't pay enough attention to the problems of elimination. Least they pay it in a certain way. They pay attention to whether they're constipated or not. But that's not really the thing.

Disposal has become one of the major problems of modern civilization. As a practical problem for the city of San Francisco, where to put the garbage is becoming quite critical. Mountains and mountains and mountains of garbage are arising. And it is almost as if the human being could be eventually crowded off by his own wastes. That's because we haven't really thought about elimination and the problems of elimination. We've only really thought about the problems of keeping, storage. And the things we store. The... I'm appalled by the files that I'm required to keep. Other correspondence by the increasing accumulation of records. This thing I don't know why I make these tapes some people like to listen to them I never listen to them because it would take me as long to listen to them as it does to make it and I would simply be repeating the experience why do that if some student wants to go through something more carefully fine. But you can read a book so much faster than you can listen to a tape.

So there is a thing going on now called the Information bomb, which is the proliferation of records. And this is reach such a pitch or that it is plainly absurd. Let me give you an ism examples from a field that I'm well acquainted with, Oriental Studies. And then you know this is a small field of relative unimportance. But today, to be a serious scholar in the field of Oriental Studies. You have to make like you're a very very meticulous scientist. Because if you publish an article in The Journal of the American Oriental society, which is one of the dullest journals ever conceived. And you make a slight mistake with a diacritical mark, or a Sanskrit character or a little line wrong on a Chinese character you will next month be demolished in a footnote. By some pesky scholars. And, here they all are, there they've got so much detail in their head they know so much so much information has been acquired it would take nobody could possibly master it the articles come pouring out there if it's that way in Oriental Studies You should imagine how it is in electronics. It comes and comes and comes and comes and I was talking the other day to a man who has done a great deal of work in this and he spent fifteen or more years acquiring some Tibetan prints, and he could out of this material compile to enormous volumes to be published by university press, with every kind of commentary on these prints and what would happen? They would be bought by a few big libraries and one or two scholars and nobody would ever read it. So he said to me I am through with that game. I am an old man, I have seen enough I have

attained all the academic honors I ever could want and I am now going to have fun. And I am going to publish these Tibetan graphics as far-out posters. But you see, what happens? After a certain point, this method of the intellectual analysis, which was always good and useful in the beginning and did some very lovely things I feel.... When you, you study. Let's say you take a course on Renaissance painting from somebody who really knows what it's all about. Or on Baroque music. Or on lida, or something like that it's fascinating to. See how those things were put together and why it's extremely beautiful but if you go one step beyond that it's like cooking the souffle just a minute too long or the whole thing disintegrates into dust. And as it is then, in the academic world today where you have an intellectual market going on to do this thing to turn out graduate students to turn out professors who have to put the new graduate students through the paces and all the field has been covered so they give them are not minute and ridiculous things to do and all the information because some of it is information. Piles and piles and piles and everybody including the scholars suddenly get around then say what on Earth are we doing? Especially if it's in a sort of historical humanistic subject that has no particular technical application. When Aldous Huxley graduated from Bill. At Oxford his tutor took him aside and said this to Huxley. You have a very distinguished record as a student. He was in English literature. And said you should very seriously consider an academic career in English that you would make a very fine professed and all the success that sticks trough. Because I always thought literature was something to be enjoyed not just. And so it is you say that the capacity for the enjoyment of scholarship is not really known to these frantic scholars terrified that they will be demolished in the foot. And having to make that thing and keep this thing going you know realise that the word Scola. School means a place of leisure. It was where there the if the phrase, a scholar and a gentleman. A gentleman meant somebody who didn't have to earn a living, as he owned land or something, and therefore he could devote his time to scholarship. And so a scholar and a gentleman would acquire gradually a beautiful library and he would go into that library and read as an easy pace. No deadlines, no thesis to present the seven time, he studied for the love of learning. And all those beautiful light like the not barren sins library at eight thirty in Florence is a gentleman scholars library where he loafed the way many many good hours studying a subject that he loved and got to know a great deal about it. You

cannot produce scholarship by this method across the bay. It doesn't work. It produces simply increased harassment. Piling up of enormous quantities of irrelevant. Facts, yes. But a fact isn't the sacred thing just because it's a fact.

So you see in this way how a graded education system, with goals with aiming at God only knows what aiming at a professorship of a higher rank ending at a higher salary but whatever it is all that is irrelevant to the actual scholarship. And so as a result. The academic world is a lot of political games. With it I say again some notable exceptions one know there's certain still absolutely genuine scholars who are trying to avoid committee meetings and grading papers and all that kind of thing, because they still love learning for its own sake. But they're not many of them. And they have amazing put-downs. If you love learning for its own sake and you're not. Worried about all that final points that you could get caught up on they say you're a popularizer you're a dilettante, and above all, an amateur. And you know what an amateur is as distinct from a pro we've come to use the word pro the man as me is very competent and amateur the dabblers amateur met the man who does it for the love of it from the group ammo and Latin. The professional, the man who earns his living at it. It's curious how these things change.

So you see what we must be looking for is a diversion from that whole tendency which makes the professional instead of the amateur. That whole compulsion to use whatever it is that you do for some other end altogether. And other words I'm baking bread not because I'm a vocation to be a baker because it is my way of making money. If the soon as you do that you see you lose track here is the point. So the diversion this way instead of going on with the course of history. Robert Oppenheimer shortly before he died said it is quite obvious that the whole world is going to hell. And the only thing that could possibly prevent this is not trying to prevent it. [Because] the minute you get meshed with that contest. There is a there's nothing more. Nobody I know in this world is more hostile than a pacifist on the rampage. The bitterness the the vitriolic.

Once, I got in an argument with Margaret Mead. Ugh. And she was talking about she was in a very very highly emotional status is perfectly

understandable about the bomb. I said I am a little worried. That we could get so excited about this and so violently try to stop the bomb that we might inadvertently blow it up. She said, 'You are a fake Swami you have no consideration for your children and your children's children. You have absolved all responsibility for the cost of destiny of history.' Well, this is a you see today a very big question. Whether to take part in trying to save the world, or whether to mind your own business. And to do something else. I'm a say I wrestle with this question. Because there's still enough of the old conditioning in me say you really ought to get out there and do something about it after all you are responsible you and you you got a hearing and a lot kind of thing and I have to tell you it takes an enormous effort. To be lazy. To say now wait a minute go back to Lao Tzu, and never forget. That when I see a man getting ready to put the world in order, I know there will be great trouble. Govern a great state as you cook a small fish. But you see, the puzzle in connection with all this is the problem of the Sorcerer's Apprentice. You remember in this story which, what's his name Duka What was that musician made that they [sings]. He used the magic to try and save the work. And it got out of control. And when the broom wouldn't stop searching water. He didn't know how to stop the spell he chopped it. And immediately it turned into two brooms, rained twice as much water. And as he'd hit them the fragments standing each one into new broom bringing more water. And that's the situation we're in. See, we're in an economy, which has to expand or collapse. We talk about a growing business it means one that's making more and more of no nor more every. So everybody has got to be inside to want more and more and more products. And if you don't do it you're a bad consumer, and there are all kinds of ways of pressuring you into being a good consumer you come around here and you live on a houseboat. Well, we don't pay taxes because we're above. And well our water is people. And I say orchard don't you have a sewage here. And the boys says no. Well, that's a serious health problem. Well it does just isn't. Everybody who lives around here is very healthy. And the main problem in the bay is industrial waste chemicals kill the fish fish like our waste Fishley mackerel they thrive on all you've got to do is bring a basic shipment of mackerel and duck. And I want to bout the girl the birds you know they they deposit their excrements in the bay and at certain times of year you can hardly see the water from where they got to do have process going around shooting the birds because they're fouling the

Bay what they want in this bay is distilled water with a ten percent saline additive for realistic effect.

So the thing is, that if you live in this sort of thing eventually somebody says well we won't insure you or you're doing this regulations wrong that regulations wrong the real reason is that you're not being a good consumer. You don't own the right kind of appliances the right kind of car the right kind of anything and so you're considered a bad consumer when you've got to go on owning somebody made a fantasy a little while ago about the future, where everybody is required by law to possess enormous flashy cars and fantastic expensive things and only great business tycoons will be able to get away with driving jalopies. And wearing old clothes. So, but you see in that situation where you must, you must, you must increase increase increase like this you simply not viable what's happening to you is the way you kill poison oak. Who feeds certain hormones which you paint on the leaves and this promotes the growth so excessively that dish blow up. And we're in a situation like that's where our progress is cancer. We're going to blow up by sheer bluh. And less and less you see we stop. Stop the future. Time has got to stop. And create a diversion. At the end of the question period yesterday, I said with under something which I would have to take up today. And this arose because we were discussing the problem of prediction. Which is of course related to the problem of control. I had made a passing reference in yesterday's Seminar, to the fact that the knowledge of time, the knowledge of the future, what Korzybski calls man's time-binding ability is a an advantage for which we pay a very serious price. To know the future in a conscious way gives you obviously a survival advantage. But at the same time it gives us a vital disadvantage so that what you gain on the roundabout, you lose on the swings. You gain the ability to plan. Your future, say to invest to take out insurance to do all those things that are called provident. But the price you pay for it is anxiety. And you pay this price because you know that you don't know enough. That you know as it were, enough about the future to try to be profit or if you don't know enough about the future to be sure the chop Providence was correctly done. Therefore you worry. Therefore you are concerned with what will happen tomorrow and it's so extraordinary that that passage in Saint Matthew's Gospel where Jesus says, 'Don't make any anxiety about tomorrow what you're going to eat what you can drink,'

and I am amazed about that because every minister I have ever heard discussed this passage says it can't be put into practice. Is that the church simply never did teach that that's they they the most a verse of passage in the Gospels which is swept under the carpet say. In a way because, Jesus told all sorts of stories in order to make people think. This one this this image of the flowers of the field and the birds that don't make any plans. And he did another one for example the story of the Pharisee and the publican, very interesting because its effect is X. is extremely funny he says here is the Pharisees goes up to the front row of the church and stands up and sort of memorializes God on what a good guy he's been. That he's fulfilled all the duties and so on then there's the public a new creeps into the back and beats himself on the breast and says only God be muzzled me as an see now having told that star the situation is completely reversed. Because then all the Prince creep into the back of the church and beat themselves on the grass and take up events of all to me as an insult or now we would have to tell the tale exactly the other way around and say now the honest guy is the one who simply walked straight to the front and addresses God man to man. But you see, what people don't realize in what I would call guru manship the art of teaching is that the teacher tells tales not for their immediate obvious meaning that their later effect. What is the result of having told the story? In this story is completely deflated say humility. Where you try to be humble It's a con.

So in the same way, that the passage on be not anxious for the morrow really asks you, why can't you put this into practice. Here's a precept, who contract nobody they say oh it's impossible, we cannot give up making plans we cannot give up prediction. Of course we predict in a way. In a sort of unconscious fashion. The simplest act involves a kind of prediction. So in this case, we are simultaneously aware of things which if you do regard the present as a hairline would be called Past and Future at once. But if you not hung up on the idea that the present is this Helen thing which is purely abstract then you have no problem in accepting the idea that we are simultaneously aware of past events and future events. Because they're all, just like you're watching from a traveling vehicle and you can see where you're going to be and you can see where you have been from where you are now. So in that sense then, we have a knowledge of the future when I move to pick up my glasses but that is a different kind of knowledge from

when I speculate in an abstract way as to what I ought to do a month from now or might might happen a month from now, you see.

So then, the question then becomes we we predict those far future which are not within our present vision, by calculation. It may be astronomical, navigational calculation or as it was in all times astrological. People thought they had in astrology the means to foresee the future know what to do. And then the question arises, Well what of... Supposing there is a fine science of prediction whether it be scientifically respectable like navigation or meteorology which isn't too hard. Or whether it be something like astrology. Are these really profitable sciences? Now I pointed out the problem is A, that when you know the future, you pay for it with anxiety. You know I am going to die. A creature that doesn't make predictions like a cat or a dog, when seeing another dead cat will not necessarily in that's going to happen to me. Because you see, a true animal a truly functioning entity, is not self-conscious in that way. For example, you all know. That only other people have head. Only, how do you become concerned with your head. Why, because you have been made conscious of your face. You looked in mirrors you've been talked about is the only part of our body that we live permanently. And even when we put gloves on you know their hands are covered. We always keep the face naked. And you learn that you're there in terms of having enough. You can touch. For a good face and lose face all these things indicate the importance of the face is it one that every where as inside beyond the face where are you. If you were living naturally. You would be as unselfconscious as your head. You know even than the brain is not sensitive to probes.

So you you would live in terms of all this is going on as you. But you've been taught or the idea you've been smashed back into your head, see, by social indoctrination, and your face has been made to stand for you. The real you behind the face is everything that you see and hear touch and sense. So the headless man, you have never had to go out of your head to lose your mind to see is in a way always characteristic of the wise man. Because he's come back to his original emptiness, which is behind the face. See when you turn, to see your hand and what is behind the eye you can't it's not dark. It's not light. You just can't apprehended in any way at all. And that's what it's all about. But so then, when you start calculating and

you resort to projection. You are now trying to get hold of all of us. But many people have an instinctive feeling say when confronted with a great astrologer who could tell them all the future I don't want to hear. And rather not. And this is in a way a wise, if uninformed reaction. For the simple reason... Well let's put the other point of view from another point of view would be a realistic person saying the trouble with you is you don't want to know your future because you're afraid of life. If you were know your future you could take practical steps to adapt things to it if you knew you were going to die next Tuesday, you would immediately put your house in order and make less trouble for your friends and relations. Face it. That sounds all right to begin with. It's like all technology is initially a success.

But the real problem the kindly comes to is this. When the outcome of a game is known, the game is cancelled. Because the whole point of playing the game is that we don't know the out. Because the known future is already past. And the higher the degree of certainty of knowledge as to the future to that extent it has happened, you had it. And we don't want to put the future in that situation, not really. Because the how easy if you think of the cosmos as basically a game of hide and seek. Where the Lord God is creating the universe by forgetting that is God I'm imagining that if you. Then this is the the fundamental way of getting rid of the eternal boredom of knowing all about it. And of there being no surprises. The whole the whole vitality of being alive. Is that it is always surprising. To be enlightened is to be surprised at everything. That it is a wonder that everything is a miracle that it is highly improbable, and really shouldn't happen the role but there it is. If there isn't that sense, there is no vitality in any of it. That again of course we have the problem that I discussed yesterday in another form the problem of order and randomness and the drawing the line you see, where to draw the line between order and randomness so in the same way where to draw the line between the known and the unknown how much to predict how much to say well, I'd rather leave tomorrow to tomorrow. Sufficient unto the day is trouble.

So, you see again it is all a question of where draw the line of how much to control and realize that when you go beyond a certain degree of control when you go beyond a certain what I will call natural prevision such as. I described by the analogy of looking out of the when the train when you go

beyond a certain degree of natural provision, you will encounter a law of diminishing returns. The more you succeed the more you fail. And then you get into this sort of. I describe it yesterday from the academic point of view when scholarship acquires an exactness and a highly detailed degree of information. That constitutes an information bomb and nobody can keep track of it and the whole thing becomes a bore who wants to keep track of it any longer who gives a damn you know about those final details of Shakespeare's use of the conjunction it. So in the same way, in practical politics, we have reached a state today where law is out of hand. There is too much paper there are too many whereas if Sands about subclauses and so on and nobody could keep track of it the whole thing is in a state of total confusion and this confusion exists in the name of sanity in the name of trying to set things in order because everybody shouts when somebody does something wrong there ought to be a law against it and soon there is indeed a law against it there's a law against everything we are all at this moment doing something illegal. I don't know what it is but it's always there and somebody can find it out and invoke it if they wish to make trouble for us. I'm quite sure that my entire situation is illegal. And that's a so for everybody. And this is the result you see, of wanting to pin everything down.

In ancient China, the Confucians had a thing they call the rectification of names. And they were the Confucians are curious people because while they have some marvelous ideas there's certainly lacking in humor. And they're rather ponderous and puritanical and stuff in. The Taoists on the other hand have humor. And always making fun of the confusions are they the rectification of names was that Confucius said we must be sure when we use words that their meaning is established. So this means the dictionary. And so they were they were the first real serious thinkers about dictionaries, about definitions about laying down what the words mean but the Taoist pointed out by saying if you're going to rectify the words, What are you going to rectify them with? Well they said with words well then they said what are you going to how are you going to rectify the words you used to rectify the words. Well I thought about that. And then they said well their words are self-rectifying. That is to say, you rectify words with words and the words you use to rectify the words are rectified with the other words it's a close circle.

So you can't play a game called Vish. In which you supply the players each with a copy of the same dictionary. And then you have a lot of words written on slips of paper and a hat and somebody pulls a word out of a hat and everybody looks it up in the dictionary. Then they take the definition and they look up a key word in the definition. And look that up and so on until they get back to the word They started with. The first person to get back to the word that everybody started with calls out Vish, short a vicious circle. And then there is an umpire present to rule on whether they cheated in other words whether. They looked up. When they saw our knowledge to observe to record on looked up the word to instead of record or observe or whatever. So far the dictionary only. Gets out of a vicious circle where there is a picture beside the word. Then it escapes. But otherwise all attempts to pin down words are simply going in a vicious circle.

So, one uses words effectively by not trying to pin them down too hard. But, we are always saying. Put it in writing. If we're really serious about an agreement between two people put it in writing. Because I can trust the document but I'm not sure if I can trust you. Do you exist prove it have your birth certificate passport card of identity if you can produce this wretched piece of paper you're there if you can't you're not. Well obviously it was a good idea to record things that we could be sure that people wouldn't be dishonest. But all this started from people being the sun. And in if we are going to stop people from being dishonest. There's only one way to do it. And that's what people not to be dishonest. No other way there is ever that event it will prevent. And if. You think you can go on living by preventing people from being dishonest with you by rules and regulations and laws and police and all this can you eventually you succeed in the short run once again in the long run you run into a total tangle. United States is the country in the world with most laws. And yet our police are completely mistrusted by every saying they're crooks and scoundrels and violent, fascist kind of people. With exceptions, you know everything has exceptions, you know, a nice cop on the corner... That by, and large through. The state in which say people say oh well the law will take care of. The law won't. You have to take care. And you can only be a law abiding citizen by trusting our fellowmen. And if you don't do that no one will trust you. And therefore a system of mutual mistrust will exist which of its very nature must fall apart. It cannot operate.

So once again, you see this is a quite a problem of the confusion between physical reality and symbolic reality. The law says this therefore it must happen and if it doesn't happen somebody is there with a club see that it does. Maybe, unless you one go out can see conceal it find a loophole in the literature. Get a good lawyer. That means a man who can say that the law didn't say what it was intended. So that then of course, everybody is accountable and that means keeps accounts. And. I are increasingly find that it's difficult to operate. Because of all the records that have to be kept one spends more time recording than one does doing. So, this is to say then that the symbolic method, prediction, recording or prediction is based on recording and on it's like you take a graph of the movement of air of a stock or of anything anything you want to graph and then you establish a trend to see where it's going.

So recording is the basis of prediction but if you go into this beyond a certain point. The process cancels itself out because it's no longer worth doing. So the wonderful Jewish idea, of the Year of Jubilee, you know, when all debts are cancelled and that begin again. That's what we need now we need a new chemical or you know in a lot of people talk about putting nerve gases in the air which will immediately paralyze the enemy what we need is a gas that will destroy all paper whatsoever. I wonder what would happen, I've often thought about it. Even though I depend for my living to some extent on paper writing books. I think on the whole the benefit to humanity from the complete disappearance of paper at this point. Wouldn't have been true absent some other time but now I think that much would be said and it would have to include plastics celluloid film and all that other things well. Yes all recording to disappear in other words the book of the recording angel is to be eaten up by God. If they are this is the thing.

Now, that's of course I'm being please understand I'm being somewhat facetious. And that this mustn't be taken quite literally, but it is saying this point. Look at it look at a different group of tourists. I take people to Japan every so on, and the Japanese are absolutely with wherever you go the tourist the Japanese, everybody, they carry cameras. And the very nice to have a camera and photography is a fine art but there's a certain kind of people who never never look at any except with a camera they go around capturing reality in this box. And there was one man who was a magnificent

photographer who came along with me who never did anything but photograph. And he was always late and dawdling behind the other people even though we moved with a very leisurely pace because he was interminable photographing photographing photographing capturing the world stuff and making a still see with his box and movies and the another kind of still is a more complicated. So the clutch box you go around with as a result I find that people do not relate to the environment is the only thing that you should ever carry when you're strolling is it is a scarf or a crane to help you climb your hand should otherwise be completely free of income. So should your eyes and ears and everything then it will really happen. But otherwise, if you go around with a recording instrument all the time it won't happen. The only good recording instrument will be one that you were completely unconscious of. That you didn't have to focus and flip and study instead of looking directly at things were going on participating directly with people in social relationships.

So in the same way, when you have... you're seeing wonderful landscapes and works of art and antiquity also when people have very good times have a picnic at the beach and it's a delightful landscapes, someone should have brought a camera, to prove that this really did happen. But what happens instead nowadays when somebody gives a great party and all sorts of people are invited they are sure that the society reporter comes from the press. Then they can read about it in the paper the next day and look back and say now that really did happen it's in the papers or the same way a young adolescent who feels that he doesn't really exist commits a crime in order to get his name in the papers there will be headlines as a great hero and villain. And you know he's there he'll be recognized. It didn't happen if it wasn't recognized therefore, some very bright person pointed out all the while ago we have many pseudo events events that are created for the sole purpose of their being reported in the press. Like life goes to a party, remember those things all those parties were organized by staff of people who came up from Life magazine and said this would make a good target that set it up this way and they get various people to cooperate and all the and they have the party in the same way publishers instead of looking around for creative authors think up books then they find a hack to write them as if this would make a good book. And it's a pseudo-book. A non-book. There is all kinds of work done like this. Foundations invent projects,

Suter projects. Because instead of you see what happens is that. Instead of going around with a kind of field staff looking for what artists and scholars and people actually doing that is creative they stay in the office, and they get masses of applications come in and which are too boring to read. So finally, they sit around think up what would make a good project to give all this money to and. Then they think up a project then they go around and try and find people to do it and all those people they find are frustrated Ph D.'s from Harvard and elsewhere who are sort of academically competent but don't have very much on the ball they have to be told something to do investigative research.

So it's the same principle, all along, which translates life into a system of symbols. To predict the future for us. Then it makes us anxious to see how the vicious circle operates and having made a sanctions we turn back to it and say you solve this problem we don't want to be and we want a full proof system. Back to the recorder that are closer study of the symbols how can we are with the future. But you see? It's a complete vicious circle the law it's a seed the more it sails the more you are quite sure where you're going and the plane won't crash under any circumstances. By the time you can travel from here to anywhere in the world in an absolutely assured won't-crash plane, I assure you, there'll be no point in the. In the region. Because the place you will go to will be the same place and started this will look exactly like. Answer more. It will already. Let that journey in the completely full-proof plane, because it is absolutely planned you will have already taken that. That's why the place you are going to will be identically the place you came from. And so, who will then pay for their lines by travelling on nobody. There has to be the risk in it for there to be any point in taking. So this is the most important thing for all technologists to understand. That technology is a process, like cooking, like polishing, which you must do for a certain time and then stop. Then it's done, it's ready. It's created. But if you keep on keep on keep on keep on you you know supposing I have somebody I love very much and I like to stroke. They're not strong but if I keep on stroking are others going up. Up to a point it's fine, beyond that too much. And [this is] so simple I mean I feel I'm talking in platitudes. But this is a thing the people have simply neglected, when it comes to technology when it comes to law when it comes to the whole philosophy of prediction. Well, let's take an

intermission.

Well we come out of the most difficult part of the seminar. And in, by way of preface, I want to say, to reemphasize the point that I've made already, that in presenting ideas, I exaggerate. The reason for this is. That they are that insofar as I present ideas. Whereas the actual content of the philosophy is not ideas but experience, these ideas are intended to act as correctives. And so when you're walking a tightrope, you learn balancing. And so if you're in danger of falling in a certain direction, you throw the weight the other way. And there are all sorts of funny tricks to balancing as you know when you ride a bicycle. You turn the front wheel in the direction in which you're falling, whereas the person who doesn't know how to ride a bicycle tends to turn the wheel the other way so he falls over.

So in this kind of way what I'm talking about is always a corrective to whatever is a dominant current idea. At the end of that famous classic of Zen Buddhism called the sutra of the sixth patriarch of the Tanji [sic] the Platform Sutra. In a chapter the people of virtually neglected. Explains the whole technique of Zen teaching by saying if somebody asks you a question about metaphysical things you once are in terms of everyday life. If somebody asks you a question about everyday life you answer in terms of metaphysical. For example, what is the ultimate meaning of Buddhism master replies the cypress tree in the yard. Second example. Master and student are working together in the fields and the student says please pass me the knife. The master hands in the night blade first holding the entire handle in his hand the student says please give me the other end. Master says, What would you do with the other end? In the first case the metaphysical is answered in terms of the everyday in the second case the everyday is answered in terms of the metaphysical. And this is balancing, this is the whole meaning of the when Buddhism is called the middle way the middle way doesn't mean the compromise. It means balancing out. You punish answer referred to this as the path of the razor's edge.

So in this way if I use an idea at all, it is for the sake of counteracting an idea that is current. For example, Buddhists will explain that when the Buddha taught what are called the three signs of being. The three signs of being anitya, that all things are transient. Anatman, that there is no self. And dukha that everything is prostration and suffering. He did this not to say

that's the way it is really now finally this is the dogma this is my doctrine he did it to counteract. The idea that reality is eternal, [it's] it's flux. To counteract the idea that is a self that is the permanent witness of the trance in and around there of experience he teaches no self and to counteract the idea that the aim of life is happening as. He teaches the fact of life. Buddhism is a dialogue. It is not a doctrine. This is terribly important. There are no such things as the doctrines of Buddhism. There is simply a dialogue between a teacher and a student and the student creates the teacher by raising the problem. And so, there is the back and forth. In which if the student tries to fix on this part of you the teacher emphasizes that. And then, when the student says to the teacher, well all right, I'm going to agree with you whoops nothing to stand on goes over here or over here or over here or over here so that in the end of the dialog. You get to a position where you found that all opinions all views all drifty are inadequate. Because every view of Mt Tamalpais is different. And so there is no Say correct way of seeing MT time applies there was once a wonderful Zen master called E.Q. and he lived in Kyoto and in front of his temple there was a very novel in pine tree. And one day he posted a notice by the tree which said I will give one hundred yen which is quite a sum in those days to anybody who can see this tree straight. So soon there were all kinds of people standing around the tree lying on the ground trying to climb up on the wall above it and find an angle from which the central trunk of the tree could be seen as a straight line. There was one fellow who knew it was some monkey business going on at the would be with the problem. And so he went to a friend of recuse who was a priest of another sect but he was very friendly with this priest. And this priest was called...oh, what his name...something like a Rioman. And Rioman said, well the simple way to see the tree straight is of course to look straight at it. And so, the man went back to Ikyu and said I have solved the problem of the tree. To see it straight you look straight at it. And Ikyu looked very suspiciously because he wasn't convinced this man was a real understanding man but he nevertheless he forked out the hundred yen and said You must have been talking to Rioman.

So, now, let's it against as a corrective you see to our own fascination with time and our own obsession with the future pose the counter idea. That there is no future at all. And everything we call the future is a complete mirage. So is the past. There is no future, there is no past, there is only this

now. And you say well, that's ridiculous. Because so far as the past is most concerned concern we are quite sure of it. We know we've got every kind of historical record we've got our own experience to prove that. My mother who is not alive now will really did exist at one time that Socrates, that Jesus, that Alexander the Great, all these people really did exist and there was a past that led up to now it's all in the history books it's been photographed it's been recorded and obviously it's real and if that's real then it's perfectly clear that this process we're involved in is going to go on, and there is going to be a future. This is such elementary common sense, but I want to challenge it, radically. And we will take as our beginning the act of throwing a pebble into a pool. And you will see concentric circles of waves created. And you see, these actual waves flowing out across the pool. Now the truth of the matter is that they don't that water goes up and down. But no way travels you let the same illusion when you see a rotating Barber coil, a rotating screw the thing is revolving and it looks as if something is traveling upwards along that [these] excessive red stripes of the bubbles photo are moving up they're not moving. Now there's the basic principle this is the basic principle of the world considered as Maya or illusion. So then you might say reasoning from this that. There is something. That is history that there was Socrates, and there was. All these great figures and great movements and wars and all these political shenanigans that we call history. But they are all, what we're doing now, with simply the names changed. It goes on and on I like to tell a story of A which is the German story and it has Germany there was a fisherman sitting on that the river. And somebody came up on the washing and said it seems to me that you're doing something very cruel putting those worms on books and he was in they. He said, but they are used to it. What is going on is a constant repetition of the same thing. But appearing to be different all the time. Every day the French proverb plus ça change, the more it changes the more is the same thing. So that always, we get the idea that every situation is completely New You participants new personalities you children involved and yet. It's the same old process going on. Or you get a similar thing, and this comes out of their last day experiences. If you look at a Rorschach blot, under the illusions of L.S.D. you have the very odd sensation that you are watching. The watery ink flowing into position. It's still moving as when you know you make the ink blot and then you fold the paper across so underneath your photo all the angles blew up like this and finally fixes in a

certain position but you open it and where they are as you can see it's still happening it is moving but it's still. And this connects the very very importantly with the Zen philosophy of the nature of time. And I want to read you some quotations from Dogen who was a great founder of the Soto Zen school who wrote a book called Shobogenzo of which has never been fully translated We only have excerpts. And it's a funny thing as I was talking about this book with a wonderful Zen master who I think is really magnificent man, Morimoto. And I had Gary Snyder as an interpreter and as he's a magnificent average over the other wonderful command Japanese and an equally good understanding of them so I have the impression of the conversation that remains in my memory. Is that I had a direct talk with Morimoto. The interpreter eliminated. Very strange. So we brought up the Shobogenzo at that parable. He said it explains everything it makes it all completely intelligible. And we were discussing its translation of the discussing the translations and texts in general and he went on to say you don't need to translation. Not if you really want to understand Zen, that you use your own books, use the dictionary. Use Alice in Wonderland, use the Bible use anything is it that you realize don't you think that the sound of the rain needs no translation. And a few days afterwards I went with Gary to the morning lecture given by the master of Dido. And he was explaining in Chinese text and in the middle of his explanation tremendous rainstorm. And the thunder of the rain on the roof was drowned out absolutely anything he had. But he didn't stop. He went straight on with the lecture. Because, there was the sound of the rain. You know, whatever was going on, was it. And there's a funny lectures they have a show where the teacher sits opposite the Buddha, so if he sits on the side of the wrong but is it's over there and then the monks sit on the side and the visitors sit on that side it's a long rectangular and he carries on this dialogue with the Buddha. And everybody is invited to listen but you know it's a very funny thing it doesn't make any sense. So, this Shobogenzo, Dogen has a lot to say in it about the nature of time. And the nature of change. And the basic thought here is this. And I'm going to try and show you. How the same experience can be conveyed. By using language expressions that are formally contradictory. He says for example that the screen does not become the summer. And when what is done the word does not become the ashes. He says there is spring, and then there is summer. There is word. And then there is actions. And so by inference you now who are sitting here with me and talking, you

will never never die. Just as the world will never become your. T.S. Eliot plays the same idea in the four quartets and when he's describing that the passengers who boarded the train are not the same people who will arrive at the destination. You are sitting here are not the same people who walked in the door you changed. And so you are not the same.

So this is as if to say time is created by the illusion that this state and the state and the state and the state are in some way connected. Now you would say, well that is a kind of atomism. That is saying that there is that life is a moment like a movie. That movie is a series of frames on film, which by being spun through the camera create the illusion that it's not a series of frames but it's a single frame moving. Now this is one way of saying exactly the same thing as could be said in the other way and the other way of saying it is this. The notion that the movement of life is simply a succession of static states is a purely intellectual way of breaking things down. It's like calculus, it's like saying that a curve is a series of point instances. That when you hear a continuous sound. Aid if you analyze it it that that that that that that that that that that that that but you get it so fast going together that you can hear the intervals just in the same way as when the eye is deceived by the revolving cigarette in the dark. But one school of thought will say the reality of the situation is guess discontinuous it's got that that dot dot the other school of thought will say oh that's mere intellectualism. I'm the reality of the thing is real that you know it is a sweeping curving thing which has no structure. Now both are right. Both are absolutely right. It's just two ways of looking at the same happening. And as we can describe pain as a hot pang or a cold sting only oppose words so the realisation of the nature and movement of time can be looked at from these completely different ways one you can say there is there is only now. And you say well now is this way we happen to be sitting in this room but at another now we have been driving down the highway. So we driving down the highway, is not the same state as we sitting in this room. But that the point of saying that, that you driving down the highway is one thing and you sitting in this room is something altogether different the point of saying that is simply as a gimmick or what is called in Sanskrit a new idea or skillful means. For getting people to realize what it is to be here and now. And to see that this is what's important. Whenever you get into the meditative state, by whatever means then. You suddenly understand that the

whole point of life is what you're doing. Where you are. And this results in a kind of untightening of all your muscles. And you suddenly see that it really is worth looking around. That the chips of wood on the log, the funny markings on the concrete. The expressions and just to the people sitting around. Are what it's all about.

And there is no difference, between the ecstatic state of union with Brahman Nirvana, and the very matter of fact moment in which we are sitting around here in various pastoral feeling various feelings throughout our bodies thinking various thoughts and just because you consented to do so allowing the noises that I'm making to reverberate across your eardrums. This young ion young man that's going on is the young are young I know that everything is easy that's a. What it is that's what it's about. And you sit back. And you say yeah, that's what it's about. A lesson that I get that yeah yeah yeah. It's not marvelous you know that it does that at all. And that is called in Buddhism, seeing things in their suchness. Tathata, ta-ta-ta-, are saying everything as just that. This person goes this way the other person goes that way you have the style of that style. And so, in the scenery of spring there is nothing superior nothing inferior flowering branches grow naturally some short some long. But however, it is an extraordinary experience to overcome. The illusion that there really is time. Well let's begin this way. It isn't isn't it obvious. Bearing in mind the point that I made this morning. About our present not being a hairline. But I kind of fuzzy span which polarizes past at one end and future the other. These are simply the two ends of the present. As we perceive it directly but beyond that beyond what we perceive directly beyond what you see now here now feel now where is the past. What has happened to the pop of a champagne cork which you had last night. Well it just isn't there. And where is tomorrow's edition of the San Francisco Chronicle. It doesn't yet come of the press. It isn't there. So, from a sensory material realistic point of view there is no past and there simply is no future. Never was, never will. Your conception of the past is very subjective. You've only to study history to realize how subjective it is how many ways history can be written because every historian. What does he deal with? He deals with the records and with memories which are extremely fragmentary. Because he deals with mostly with verbal records and sometimes archaeological record of the past. And not only are these records fragmentary, that they only record those aspects

of what happened that were worthy of note. To someone or other who recorded but then when he in turn gets the notes, he uses them like a rorschach blot, and he projects on to them his idea of what happened. Anybody with a lot of experience of courts of law knows for example in cross-examining witnesses their testimony as to what did happen is extremely arbitrary and confused. We are making sense all the time of this rorschach blot.

So history is much more an art than a science it is a reconstruction by a historian. Who uses the materials of evidence in the same way that a painter uses paints. And in this way he reconstruct his version of the past and if it is sufficiently persuasive he convinces other people that that's what happened. Various sneaky governments have caught on to this, and realize that they can write their own official history about anything. And then they've got a doctrine that there is a kind of historical destiny or historical compulsion, certain things as a result of history not happen and then they use this to justify what they're going to do anyhow. Nowhere is this more apparent in scholarship than in historical studies of the Four Gospels in the life of Jesus. If you study all the great scholars, say from eight hundred fifty to the present day, who have examined the New Testament from an historical point you will find that every one of them has a different history. And that they have seen the texts from the point of view of their own particular way of wanting to present Jesus they've got excellent reason for rejecting all those parts of the text that don't agree with their interpretation and accepting those that do. And they cancel each other out a way down the line. So we know them from a sensory point of view that just as you cannot point to the difference between your. You cannot find the past. Equally, you cannot find any future. All it isn't here. And the future as such never will be. As the proverb says, tomorrow never comes. So then, you have a situation which is eternal. From the beginning of any form of the whatsoever. Whether it was mineral or merely gaseous whether it was an amoeba whether it was a plant an animal or human being, it knew that it was involved in a process. Or it was involved in the process even if [it] didn't know. Where the individual form begins and ends. All or does it. Where do you draw the line? Let's say we have a vibrating like this. Yes, you can point to that tangent you can draw tendons along the top of all the curves along the bottom of all those tangents that's the way you say this is

the crest this is the. Crest is where it is most that the trough is where it is not. But you see at once that you can't have the wave if you don't have both crest and the trough. And that every time it goes crest-trough. While that's away what is a way then we see. In the image of throwing the stone to the pool that there is not a wave. There is waving. But there is really no individual wave. You think you see this individual wave going out like that. Take a piece of cloth. Spread it out on a table, and then push it together so that you get a fold across the center. Right now move your hands so that you make that folding happen all the way across. The cloth doesn't move. The folding. That is this is a folding. Can you pin it down and say it's an entity. You can't. So in exactly the same way all our human history, from our earliest possible imaginable ancestors until now. Is standing still in the same place. Doing the same thing over and over again, coming on each time in such a way as to give us the notion that it's new. You are your fathers and grandfathers millions of years ago. You say they were sitting around in skins, and using stone implements. From the point of view of somebody a million years, hence we are sitting around in Skins using stone. The past people always were. But you see when those people were sitting around in caves with stone implements and skins, they had ways of conversing and relating to each other, which contained as much qualitative subtlety as we do. As we have. What we call primitive people have perceptions, ways of doing things that we would not even know...we wouldn't even know what to look for. And so they have in fact a very very high culture. Only its base it's structured say in a different dimension on a different wavelength than ours. But it is just as human and just as authentic. But we have the illusion you see, that it keeps changing. Getting better, getting worse one thing or another. But that's the same kind of illusion as the motion apparent motion of the wave across. So let's see how Dogen puts it because he's got some vivid ideas. If we washed ashore while we are sailing about we feel that the shore is moving. But if we look nearer to the boat itself we know then that it is the boat which moves. When we regard the universe in confusion of body and mind we often get the mistaken belief that our mind is constant but if we actually practice then and. Back to ourselves we see that this was wrong. When firewood becomes ashes it never returns to being five wood. But we should not take the view that what is Lassally Ashes was formal if I would what we should understand is that according to the doctrine of Buddhism firewood stays at the position of firewood. And then ashes at of the position

of ashes. There are fallen latest ages but these stages are clearly cut. It is the same with life and death thus we say in Buddhism that the unborn is also the undying. Life is a position of time. Death as a position of time, they are like winter and spring and in Buddhism we do not consider that winter become spring or the spring becomes some.

Now, another quote: When a fish swims he swims on and on and there is no end to the water. When a bird flies he flies on and on and there is no end to the sky. From the most ancient times there was never a fish or swam out of the water nor a bud who flew out of the sky. Yet when the fish needs just a little water, he uses just a little and when he needs lots, he uses lots. Thus, the tips of their heads always at the outer edge of that space. If ever a bird flies the on that it he dies and so also the fish. From the water the fish makes his life and from the sky that makes his. But this life is made by the bird in the fish at the same time the blood in the fish are made by life. Thus there are other fish who work and life and all three Create each other. Yet, if there were a bird who first wanted to examine the size of the sky, or a fish who first wanted to examine the extent of the water, and then try to fly out as when they will never find their own ways in the sky or water. So what he is saying now. Space is as far as you can see. The father you can see all of them all.

So with time, the element of time is as much time as you can know. But this I mean here direct knowledge your present a section of time which you call the present. To be concerned with the future you see, would it be like the fish who gets out of water. He would die. So, to put it another way. What you call time is not something into which you have been dropped as if somebody had dropped you onto an escalator and you suddenly found yourself carried by it. What you call the experience of time is you. It's not some, something else altogether you see, in which is a trap for you you are time all right you go on you want to go on? I go on, a great you create time I want to go on. Why do you want to go on? Well you say why, because one must go on why why must you go on? You feel compelled. You know. It's our duty to go on. How did you learn that? Well we were taught it when we were children by our parents they said you must survive you must live. And they were taught that by that so they knew no better. But if you live a life in which you feel you must survive then your life has a track. And you go on,

and feel you must go on, because you are not fulfilled now. If you really understood the now, you would not feel that you have to go on. As Confucius even put it a man who understands the Tao in the morning can die content in the evening. If you feel you say I must go on, I must go on it is because you have not. Lived. You're always hoping to live. So then if you come to your senses, which will tell you there isn't anything but the now. And that therefore because there isn't anything in the now it is supremely important. To rest in it. To get with it, to be one with her. You will understand the point, what's going on. That you, in your way, are your fathers and your grandfathers come back. Myriads and myriads of past events are still going on in you and you are doing the same thing. Only it keeps looking different, in the same illusory way that the wave appears to be moving across the water.

The Future of Politics

This then, is the last seminar in the series of seminars on the future. Devoted to the subject of the future of politics. All along, I've been emphasizing a particular point. Which is this: that the very idea of the future, has something spurious in it. That to live for the future is an indefinite postponement moment of life. And that the great political systems of the Western world, whether they be capitalist or communist, are based on the notion, that what we live for is the future and this is a very funny thing when you specially when you think about Marxism, because the Marxists have always said that religion is the opium of the people because it's based on the idea of pie in the sky when you die. But in fact, the politics of Marxism are just as much pie in the sky, it's always a five year plan for something to turn up that will be better than what we have now later on.

And in the exactly the same way, our notions of the Great Society are based on a futurist approach to life. Wherein you go through, in your education, a whole series of steps. The word in Latin grottos. Means a step. So we have first grade, second grade, grade grottis grottis grottis. I'm a graduate you know you've gone along the steps but just still doing it. So that when you become finally successful as the president of your corporation. You have a funny feeling of being cheated. You climbed the stairway, and you got to the top, and there's nowhere else to go. And since he never been taught to

live in the present, you don't know how to do. So an insurance salesman comes around and says, 'Listen I've got the very thing for you.' Retirement program, because when you're sixty five, you'll drop out of the system. And then you'll really be able to enjoy yourself, despite your prostate trouble, menopause, false teeth and everything else and.

So really the art of living in the in the eternal now, is not taught in our educational system. And it's not taught because it's thought of as being feckless, irresponsible. It isn't irresponsible at all. It is everybody's duty. I could put it that way, to enjoy themselves. Because if you don't do that, you become a nuisance, you become aggressive, you become a robber, you become a thief, you become a somebody who's trying to organize the rest of the world that is to say a power maniac simply because you haven't learned the very simple inexpensive art of living in the present moment. It really doesn't take an awful lot of energy to maintain a human life. If you really consider what you need to eat. What you need to wear, how much housing you have to have. It comes down to something quite simple. And the simpler, the more you have the capacity to enjoy watching a raindrop crawl down a window. But if you watch a raindrop crawl down a window and you think my look at that everybody says you're crazy, why are you watching a raindrop fold out of their country find something more important to do that means country make more trouble than that?

So the, the mentality, that doesn't recognize the importance of watching a raindrop crawl down a window. Is the one that is creating the trouble in the world today. I had an astounding session just a day or two ago with the chief of an Indian tribe. He was from the Western Shoshone Indians which are located roughly around central Nevada. And he was explaining how the government of the United States is really seriously trying to get rid of the Indian way of life completely. Especially by virtue of a bill which allows the Indians to borrow money on their own land, you know what I mean that.

So having it when he had told his story. I said Well now 'What do you want us to do about it?' He said, 'That's the wrong question.' I knew this was coming. He said 'You pale faces, you white people, you always think about doing something.' That means in voting in politicking. That's what's the matter with you. So I said, 'Yeah that's what's the matter.' He said we're

going to do something about it but we're not going to do it in your terms we expect you to be sensible enough to correct your own actions. We're not going to fight you, in the ordinary way, not on your terms. He said then further we are in harmony with the physical earth and geography and the sky on the waters of this country. And you'll strangely find that there are going to be more and more tornadoes more and more earthquakes more and more natural disasters, because you are, as people, you are violating nature. You are destroying it, and it will fight back against you and we are nature we are not. Some strangers on this land, we are the same thing as with the same process as the Land. And we regard ourselves as the same as the continent. And it's not just us in North America. It's we're in touch with the Indians in Peru and Chile, Brazil. We are one great family and we're just waiting for you invaders from the west from Europe to strangle yourselves and get rid of yourselves.

But the, in other words, he was saying that he wouldn't play the political game. Not on any account. And didn't really want us to play a political game on their behalf. Now this is something so inconceivable to most white people. Because for example, when you get Indians on the reservation and they don't do anything, and they don't develop it, and they just sit around and we say well they're no good. They're just lazy. They cannot make us understand the importance of a contemplative life. We say you are of no value, you're not even human, unless your changing things unless you're interfering, unless you are progressing. Unless you we confuse growing with progressing unless something is happening and great operation a new project is going on and you're busy with it you say, 'Well you're you're lazy, you're good for nothing.' Because you are not working for the future. But they say, if you're working for the future, you're quite mad. So they don't work for the future.

Just like a Chinese coolie. Works long enough to make some money. Then he knocks off work and he goes to the gambling joint. And he gambles or he smokes opium or just generally wanders around and digs the scene. And we say well that's awful that's irresponsible, you can't do that that's not maintaining the world properly. What do you think maybe that is maintaining the world properly maybe it's we who think that everything should be progressing who are destroying the world. Because we are by our

protestant ethic, by our notion of keeping everything in charge it's true we have a great initial success. We destroy diseases. We keep people alive. But on the end is the H.-Bomb get rid of it, entirely.

So, these nonpolitical people are saying to us, the trouble with you is you don't know what you want. You have a future, which you're working for. But you're all wretch and no vomit. You, you promised yourselves, the good thing is going to happen. You keep promising promising promising promising even your money is a promise it says on the dollar bill that the treasury of the United States will promise to pay a dollar. What they are going to get if you deliver this and say, 'Come on now.' Whatever it is that those dollars. And it is can give you credit. Because it's paper, it's all symbolism.

So, all these myriads of so-called primitive people. Like Amerindians. Mexican-Indians, Africans. Don't communicate with us. And we don't communicate with them. Because they don't want what we think is the desirable good society, or some of them do, of course. In Japan, for example, the Japanese have been fairly conned into the idea that the Western way of life is a great thing. And so they're by and large frantic industrialists. And so as a result the cities of Nara, Osaka, Kobe are covered in smog. Tokyo is just a madhouse. They're getting it.

So the whole point is, the future is an illusion. The basic ideas in Hindu cosmology, that in the course of time you go through the series of yugas, or the epochs. You begin with a great state of affairs and it gradually deteriorates, is a way of saying to people in the course of time, things only follow. Therefore, get out of time. Get off the wheel of sunless out of the rat race. So this underlies my idea of what I call the politics of diversion. Divert Western man from history, from the notion that he is in a historical process which is leading to something always better and better and better but which in fact only leads to more and more destruction. Divert people from time. By living a style of life which is timeless. And which is therefore more attractive than life devoted to time. That doesn't exclude our technological power. Part of the whole point of technology that I'm going to take up in detail and in a later session is that through technology, we have the power to obliterate poverty completely. But this must not be looked at in

a historical way. While it is looked at in a historical way it will not work. That is to say. The whole problem of money. And the distribution of the wealth of the world as produced by technology is a psychological problem not a material problem. People are hypnotized with money which is the symbol of wealth as if it were something that was valuable in its own right. That's the confusing money with gold when Ramakrishna said that one of the evils of the world was go he was I think perhaps unconsciously quite correct. There's a story, that once upon a time, all the banks in the world got tired of shipping gold from country to country so they decided to open an office in an island in the Pacific where all the banks had their headquarters, and all the gold was put together there so that all they needed to do and they had to exchange some gold was to trundle it across the street. And operations proceeded beautifully, for about ten years, and then all the heads of the banks from the different countries came with their wives and their children to visit the island and have a great convention. And so, they inspected the books and the transactions and everything was in perfect order. At last, the children said, 'Daddy I want to see the gold.' For the bank president said to the man it is, 'Take our children down to the vaults so that they could see to gold'. And so all those managers said well it's sort of difficult and problematic and takes a lot of time and then and the president said what don't be stupid What's the matter can't they see the gold. So they hummed and hawed and said well we're sorry to report that seven years ago it was a disastrous subterranean earthquake. And all the gold was swallowed up. But of course, we all knew how much we had at that time, and so we've kept the books according. So it's a joke. People don't realize, in other words, that that money is bookkeeping. And nothing but bookkeeping, and therefore the whole idea of taxation for example is a complete anachronism.

The thing that is stopping the flow of the actual wealth of the world is this fixation on money. What you need to do is actually reverse taxation. And issue, instead of charging taxes issue credit then you have to keep the credit balanced to the gross national product in some form of figuring and then everybody can circulate what they're making. Otherwise, you are in this ridiculous situation, where people are stopping in India, and we are hoarding food supplies and burning them and try and dumping them in the

ocean, which is sheer insanity, but it's all based on a psychological block about money.

So, this kind of psychological block is what an Indian philosophy would be called a Maya. It is an illusion, and it's the same kind of illusion as that of the future, of the idea that the future is when we're really going to live. And if that's the way you operate, when you get there, you're never going to be able to handle it, because you still want a future at the Europe. You're a special donkey with a carrot suspended from your collar on a rod is pursuing. Well now, when we approach the subject of politics, you obviously recognise at once that the word is connected to the Greek polis meaning a city. And the city as I've indicated in a former lecture is probably an ephemeral phenomenon in human life. As our technology of communication develops, cities are going to disappear. And for the same reason as our technology develops politics and it is.

Let's go back to an early stage of our development. When human beings changed, from being hunters, to being farmers. This is a very critical stage in the history of technology. When we were hunters, every male knew the whole culture. In other words, he had to fend for himself to make his own clothes to make his weapons to know the arts of hunting and also he was in charge of his own religion. The. Their way up peculiarly religious people in hunting cultures and their culture all medicine men. And the interesting thing about a medicine man as distinct from a priest. Is that he is not ordained by anybody else. He doesn't have to be approved, by a guru or by an organization or a church. He goes away alone into the forest, and gets his own thing. He may contact what he calls the ancestors, but he has to do it by himself.

Now, when a community settles. Instead of being a roving hunting people living in the forests. And they form instead of village. A great change occurs. Where do villages and towns occur? Where a road crosses a river or a road crosses a road. And then around that which would originally hunting tracks trails, a stockade is built. And that is called the pale. We say a person is beyond the pale. That means he's an outsider. Because the pale from the Palos the tree is the posts used to make the stockade. So inside the stockade, there are four divisions. Four blocks of Tam. And it is of the essence of an

agricultural, as distinct from a hunting culture, that you specialize, that you divide labor. And so, when labor divides itself, it tends to divide into four major groups.

Those, first of all, who are the brains. The Brahmins. The idea people. The thinkers. Second, the brawn. The military men. Who defend the scene. So they are called in India, the Shahtria. Who next why the traitors. The merchants the vice. And then next who? The Craftsman, the skilled workers should. Because then outside there are the people who don't have any particular qualifications. And there are low outcasts who are untouchable, but there are another group, who are very curious. They're also outside the pale, but they are respected for being outside the pale and they are called in Sanskrit Shramana. Which is the same as the word Shaman. Or in Chinese, Chamin, meaning an immortal, who lives alone in the mountains. In other words the people who still retain the values of the hunting culture. And say, like this, when you settle down in the city, in the polis. You new divide labor. And your Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Sailor, Rich Man Poor Man, beggarman, thief. You assume roles, you put on a mask. And say I'm a soldier. I'm a priest but you get more masculine that. You say I am a person the word person means mask. Persona. The mask worn by actors in the Graeco-Roman drama. And you are taught while you live in the polis. That you are your mask. I'm taught that I was taught by my mother, that I was Alan Watts and I've never been able to recover from it. And so everybody is assigned this roll that you supposed to play.

Well, you play that role. But in ancient Indian custom it was recognized that that you played it only if for a while. That when you had raised your children. And done your social duties. That you then had to prepare for death. Death, when you were playing a role, seems a tremendous threat because what's going to become of me. But they'd explain that that doesn't matter, you would just have to find out, when you are ready to die, you can die properly and with dignity if you know who you really are. So in order to find out who you really are, you withdraw from your role. And you become what is called Vanaprasta, which means forest well instead of grihasta. In other words, you go back to the forest. Away from the polis, outside the pale. The doing of this may take many forms it may be purely perfunctory to retire to a cottage in the backyard you may actually go out into the jungle

you may actually tear up all your clothes and run naked and sit by the river. All sorts of ways of doing it. But you give up your name. You become nameless. Or you may assume a name, which is a Divine Name, one of the names of God. There are people trying to do this in the United States today called hippies. I met one the other night and I asked him what his name was and he said My name is you. And he absolutely would not acknowledge any other name in all. Well great. OK. You're you.

When you got to become Vannaprasta, you're outside the pale and you concentrate your psychic energy. To find out what's going on, what is this that we call existence. You just you can find this out quite easily but you have to pay attention to it you have to concentrate you have to give your whole mind to say take hold of a sound. And find out what sound really is. Or you can look at light, and find out what light really is, or you can stop something and find out what is going on here. And when you find out, you stop being anxious. But you see then, politics is the order of that transitory state which is the city arrangement, the role playing, the game of social life, designed in a particular style. And I'm not saying I'm not trying to say in any way that the policy is something wrong. We shouldn't put it down and say it's bad. The only thing that could be bad is to take it too seriously. In other words, if you take the fundamental idea that the whole universe all its forms all the forms of biology, all the different species the giraffe, the rhinoceroses, the Buddhas, the the roses, the eucalyptus trees etc. Everything is a form of biological game, it's a dancing thing on, different styles. And we wouldn't want to say to any of those things, you shouldn't happen. Because they're all the great Maya, other great illusion the great play and so the palace the human community organized with division of labor, with classes with. All the complications of economics and banking and transportation and so on and so on and so on, all this is a particular kind of play. And each form of it is as legitimate as say, different kinds of dancing, a waltz, a rumba, foxtrot, a frog, all other perfectly legitimate forms of dancing that the universe does. But the important thing to understand what the Sanyasan, in the Sramana, the man who goes outside the pale is saying is. Please, people who are in the pale I in my existence reminds you that you're only playing. Don't take it too seriously. Because if you take it too seriously, you're going to start destroying each other and

fighting and saying, this city against that city, this country against that country, and so on, because you're too involved.

So every sane society allows a certain number of people to deviate. Monks. Some sort of outsiders. And says you don't have to join, you don't have to play the game. A society which is insane and I'm sure of itself cannot allow that to happen it's everybody must join everybody must work. Everybody must belong. And then freedom disappears. Because as a matter of fact, the anxiety is, if you say well you don't have to join, there are conditions under which you can go out then a lot of people get together and say well what would happen if everybody quit? I asked what would happen if everybody decided to take American Airlines Flight three to New York tomorrow? Well they just wouldn't get on. I mean. And they won't anyhow. Because a lot of people aren't interested in that. Are not ready to quit. That doesn't mean that they're inferior a be a calling is not inferior to the oak tree. It's a potential oak. But as an a call it's just as beautiful and lovely a thing as a full grown. A baby is as lovely as an adult. Sometimes a great deal more lovely.

So, a person who is in the beginning state of evolution is just as marvelous as a person in a high state of evolution. Just as much a manifestation of the divine dance. So, when a society allows a certain number of people to withdraw. It should have no anxiety that everybody will want to withdraw. Because some people are absolutely fascinated and in competition in being involved, in playing the game. They should be fined for that. But we are witnessing in the United States today a great motivation for withdrawal. It's simply because we haven't provided for it. We haven't...there's no opportunity for a Protestant to become a monk. Or a Jew. The Catholics have half heartedly provided for this sort of thing. And there have to be people who stand outside the game. And do not identify themselves. With a class. With a name with an ego with a persona with a role. And a society which cannot tolerate that is weak and in grave danger of dissolution. A society which can tolerate it is short of itself inside. Doesn't have to insist on. Everybody agreeing with the way you see things. That's the nature of democracy you say you have a right to do.

So, furthermore underlying the nature of a democracy is the notion of mutual trust. And this is difficult in a polis. You can obviously. Have an ongoing human arrangement. In which, proper behavior between each other. It isn't forced. To live violence of some kind by police. After all, who stands behind the police. Who gives the police the authority. Why, the people do? But if the authority of the police becomes something separate from the off already of the people you get in a violent situation you no longer have democracy you have a dictatorship. So, but if you really trust each other you don't really need much in the way of police. Yes, you need some scouts to direct the traffic who simply establish which row is to move first. Not by authority, but simply pointing out that when we get to a crossroads, there has to be some sort of order here, and we let so many cars go through this way then we stop them and we let seventy cars go through that way that's the mutual benefit of everybody concerned so there's a scout there to give a signal. Which we've all agreed upon. But when that scout starts dressing up like a storm trooper, and putting on all kinds of guns and whistles and helmets and things like that then he begins to act his role. He begins to behave like that kind of a person. And he becomes a vested interest. And so we have to say to him. Go back to your boy scouts hat. Take off that helmet. On those bandoliers full of bullets, and those boots. Start looking like a human being again. And then you'll behave like one. Everybody will respect you when you put up your hands say this row please and everybody will cost naturally accommodate themselves.

So, as then a society tolerates within itself a group of people who play no role. Who are in that sense liberated. We come to see all of us, that the political game is not absolutely serious. That the laws of the state are not the laws of nature. That the laws what we could even call the laws of nature are very many of them, nothing but social institutions like time, like space and so on. And so in not taking our civic political life too seriously, we can live it at a decent pace. And stop from the idea that it is our sacred duty to impose our wonderful way of life on everybody else. And that you see is a quality of humor. When you don't take yourself too seriously. You can laugh at yourself. And this is the most essential ingredient for a politically healthy people is to be able to laugh.

So, that's why one of the difficulties about churches and law courts. I was in the law court some time ago giving evidence. The two accused people were smiling the judge at the gavel. They said, 'You two young gentleman, should realize that you're on trial for a very serious crime. And that this attitude of laughter is disrespectful to the court.' And their attorney got up and said, 'Your Honor, this is the first time these two men have ever been in court and they don't understand what the rules are.' And he said it's high time they did it. Now, every great court where every supreme King Chakravarty and presides always provides for a jester to be present. Because the moment the king in charge, or the Justice becomes too serious, he takes himself too seriously, there is tyranny abroad. And so a proper king has sitting right down there on his left a character in cap and bells. And in ancient days, the fools were very powerful people. Very important people. One of the fools of the court of England Rahir, founded some Bartholomew's Hospital out of as well. As the fool, as Shakespeare puts it, 'Within the Hollow Crown that runs the mortal temples of the King, keeps death his court.' And they're the antic. The antic is an old word for the fool there the antics that scoffing at the state grinning it is pomp allowing him a little time to monetise be feared and kill with looks. And at last comes death and with a little pin balls through his castle walls. And farewell King. Because the fool is the one who reminds you all the time that your mortal, your fallible. Human. Don't take yourself too seriously.

So, at the Congress of the United States at the sessions of the Supreme Court there ought always to be a fool, who says the judges. But you know, the trouble with Republics is that they are little insecure and they don't allow fools around. Very secure Kings only can allow fools. Dictators can't allow fools because they rest upon the will of the majority. They get into power through referendums. They sure can't tolerate fools around. It's only an aristocrat, a person who has come from a long, long line of rulers and is doesn't just isn't insecure about the situation he can allow the fool. So, if a people is to be mature democracy is to be matured it must allow the fool. It must allow the Joker. And not merely as a cartoonist in the daily press. To point fun at the goings on, the presidency. Somebody actually present at Cabinet meetings, who was appointed to be the maverick to be the funny in the hay session. In the same way a university faculty must have in its membership a small percentage of complete scruples. Who are not

respectable scholars who have weird ideas because they will keep the rest of the faculty alive. Not too many of them, always a little balance like the salt in the stew, a little bit but not too much. That is always the element of the people who say to the whole system it's going on to the whole reality of life 'haha.'

So now, I want to contrast out of Asian sources, two great theories about politics. Respectively, from two books. The first book is the author Shastra. Which is the manual of political wisdom, originating from what you might call the great period of medieval India. And the opposite sort of book altogether the Tao Te Ching from China. Probably four hundred B.C. These books contrast with each other in a completely beautiful way. Both of them are manuals of advice to an emperor. When in Sanskrit, one speaks of the word Chakravartin, it means a wheel Turner. And a Chakravarti can mean either. A completely omnipotent moment. Or a Buddha. Now, this is the extraordinary thing about the life of the Buddha himself, because he is reputed to have been the son of a very, very powerful king. And when the astrologers got together at the time of his birth they said this boy, Guatama, is to be a Chakravartin, the question is In what sense of the word will be a chapter about him. Will he turn the wheel of the world or will he tell him turn the wheel of the Dharma. And his father wanted him of course to maintain the royal dine and turn the wheel of the world. What is the wheel of the world the wheel of the world is the song. The rat race. The squirrel cage. And the wheel of the dharma is this, is the same wheel only, you run along it without thinking you're getting anywhere. When the earth circles the sun, it's not going anywhere. And when you play music. You're not aiming at the final chord. When you dance, you're not aiming at us but a particular spot on the flaw. But if you think, that in the process of musical dancing or whatever that there is some destination at which you should arrive then you are in the rat race wheel the Samsara wheel and the Chakravadin is the master of controlling things. And so in this extraordinary book called the Shastra author means. Citizenship belonging to society what is involved in the duty of social organization Shastra means text that as I'm an authoritative kind not so was Orotate it was a Sutra but nearly.

So, here is this book written. To describe the duties of a man who is a complete tyrant. You've got to be God, you've got to govern, this is your

duty. Somebody has to be elected to be president of the United States. Or whatever by whatever method of election it may be vote it may be birth. And it tells you that if you take the reins of power what you're going to have to do. It's phenomenal this man who wrote it was far more realistic than Machiavelli. And he said. 'From the start, realize that you will never succeed. The road of power is always failure.' But you may have to take that road. It may be your svadharma, you also father out of mark which means your own function, your vocation, what life elects you to do. And you will never succeed at it. But in the pursuit of power this is what you're going to have to do first principle is have no friends. Don't trust anyone or anything. You've therefore imagine yourself living in a palace which is a fortress. And the palace is so constructed that it's a mandala, a circle. Rings within rings within rings, both architecturally and organizationally. And you are the spider in the middle of this Web. In your inner sanctum, you cannot really sleep. You must at best only sleep with one eye closed. And you have guards around you all the time and you have secret gods who watch those gods. You can't really eat, because someone always has to taste the food for you first to be sure it's not poisoned. And then you arrange your ministers and advisors in the following way: every ring, you set at odds with the next ring around it. And you promote discord between the separate rings, on the principle of the Latin saying divide et impera, divide and rule. So that therefore For example you have a very close association of cabinet members who are your immediate advisors. But don't trust them have just be on them some subordinate by those who want to use up their positions and will watch your cabinet ministers for any treachery to expose them and immediately give them away. In this way, you guard yourself against treachery, from the immediate circle and so you do this the whole way out. Then, you plan within the center of this palace, a secret exit. Where you have a trap door and a tunnel that goes down to the river where there's a speedboat waiting, to make an immediate getaway if the should be a palace revolution. But on the way from the tunnel, as you go down, there is a special keystone that you can remove and cause the entire palace to collapse. And shatter everybody inside. So here you have this thing which is very very much like a modern fantasy, George Orwell's book one thousand nine hundred four where Big Brother is watching everyone, the trouble for Big Brother though, is that in watching everyone to see that they don't break the law, he has no time to enjoy himself. Just as this poor guy

who's the mahamaharaja Chakravadin. Talking about him cannot sleep because he's always got to be on the watch. So Big Brother could never take his girl for a walk in the park. He's always got to have his eye glued to the television which is inspecting what everyone's doing is the most miserable of men the spider caught in its own web.

So, the whole theory of political control by imposition of the rule of law from above. Which is alas, the Christian theory of the universe, this is the way God is operating. Do you realize that according to the theology of sir Thomas Aquinas, God is personally aware with his full total consciousness of every atom of existence. That is to say, a mosquito's wing does not vibrate without the entire total consciousness of the Divine Mind. The mask of the Episcopal church opens with the prayer, almighty God under whom all hearts are open all desires known from them no secrets I would. Think of it. Think of having to be occupied with the vagaries of every human mind. Think of the boredom of having to put up with all that. Poor God, the victim of his own power game.

And so the most ingenious man who wrote this Arthashastra showed all this up in the most vivid way. That is the price of power. Now, the gods of the Hindus do not work this way, they do not operate in the manner of the Chakravadin. And this is revealed in the fact that they have more than two arms. When Shiva is depicted dancing the Tandava dance yet ten arms all of which operate individually. Have a look at Tesh but are has one thousand dollars. Have a look at Ashgrove when translated into Chinese becomes quite. Common in Japanese and in the gorgeous sunders sang and though temple of Kyoto there is an image of calm literally with one thousand on come. And surrounded by one thousand replicas, only these ones only have ten arms. And they, eight and each one of them has a eleven heads. This is kind of a spooky thing to us say What is this kind of deformed mission of the human image of? But what it's like is that your body is covered in the vents. And each one of these nerve ends is sensitive as if you were covered in eyes. And they're carrying information through and you operate and you adapt to the world without having to think about it. So it means, that the true power of the Divine Being is that it has one thousand arms, and does not have to cogitate about how to move them. The poem says that the centipede was happy quite, until a toad in fun said prey which leg goes off

to which. This work to mind to such a pit she they distracted in a ditch considering how to run. The centipede operates all those legs, without having to think individually how to do it. Just as you breathe, just as you grow your hair.

So, in the same way the Hindus have the idea that the universe is operated in the same way. That the the Supreme Lord has a one million one thousand watt of arms and each of you is one of those arms. And they they go like that. In the West, with our political-monarchical theory of the universe, God is supposed to know every detail and keep track of it all. So there is a book called The Doomsday Book. The book The Archangel of Judgment and in that is recorded every single thing you have done. So that in the day of judgment you will have to answer for it all. As Jesus said, every hair of your head is numbered. Phew.

And the Hindus would say either lotsa has to get the number. Call it. Call it a Kalpa, call it a crow of kalpas a cochi of kalpas they have these words that express fantastic numbers like we use in modern astronomy. So, if you want to keep track of everything, remember it all, figure it all out. So that a little there will be a day of reckoning, in which we can say, finally this is the truth about what happened. That's a very dangerous idea. And this idea of the day of reckoning is the one idea that can very well destroy the world. Because if you get in a final argument. And say we've got the bomb on our side and you've got the bomb on the other side. And we know that if either one of us uses it the whole world is destroyed. So what's to be gained? Oh, says one side, we believe in the last judgment that beyond death there will be a reckoning when everybody will be brought together on the Supreme boss will line up everybody in front and say now the rights and wrongs of this issue are as follows. And the people who believe that they will survive death in the spiritual world you know, better dead than red, will believe that the Communists will be brought up before the judgment throne of God and that God will lecture them and say that they were all in the wrong and that they it was right to blow the bomb against them. That's the consequence of believing in immortality you see you could actually do it.

So, this idea then that the world is governed. By conscious and personal knowledge on the part of the deity is the politics of money, it is the politics

of Machiavelli, the politics of the Athashastra. Although in the AushaShastra it is quite clear that the writer of the book. Realizes the fallacy of the whole thing. That what he is saying is that if that's the way you want to go this is what you're going to have to do. And that therefore life is an organization that will not work under dominance. It will only work by cooperation so you get the opposite book. The Tao Te Ching. The legend of the Tao Te Ching is that it was written at the request of the captain of the guard. Of what was then the Chinese capital. When the court librarian got disgusted with the life of the court, and decided to retire into the mountains.

The Chinese have a strange love of the mountains. There is always idealized, being able to wander off into the mountains and get lost. One of the lovely poems of the Chinese. Says..it's called looking for the master. 'I asked the boy beneath the pines he says the master's gone alone heard gathering somewhere on the mound, cloud-hidden, whereabouts unknown. And all the old Chinese scholars and poets have this nostalgia. To leave the world in its competition and one upmanship games. Go into the mountains and leave no trace. So Lao Tzu, which means the old boy. Literally, the old boy. When he tired of the life of the court. [He's] supposed to have been stopped by the gate Guardian when he was leaving the guard said. I cannot permit you to leave because you are a very wise man and will be valuable to us so would you please write down your wisdom. For ruling the state and then I let you go. So Lao Tzu said, Yes I will and on the strips of bamboo scratched out the text, which is the most paradoxical book ever written. Because it starts out by saying that I'm a bit that there's a thing called the Tao what is the Tao. Tao is the, is the way is the how-to, is the. The Prince and the is the way of nature is the cause of things. He starts by saying the way which can be described is not the eternal way. And then he goes on to describe it at one point he says those who speak do not know those who know do not speak but yet he speak. He rights the book.

Well now, this book is a manual of advice to an emperor, essentially. It can be read on many levels. It can be read as a mystical book, it can be read as an alchemical book, it can be read as a meditation manual, and equally well as a political textbook. And the the basic idea of the whole thing is that in the art of ruling, you do not use force. You never. Press the issue. And it is for this reason that the the Lao Tzu book is the basis of Judo. In Judo, you

don't use force against your opponent. You use his force, if he uses it against you. You can practically prove that if someone comes to a calamity as a result of a judo thing that it was his own fault. Because the principles of it are like that. There is an esoteric form of Judo called Aikido. And that any I would say any young man in education today should learn aikido. So should every young woman it is a fundamental science. Aikido is the art of being unattackable. Because when somebody tries to hit you you are never there. You simply dissolve you disintegrate you know you're not that a catch hold up. And the curious thing about Aikido is that you learn certain tricks that you can accomplish only if you don't use effort. You can for example learn to put you on Mount straight in a way that nobody can bend it. But in order to do that, you must use no effort. It's the most peculiar paradoxical thing it really freaks you out when you get involved in this experiment and the teacher shows you how to do it the funniest experience is just like everything suddenly became contrary to common sense. But that's all goes back to Lao Tzu, to the imagery that is used of the pine in the willow. Willow tree is springing, and relaxed, and when the snow falls the willow tree droops and the snow drops off the branches. But the pine tree is too tough and therefore has an arm like this, and as the snow falls that piles up and piles up until the branch cracks. So Lao Tzu says, the man at his birth is supple and tender. In death he is rigid and hog.

So suppleness and tenderness of the characteristics of life, rigidity and hardness of the characteristics of death. He likens the functioning of the Tao to water. And he says now water is always taking the line of least resistance. It doesn't strive, it always seeks the low level, which men in the hall because they always want to be on top. But what can you do with water. You can't cut it, you can't injure it, you can't compress it. So he's saying in other words if you want to govern a nation you must behave like water. Govern a nation as you cook a small fish. That means that if, you must do it gently because when you have a small fish in the frying pan if you chivvy it around too much it falls apart. And so therefore he has a conception of the Tao, which is as it were, the exact opposite of all conceptions of God. He says this the great Tao flows everywhere, both the left and the right. It loves and nourishes all things, but does not lord it over them. And when merits are accomplished, it lays no claim to them. It says, the swishing wind does not last out the morning, the pelting rain does not

go on all day if heaven and earth cannot keep these things up how much less.

So he has an idea of the Emperor as an anonymous sort of person. Who is always retiring, who would be in other words, to a political community. In the same way as today, the sanitary engineer is. Now, we have a sanitary engineer who is an official of Sausalito or Marin County. Never would you imagine the sanitary engineer going through town in a great car with a police escort and flags in all directions. Nobody even knows who the senator engineer is and yet he is a very important official. Without him, there would be health problems and all sorts of difficulties. But because he is in charge of the sewers, everybody would say well, that's not very glamorous. Then Lao Tzu is saying, that the the chief official of the state should have the same attitude as the man in charge of the sewers. But the less he parades himself, the more effective he can be. The less that's known about him, the better.

So he says, the energies of the Emperor should be directed to keeping the minds of the people unpreoccupied and their bellies well filled. In other words, let's not have news about politics. That the newspapers be full of interesting things. Not political things. But our newspapers, which are all about politics are full of catastrophes. You open the newspaper and what do you read what is news bad news is news. The saying you know, no news is good news. All news is bad news. They don't say the great things that are going on. Very rarely. You get somebody who claims to have cured cancer or something and that gets a headline. But by and large bad news is the news. So Lao Tzu advocates no news at all. No discussion of politics he says My ideal state would be a small one in which you could hear the chickens in the neighboring state. And there would be no apparent government. It's a kind of anarchy. But of course, anarchy depends upon everybody being responsible when you drive down the highway and you see a rock lying in the road you don't say, oh the department of highways will take care that you stop your car and kick it over to the side. I don't know if you know that book. The power within this. Which is written by. A man it was reconstructing the travels of a Spanish explorer the United States. And he says the evil of Spain is that everybody regards the nation as an entity that exists in its own right, distinct from every individual in it.

And therefore shifts responsibility to that, as if the nation existed, as if in other words the government was something different from you. This is that's where the evil comes from. We say, oh, the government will do it, the government will see to it.

So there is likewise a story in the Bible. That when one day there was a question of electing the king of the forest. And they went to the various vegetables. They went to the oak tree and said You are strong upstanding How about being king of the forest? And the oak tree said I don't have time for such a thing. All my energy is expended in making this god just wouldn't constructing good acorns and I wouldn't have time to be king they went to the vine in the vine said no I couldn't be cute forest because all my energy is absorbed in these grapes, and you will need your wine and so on that I have to do that. And they went all around and finally they got to the bramble. And the Bramble said sure, sure, I'm nothing special do, I'd be most happy to be king of the forest, and so the bramble grew up and strangled everything. On it being there for that. Being King being in charge, is an operation that doesn't work. Now let's look at this from the point of view say, of electronics.

It's primarily it comes down to scanning. Observing, and integrating the behavior of a very complex system. How can you do it? There's a bottleneck. You cannot pass that much information through a single source. Without rendering that single source of observing it incapable of observing it. It's as simple as that. Therefore, if you are going to have a control of an enormous amount of information. It has to be delegated to many scanning units. And you have to trust them all to work together. Because if again you go back and say well then that has to be something that scans the scanners, and see that they're doing their job right why of course the thing that scans the scanners can only take a very general impression of each one it can't go into the details can it.

So, a highly organized system where a lot of detail is going on has to be a system of mutual trust there is no way of bossing it. If you want to have it all you have to have it by letting go and saying to all the units in it come on let's play together. At the moment you come on up tight about them and say. Now, I want an accounting from each one of you. Each one of them

feels a little mean about it and will conceal information and you, if you're going to keep charge of the whole thing in that style of behavior I'm going to have your hands full too full you won't be able to watch it all. So therefore, every organic complexity works by the delegation of authority. Every organic unity is a system of love. That is to say, of mutual trust. That says, thank God I've got you around. I often think about when somebody does something that's marvelous and I think what a relief that you could do that and I didn't have to. All that effort that you put into doing this is so beautiful, and it just relieved me of the necessity. See, and that's the way that the life principle really works. In complete opposition to any idea of lordship. Of all the credit belongs to me.

So it's so funny when in Christianity, everybody ascribes the credit. For anything good that happened to the Lord God. There's a sense in this. But it is not the sense that's usually advertised. When you say it, wasn't me that did it. You as an ego, supposing you've done. You've achieved something great. And you say you know it wasn't my ego that. It was all these myriad little molecules and cells, each one of whom contributed to this extraordinary thing that I did. See, you could go in that way towards infinite diversity and say of everything that you did no it wasn't me it was my people it was all these little fellows who. Each one of them. But in that, to the degree that you go towards the infinitude of the little wants. To that extent you have a true sense of unity. Whereas if you don't give any credit to the little ones and you say oh I just push them around. You don't realize how to put together. So it's this is this is the true in a meaning of the principle of non-duality. That, it isn't just kind of crass unity. Which says all the multiplicity is an illusion. And they're all really one stuff what it's saying is that the truest unity is the same thing as the most detailed multiplicity. Because you don't know, you can see intellectually. You don't know what you mean by unity in this you understand multiplicity. The one throws out the other idea they they balance each other like the back in the front so in exactly the same way the more you go fall. Highly articulate multiplicity, the more you get unity. A living organism with a complicated differentiation of its parts is more united than a piece of rock. Or homogenized milk. It's more of a total working system. You know, you can throw the milk off the floor and it won't reassemble itself. So this is a thing then that the whole idea of the giving in to the other saying. Trusting it to

do it. Trusting. When you want to learn. A certain discipline to control your muscles in a certain way. You have to do this by trusting them to do it that way rather than. Trying to dominate them in say bunk and Sierra's modeless book on playing the piano. All of his idea of developing eyes fill in technique is based on trusting your muscles. And that they have in them an intelligence and you trust them to use their intelligence in manipulating the instrument. So in I was the more you diversify yourself, the more the unity comes about.

So this is the real secret underlying the democratic principle. The notion of what a Republican is, as distinct from a monolithic monarchy where the people cease to trust themselves. And say to an office or authority. Please you take care of this instead. It works exactly the opposite direction. And that direction is the opposite direction of the Way in which all living organisms flow and manifest themselves.

At the end of the question period yesterday, I said we had come to something which I would have to take up today. And this arose because we were discussing the problem of prediction, which is of course related to the problem of control. I had made a passing reference in yesterday's seminar to the fact that the knowledge of time, the knowledge of the future, what Korzybski calls man's time binding ability, is an advantage for which we pay a very serious price. To know the future in a conscious way gives you obviously a survival advantage but at the same time, it gives you a survival disadvantage, so that what you gain on the roundabout you lose on the swings. You gain the ability to plan your future. Say, to invest, to take out insurance, to do all those things that are called provident. But the price you pay for it is anxiety. And you pay this price because you know that you don't know enough. That you know as it were enough about the future to try to be profitable, but you don't know enough about the future to be sure that your providence was correctly done. Therefore you worry. Therefore you are concerned with what will happen tomorrow, and it's so extraordinary that that passage in the US and Matthew's Gospel where Jesus says, don't make any anxiety about the morrow, what you're going to eat, what you're going to drink. And I'm amazed about that because every minister I have ever heard discussed this passage says it can't be put into practice. See the church simply never did teach that that's they they the most a verse of passage in the Gospels which is swept under the carpet see.

In a way of course, Jesus told all sorts of stories in order to make people think. This one this this image of the flowers of the field, and the birds that don't make any plans. And he did another one for example, the story of the Pharisee in the publican. [It's] very interesting, because its effect extremely funny. He says here is the Pharisee, who goes up to the front row of the church and stands up and sort of memorializes God on what a good guy he's been, that he has fulfilled all the duties and so on then there's the public a new creeps into the back and beats himself on the breast and says only God be merciful to me a sinner see? Now having told that story the situation is completely reversed, because then all the prigs creep into the back of the church and beat themselves on the breast and say got develops a hold of me as the nurse and son of the now we would have to tell the tale exactly the other way around, and say now the honest guy is the one who simply walks straight to the front and addresses God man to man.

But you see, what people don't realize in what I would call good movement ship the art of teaching is that the teacher tells tales not for their immediate obvious meaning but for their later effects. What is the result of having told this story? In this story is completely deflated. Fake humility. Where you try to be humble. It's a koan. So in the same way, the bit with the passage on be not anxious for the morrow. Really asks you, 'Why can't you put this into practice?' Here is a precept who contracts, nobody. They say oh it is possible we cannot give up making plans we cannot give up prediction. Of course we predict in a way in a sort of unconscious fashion. The simplest act involves a kind of prediction. So, in this case, we are simultaneously aware of things which if you do regard the present as a hairline, would be called Past and Future at once. But if you are not hung up on the idea that the present is this headline thing which is purely abstract, then you have no problem in accepting the idea that we are simultaneously aware of past events and future events. Because they're all, just like you're watching from a traveling vehicle, and you can see where you're going to be and you can see where you have been from where you are now.

So in that sense then, we have a knowledge of the future, [say] when I move to pick up my glasses. but that is a different kind of knowledge from when I speculate in an abstract way as to what I ought to do a month from now or might might happen a month from now you see. So then, the question then

becomes...we predict those far futures which are not within our present vision. By calculation. It may be astronomical, navigational calculation, or as it was, in old times astrological. People thought they had inner astrology, the means to foresee the future and know what to do. And then the question arises, well, what are the...Supposing there is a fine science of prediction, whether it be scientifically respectable like navigation or meteorology which isn't too hard. Or whether it be something like astrology are these really profitable sciences. Now I pointed out the problem is A, that when you know the future, you pay for it with anxiety. You know, I am going to die. A creature that doesn't make predictions like a cat or a dog, when seeing another dead cat, will not necessarily infer that's going to happen to me. Because you see a true animal, a truly functioning entity, is not self-conscious in that way. For example, you all know that only other people have heads. You don't. Only, how do you become concerned with your head. Why, because you have been made conscious of your face. You looked in mirrors you have been talked about is the only part of our body that we leave permanently unclothed, except the hand even when we put gloves on you know their hands are covered but we always keep the face make it. And you learn that you're there in terms of having a mask see you can touch it. Put a good face on it, lose face, save face, all these things indicates the importance of the face the seat of one's identity whereas inside beyond the face where are you. See if you were living naturally. You would be as unselfconscious as your head is. You know, even than the brain is and is not sensitive to probes and...

So, you would live in terms of all this is going on is you. But you've been talked into the idea you have been smashed back into your head see, by social indoctrination, and your face has been made to stand for you. The real you, behind the face, is everything that you see, and hear, touch and sense. So, the headless man. To have no head, to go out of your head, to lose your mind you see is in a way always characteristic of the wise man. Because he's come back to his original emptiness. Which is behind the face. See, when you turn to see your head, you can't and what is behind the eye, you can't, it's not dark. It's not light you just can't apprehended in any way at all. And that's what it's all about. But so then, when you start calculating, and you resort to a prediction, you are now trying to get hold of all of us. But many people have an instinctive feeling say when confronted with a

great astrologer who could tell them all the future I don't want to hear it. I'd rather not. And this is in a way a wise, if uninformed reaction. For the simple reason...well, let's put the other point of view for a moment another point of view would be a realistic person saying the trouble with you is you don't want to know your future because you're afraid of life. If you were know your future, you could take practical steps to adapt things to it. If you knew you were going to die next Tuesday, you would immediately put your house in order and make less trouble for your friends and relations. Face it. Yeah, that sounds all right to begin with. It's like all technology is initially a success. But the real problem kindly comes to is this: When the outcome of a game is known, the game is cancelled. Because the whole point of playing the game is that we don't know the outcome. Because, the known future is already past. And the higher the degree of certainty of knowledge as to the future, to that extent, it has happened. You've had it. And that we don't want to put the future in that situation, not really. Because the how you see if you think of the cosmos as basically a game of hide and seek. Where the lord God is creating the universe, by forgetting that he is God and imagining that he is you. Then this is the fundamental way of getting rid of the eternal boredom of knowing all about it. And of there being no surprises. The whole, the whole vitality of being alive is that it is always surprising. To be enlightened is to be surprised at everything. That it is a wonder that it is everything is a miracle, that it is highly improbable and really shouldn't have happened at all but there it is, you see. If there isn't that sense there is no vitality in anything. But again of course we have the problem that I discussed yesterday in another form the problem of order and randomness and the drawing the line you see. Where to draw the line between order and randomness so in the same way where to draw the line between the known and the unknown how much to predict, how much to say well, I'd rather leave tomorrow to tomorrow, sufficient unto the day is the trouble.

So, you see again it is all a question of where to draw the line, of how much to control and realize that when you go beyond a certain degree of control when you go beyond a certain what I will call natural prevision, such as I described by the analogy of looking out of the window frame. When you go beyond a certain degree of natural prevision, you would encounter a law of diminishing returns that the more you succeed, the more you fail. And then

if you get into this sort of, I describe it yesterday from the academic point of view. When scholarship, acquires an exactness, and a highly detailed degree of information that constitutes an information bomb, and nobody can keep track of it and the whole thing becomes a bore, who wants to keep track of it any longer? Who gives a damn? You know, about those final details of Shakespeare's use of the conjunction.

So in the same way in practical politics, we have reached a state today, where law is out of hand. Because it is too meticulous. There is too much paper, there are too many whereases, if ands or butses, subclauses and so on and nobody could keep track of it the whole thing is in a state of total confusion and this confusion exists in the name of sanity in the name of trying to set things in order because everybody shouts when somebody does something wrong or ought to be a law against it. And soon there is indeed a law against it, there's a law against everything we are all at this moment doing something illegal I don't know what it is but it's always there and somebody can find it out and invoke it if they wish to make trouble for us. I'm quite sure that my entire situation is illegal. And so for everybody. And this is the result you see of wanting to pin everything down. In ancient China, could the Confucians have a thing they call the rectification of names. And they were, the Confucians are curious people because while they have some marvelous ID. Years there's a certain lacking in humor. And they're rather ponderous and puritanical and stuffy. The Taoists, on the other hand have humor and are always making fun of the Confucians. Now, the rectification of names was that Confucius said we must be sure when we use words that their meaning is established. So this means the dictionary. And so they were they were the first real serious thinkers about dictionaries about definitions about laying down what the words mean, but the Taoists pointed out by saying if you are going to rectify the words, what are you going to rectify them with? Well, they said, with words well then they said what are you going to how are you going to rectify the words you used to rectify the words. Well they thought about that, and then they said well, their words are self-rectifying that is to say, you rectify words with words and the words you use to rectify the words are rectified with the other words. It's a closed circle. So you can play a game called Vish, in which you supply the players each with a copy of the same dictionary. And then you have a lots of words written on the slips of paper and a hat and

somebody pulls a word out of a hat and everybody looks it up in the dictionary. Then they take the definition and they look up a key word in the definition. And look that up and so on until they get back to the word they started with. The first person to get back to the word that everybody started with calls out Vish, short for a vicious circle. And then there is an umpire present to rule on whether they cheated, in other words whether they looked up, when they saw our knowledge to, to records on looked up the word to instead of the record or observe or whatever. So the dictionary only gets out of a vicious circle when there is a picture beside the word. Then it escapes. But otherwise all. Attempts to pin down words are simply going in a vicious circle.

So, one uses words effectively. By not trying to pin them down too hard. But we are always saying, 'Put it in writing!' If we're really serious about an agreement between two people, put it in writing. Because I can trust the document but I'm not sure if I can trust you. Do you exist prove it have your birth certificate a passport a card of identity. If you can produce this wretched piece of paper you're there, if you can't, you're not. Well obviously, it was a good idea to record certain things so we could be sure that people wouldn't be dishonest. But all this started from people being dishonest. And it if we are going to stop people from being dishonest. There's only one way to do it. And that's for people not to be dishonest. No other way that has ever been invented will prevent it. And if you think you can go on living by preventing people from being dishonest with you by rules and regulations and laws and policeman and all this kind of thing, you eventually, you succeed in the short run. But once again, in the long run you run into a total tangle. United States of America is the country in the world with most laws. And yet our police are completely mistrusted by every sane person. They're crooks and scoundrels, and the violent fascists a kind of people. With exceptions you know, everything has exceptions. A sort of nice cop on the corner. But by and large through all. The state in which say people say oh well the law will take care of it. The law won't take care [of it]. You have to take care. And you can only be a law abiding citizen by trusting your fellow man. And if you don't do that, no one will trust you. And therefore a system of mutual mistrust will exist, which of its very nature must fall apart and it cannot operate. So once again, you see, this is a quote problem of the confusion between physical reality and symbolic

reality. The law says this, therefore it must happen. And if it doesn't happen somebody is there with a club to see that it does. Maybe, unless you wangle out of it conceal it, find a loophole in the literature. Get a good lawyer, that means a man who can say that the law didn't say what it was intended to say. So that then of course, everybody is accountable and that means keeps accounts. And I am increasingly fine that it's difficult to operate. Because of all the records that have to be kept one spends more time recording than one does doing. So, this is to say that that be the symbolic method prediction, recording, all prediction is based on recording and on like you take that a graph of the movement of air of a stock or of anything anything you want to graph and then you establish a trend to see where it's going. So, recording is the basis of prediction, but if you go into this beyond a certain point. The process cancels itself out because it's no longer worth doing. So, the wonderful Jewish idea of the Year of Jubilee. You know, when all debts accounts are cancelled and pff... begin again. That's what we need now we need a new chemical or you know like people talk about putting nerve gases in the air which will immediately paralyze the enemy. What we need is a gas that will destroy all paper whatsoever. I wonder what would happen. I've often thought about it, even though I depend for my living to some extent on paper, writing books. I think on the whole the benefit to humanity from the complete disappearance of paper at this point. Wouldn't have been true or perhaps at some other time. But now I think that much would be said for it and it would have to include plastics celluloid film and all its other things well. [audience question] Yes, all recording to disappear. In other words the book of the recording angel is to be eaten up by God.

So this is the thing. Now...that's of course, please understand I'm being somewhat facetious. And this mustn't be taken quite literally but it is saying that at this point. You look at look at a book a group of tourists. I take people to Japan every so often and the Japanese are absolutely weird about this wherever you go the tourists the Japanese everybody they carry cameras. And they're the very nice to have a camera and photography is a fine art, yes. But there's a certain kind of people who never, never look at anything except with a camera. They go around capturing reality in this box. And there was one man who was a magnificent photographer who came along with me, who never did anything but photograph. And he was always late and dawdling behind the other people even though we moved at

a very leisurely pace because he was interminable photographing, photographing, photographing capturing the world stock making a still see with this box. A movie is simply another kind of still it's a more complicated kind. So the clutch box you go around with as a result I find that people do not relate to the environment. The only thing that you should ever carry when you're scrolling is a staff or a cane to help you climb. Your hand should otherwise be completely free of encumbrances. So should your eyes and ears and everything, then it will really happen. But otherwise if you go around with a recording instrument all the time it won't happen. The only good recording instrument would be one that you were completely unconscious of. That you didn't have to focus and flip and study, instead of looking directly at things that were going on participating directly with people in social relationships. So in the same way, when you will have a not being just a tour, where you're seeing wonderful landscapes and works of art and antiquity. Also when people have very good times they have a picnic at the beach and it's delightful, some says oh someone should have brought a camera. To prove that this really did happen. But what happens instead nowadays when somebody gives it a great party and all sorts of people are invited they are sure that the society reporter comes from the press. And then they can read about it in the paper the next day and look back and say now that really did happen it's in the papers for the same way a young adolescent who feels that he doesn't really exist commits a crime in order to get his name in the papers. There he'll be headlines as a great hero and villain. And he'll know he's there he'll be recognized. It didn't happen if it wasn't recognised therefore, as some very bright person pointed out of the while ago, we have many pseudo events events that are created for the sole purpose of their being reported in the press. Like life goes to a party you remember those things. All those parties were organized by stuff of people who came out from Life magazine and said this would make a good party. Let's set it up this way and they'd get various people to cooperate and it's all there and they have the party. In the same way, publishers instead of looking around for creative authors think up books then they find a hack to write them. They say this would make a good book. And it's a pseudo book. And non-book. There's all kinds of work done like this. Foundations invent projects, pseudo-projects, because instead of you see what happens is that. Instead of going around with a kind of field staff, looking for what artists and scholars and people actually doing that is creative. They stay in their

office, and they get masses of applications come in there which are too boring to read. So far they sit around think up what would make a good project to give all this money to and. Then they think up a project then they go around and try and find people to do it and all those people they find are frustrated Ph D.'s from Harvard and elsewhere, who are sort of academically competent, but don't have very much on the ball. They have to be told something to do investigative it, research. So it's the same principle, all along, of allowing the recorder, which translates life into a system of symbols to predict the future for us. Then it makes us anxious, you see how the vicious circle operates, and having made us anxious, we turn back to it and say you solve this problem we don't want to be and we want a full proof system right back to the recorder back to a closer study of the symbols. How can we out-wit the future. The doozie. It's at and that complete vicious circle the more it succeeds the more it fails, the more you are quite sure where you're going and of the plane won't crash under any circumstances. Well, by the time you can travel from here to anywhere in the world in an absolutely assured one crashed plane. There will be no point in taking the journey, because the place you will go to will be the same place and started from at least it will look exactly like it. And furthermore, it will already...that journey, in the completely full-proof plane. Because it is absolutely planned. You will have already taken [it]. That's why the place you are going to will be identically the place you came from. And so who will then pay for the airlines by travelling on them? Nobody will. There has to be the risk in it, for there to be any point in taking it.

So, this is the most important thing for all technologists to understand. That technology is a process. Like cooking, like polishing, which you must do for a certain time and then stop. Then it's done, it's ready. It's created. But if you keep on keep on keep on keep on you'll you know supposing I have somebody I love very much and I'd like to stroke her. [It's] very nice to stroke her, but if I keep on stroking can I rub a skin off. Up to a point it's fine to see, but beyond that, too much. And so simple I mean I feel like I'm talking in platitudes. But this is a thing that people have said to neglect it when it comes to technology, when it comes to law, when it comes to the whole philosophy of prediction.

The Future of Communications

This is part of a series of seminars on the future. And, last weekend, we were discussing the very nature of time. And I want to give a sort of summary of what we were talking about before going into this particular weekend's discussion which is the future of communication. Last weekend. We discussed, the idea that history, the notion of human life as a kind of progressive system that is beginning from the old, the primitive, the worn out, the stupid, and going on progressive led to greater and greater attainments the wise the good. The successful and so on. That this is a very dangerous illusion. That in so far as we feel we are participating in and improving human life through the course of history, we are actually destroying ourselves. Because everything that so far, through technology and through the accumulation of human skill, we call the increase of our powers, is leading us to destruction. Not because technology in itself is a bad thing. But because the spirit in which it is used is a spirit of man against the universe, man against nature. And man has to realize, that he is an integral part of nature. That he is just as much a natural form as a seagull or a wave or a mountain. And if he doesn't realize that he uses his technical powers to destroy his environment to foul his own nest.

And so when you look at a great modern city like Los Angeles. And you see the. Absolute ruination of what used to be a very lovely natural scene full of citrus trees and sunshine now turned into ways smoggy slum. So the Los Angeles-ization instead of civilization, of the world is the result of having a sense of our own existence. Which is contrary to the facts. And that is to say. We are all trained, by our parents, teachers. By our peer groups. To experience our own existence. As an ego. In a capsule of skin. Confronted by an external world which is not ourselves definitely not. And that this external world is something that really threatens us because we've been brought up to the idea that basically it's a mechanism it's a stupid unintelligent manifestation of energy. Right out in the father's galaxies it's nothing but fire and gas. Nearer to us it's nothing but water and rock. And it's full of buzzing insects and. Other organisms that are inferior to the human status. And therefore something that's not to be trusted at all and we have been brought up with the idea that we come into this scene. As if we will complete strangers to it. We're born by an accident of bad rubber goods or something like that. And we arrive in the US. And confront it like that see what's outside there. And this is a hallucination. All this is a complete.

Fantasy. Official people in psychiatry complain about the hallucinatory States induced by L.S.D. and so on and so forth but they are nothing they are nothing in their hallucinations compared with the hallucination of being a skin-encapsulated ego. One is not that. For example, it's a very very very simple a human being exists by virtue of living in a world where there are plants. Where there is air. Where there is water where there is some and that temperature. And plants imply insects and grubs. They can't live without them. And grubs imply birds. And birds imply fish. And so on and so on it all. It all fits together, so that you are patterns every every living organism is a pattern of something which is inseparable from the pattern of everything else that is going on. So that you could say you as a living human organism are something that the whole universe is doing at the point of space and time which you call here and now. You are not separate, you flow into all that surrounds you in exactly the same way that your head goes with your feet. See, they're inseparable, when you were born, you weren't put together like one constructs an automobile. Screwing on this bit and screwing on that bit and so on. You beautifully grew head and feet together, all of one piece. From your mother's womb. And in exactly the same way, that your head and your feet are related together so you go with you I want to get this word into the English language, go with instead of cause and effect. Instead of that mechanical understanding of the world which was Descartes and Newton they thought of the world as billiards, you know, you hit a ball and it goes [clicks]. And it's that ball like that is in. And they thought of cause and effect you don't need to use that concept at all. Go with just as a front goes with the back just as a top goes of the bottom doesn't up goes with down. There in the operable. So in exactly that way you go with. Everything that you call the external world.

And therefore you have to treat the external world as if it were as much you as your own foot. Or your own head. It's part of you. It is you. There's no way of separating, therefore you have to be very kind and reverent and respectful to the mountains, to the forests and so on. To the water to the fish. You for example, live on fish just as birds live on worms, and if you kill any creature. In order to live, you have a duty towards it. That is to say, you must not exterminate the species on which you live. People have, for example, in the whaling industry they have practically exterminated whales. And it's become a very serious situation, because you must farm, cultivate

every species on which you feed. If all worms were to be eaten by the birds, the birds would have no further sustenance. From the worms point of view, if all the birds were to vanish, the worms would overpopulate themselves, and starve themselves. So the worms depend on the birds, just as much as the birds depend on the worms. So we all depend on the whole interaction, of the system of biology. It's a mutual eating society. You may say that's too bad, you know, that life has to involve this crunching and crushing and annihilation of other creatures, but that's the way it is. And therefore, if that's the way it is, the way to do it properly is number one; to farm, instead of merely destroy. Be assured that the species you feed on is maintained, that it goes on. Farm the whales, don't just hunt them. That's the first principle.

The second principle is, whenever you destroy a living body for your own maintenance, give it the honor of cooking it as beautifully as possible. A fish that has died for you and is not well cooked has died in vain I'm quoting Lin Yutang. So this is the situation in which we find ourselves life is a system in which organisms, by mutual eating, transform fish into people, grass into people, lettuce into people, cows into people. What about people? What are they transformed into? We are proud to proud and we try to resist our transformation into some other forms of life and therefore we have a wretched profession the morticians otherwise known as undertakers who try to embalm us and preserve us and put us in concrete barriers instead of letting us simply join the biological rhythm actually watch it. Happen when a person is dead is that they should be buried three feet underground with no casket, nothing, just naked in the earth. And that field should be allowed to lie fallow for some years. And then it would be beautifully fertilized by human bodies and crops would grow out of it.

They always say that the best wheat is grown on old battlefields. But you see, we resist that. And the morticians will put an ad in with some girl who's lost her husband looking out of the window on a rainy day. They say, trust us, he's not rotting really, you know, we've got that concrete thing we've got that extra special covering that super bombing and the corpse is still there. Baby don't worry. You know, how mad can you get? How insane, how ridiculous. The root of this kind of disturbance, of feeling that

you are separate inside your skin and not simply all one process with everything that's going on around you.

The root of this is a failure, of communication. Now, if I want to talk about communication. One of the funny things that occurs to me straight off is that the subject of communication, is really the same subject as life. Life is communication. But let's take the subject of advertising. Life is advertising, because the moment- What is advertising doing? Advertising is trying to promote somebody is game somebody is existence somebody is biological reality because he's maintaining himself by selling something and he advertises it so as to sell it so one could say that all life is advertising. Everybody advertises himself and some way or other.

Or take another subject, strategy. Military strategy. All life can be seen as a form the strategy. Any major department of Human life that we classify we can call it business, we can call it strategy we can call it advertising we can call it communication but we can see all life as that. How then are we going to define communication as a particular human activity as distinct from other activities how what is the difference between communication and architecture? What is the difference between communication and playing on the stock market? What is the difference between communication and football? These are very very difficult things to define, because there is no difference. Football is a form of communication. Sex is a form of communication. There isn't anything that we do that isn't a form of communication, and therefore you may say why talk about communication because it's everything anyhow. So, in order to define the field I'm going to talk about communication. More narrowly. Communication is language. Communication is, the world of symbols. It's true, sexual intercourse is a form of communication, but I'm not going to include that sort of activity in what we're going to discuss. What I'm going to talk about is the way in which human beings use noises like words and symbols like numbers, to represent the things which go on in the material and physical world. If you take a glass of water. And you drink it, and you taste that, you see, that is an event in the physical universe, but the word water is also in the physical universe, because it's a sound. But that particular sound water is used in a way that is peculiar. It is used to represent that transparent liquid that you drink.

So alongside the physical universe of people and everything that's going on, there is another universe that we have invented, of words and signs and numbers that represent. The physical world. And we are very very preoccupied with this symbolic world. And we very often confuse it with what it represents. This is especially true in the United States of America. This is a country and nation a culture which is devoted in a most peculiar way to symbols. Not so long ago, the Congress of the United States voted very serious penalties against anybody who burned or mutilated the American flag. That same group of people is responsible for burning and destroying the physical landscape and population of the United States of America. They will not properly resist the depravities of lumber companies who are destroying the redwood forests. The watersheds. The industries who foul our streams, deprive us of all water. Poison the air. That's all fine, just so long as you don't destroy the flag. The flag is the symbol, only the symbol, of the physical country. Of the day instead of protecting the physical country, protect the symbol. In the same way exactly, people confuse money with wealth. Money is paper, is bookkeeping, is a useful method. Of avoiding the inconveniences of barter. But money has become something to possess in it's own right. To have more money than you can possibly need, you know, the joke about if somebody gives you a million dollars on the condition that you spend it all in one day what would you buy with it? And you are certain things that are excluded, like you mustn't buy an enormous real estate thing you just have to spend it on things that you could use. And it's a very difficult problem as to how you would spend a million dollars in a day. Think it out realistically. But when you get this obsession with money as a reality as if it was something that actually was desirable. You get an entirely hallucinated population of people who simply don't know what's good for them. And are as shall we say intoxicated, addicted to money as if they were all on heroin or opium. This is the confusion of the symbol with what it's supposed to represent. So then, let's inquire carefully into the origin of all this, because before we explore the future of communication, through symbols, through words, we've got to look a little bit at its past. At some point in the development of mankind, and nobody historically knows how long ago this is, we invented we developed two things. One of them was the ability to scan. To pay attention. To use our consciousness in a focused way. In other words, to notice what's going on. Ordinarily, we depend to an enormous extent on a

kind of consciousness that doesn't notice. That is to say, you're functioning all the time. Breathing, beating your heart. Even driving a car while you are absorbed in conversation with your friendly passenger. You're doing an enormous number of things very well indeed without noticing what you're doing. Your entire physical existence as a matter of fact goes on and maintains itself without your noticing anything about it. So your faculty of noticing is, has the same relationship to your total organism as say, on a ship, the radar is scanning, scanning, scanning the environment looking for trouble. That's all it looks for for another ship that it might collide with for a rock for the proper entrance to San Francisco in the middle of the fog. That's what the radar is looking for. But besides the radar there are all kinds of things going on on a ship. That are much more fundamental and essential to it.

So in the same way, in the human organism, we have a radar, we call it conscious attention. And we are constantly scanning our environment and noticing this and that as to whether it is advantageous to us or disadvantageous. But that's only a little frippery on the top of us. Useful, yes. But it's not you. The real you is the you that is beating the heart, shaping the bones. All that. And we have learned you see, by a curious social process to identify ourselves, our very selves or what I say is the real me we've identified that with the scanning process. The little radar job, instead of identifying it with the whole total organism. And therefore we are estranged from our own bodies. And by virtue of being estranged from the body, we are in turn as estranged from the physical environment of nature if you understood if you really clearly realize that you are your own organism. You would at the same moment feel because your organism knows it that you will one with your environment. This organism is related to the world outside it, in exactly the same way that say a whirlpool in a river is related to the river. Everything outside you, is sort of creating you, by flowing through you and human-ing you, bodying you, just as when the river moves it whirlpool. And then goes on.

So the entire physical universe is people and all around here. But conscious attention doesn't deliver that to us as an experience. Why? Because conscious attention or noticing, is a function of consciousness which is separative instead of unitive. It analyzes, instead of synthesizing. I don't

want to by saying the sort of thing to put it down and say it's a mistake and something that shouldn't have happened. It's a very beautiful function. Provided, provided, provided, it doesn't and I have date and distract us from seeing the world synthetically, as well as analytically. In a mirror you can see many images all different clear and distinct but underneath the difference of images there lies the pure silver of the mirror.

So in exactly the same way, seeing all the details clearly analyzed, we need to remain aware of consciousness itself, of awareness itself. Just as for example, all galaxies, all physical bodies exist in space. What do you think space is? Most people think space is nothing space however is you. Space is consciousness, space is the mind. Space is what you call self, me, that's space. and it includes everything. But you can so easily forget it because conscious attention ignores every stimulus every input message that is constant. It rules it out, it says that doesn't make any difference. I'm looking for differences because I'm on God for what might threaten my existence that from looking for a change in the environment I'm a troubleshooter.

So if you identify yourself with consciousness you are constantly anxious. What's going to happen? Is it going to work? And I on the spot you see everybody is like that. But the real you is relaxed. It really doesn't care about that it's got this little function up there that tells it you know on the whole Whether that it trouble going to happen. Really inside you deep down your harmonious with your environment. And it really doesn't matter whether you live or die. Because the whole system goes on anyway. And that's what you are. So whether you, as a specific example of the system, go on a little while one year to year three years, fifty years, hundred years, it doesn't really make any difference. If you want to play it, in other words if you want to put a gamble on how long will you live. You want to gamble on fifty years more or how many years from all. You say by gambling on it you put importance on it you say that's what I wagered on that's what I want to do. OK. But that's, that's your game. It doesn't have to be that way.

So what we have then is a situation in which, by the ability, to use our radar to scan ourselves and the world around us. And to notice features of this universe. We notice these features by being able to put symbols on them.

You notice the face as something distinct from the knees by being able to call it face. And call needs knees you do not have the capacity to notice these different features of the human body without being able to assign some symbol to the part that you notice. This is absolutely crucial. Noticing and language go together. Noticing is the same thing as what we call notation. Notation as in music symbols little signs to identify sounds on the scale. Words to identify bits of the world. Numbers to identify how many bits. All this goes together, so to attend, to concentrate, to watch, to be aware in the way that a spotlight focuses on the surroundings. This goes hand in hand with symbols. One uses the world of symbols the world of special noises. Not like ordinary noises, not like the sound of the wind, not like the washing of the waves but the noises made by speech. To create a separate almost separate world of noise forms, which of course we can think silently in our heads sub-vocally, as thought forms, they're all the same it's forms of noise forms of vibration used to stand over against the world of ordinary direct physical experience. And represent it. In a clumsy way. Clumsy yes clumsy because conscious attention, as a scanning thing as a spotlight roving over. Would do or however fast it goes to get addicted if you to get it to get it all around the I watch you if somebody measures where my eyes look, it can be done. They will see them dancing over you picking out significant points. But that way of looking at life can only comprehend what's going on in a very clumsy way. Because the actual physical world is an operation where we would say, uncountable, innumerable things are going on all together, everywhere at once. And so we say what a complicated world we live in.

Now actually, this world is not complicated at all. It is perfectly simple, it's only complicated when you try to think it out. That's what it means complicated the word complicated expresses a relationship between the physical world on the one hand and on the other a scanning system which is trying to understand and represent in symbols the physical world bit by bit as for example if we would talk about it.

So when you try to talk about the world it's a complicated world, but only because you're trying to talk about it. In itself is not a bit complicated. The human body is a from the point of view of surgery and physiology. Infinitely complicated. It's networks of veins and nerves and so on is

absolutely extraordinary but we say these words extraordinary and complicated because we are confronted with the task of trying to translate this body into language. And language is a very clumsy, it's like if we would say we would move the Pacific Ocean into the Atlantic Ocean with a beer mug. It would be a very complicated thing to do, because we'd have to take it mug by mug across fly them across by a jet plane and dump them in the Atlantic. Very complicated. But that's what you do when you think about the world you take thing by thing, fact by fact idea, idea and it's light beer mug up to be a mug of water going from the Pacific to the Atlantic. And then we say it's complicated it isn't it's only if you approach it with a certain method then it's complicated, because you insist on that method. And you say well that method is me. I am the method of taking in the world bit by bit but that's a hallucination, you're not. Each one of you includes far more capacity than that narrow method of taking in the world bit by bit. Because every nerve end in your body is alive and aware, every organ is functioning without your thinking about it, and that's you. So because we are, have a narrow down idea and conception of ourselves as purely the conscious scanner, we've invested so much emotion in that we've invested so much of the feeling that that is what we are, that we are completely miserable and tormented.

Our communication system therefore, is constantly exaggerating or to use the word in its very correct way, aggravating. To aggravate means to to make it worse. It is aggravating all the time, the delusion, that we are separate from the world. In other words, communication as we are using it is a form of non-communication, it's a way of cutting ourselves off instead of actually communicating. The more we talk, the more we think, the more we ideate, the more we separate ourselves from each other. Identify you as you as you, and you're a Republican you're a Democrat you're a beatnik you're a hippie or a this that and the other thing you're a square or whatever the more identify you you see in these. The more I don't feel that you are me you really physically are many all of you each one to everybody else is like a dewdrop on a spider's web in the early morning which contains in itself all the reflections of all the other dewdrops. And we really relate to each other like that. But in language, in communication, we all put ourselves apart as separate entities, and believe that. So the more we go on with this, the more we have divided up the more we quarrel, the more we

don't understand how to cooperate. So here we start with this paradox. Communication which is related to the word communion common what we have together. Communication is separation. And the more we talk, the less we understand each other.

So then, it has been said that our modern systems of communication are an extension into the external world of man's nervous system. Telephones, telegraph, radio, television: all this network of electronic devices is extending our nervous system in the same way as a wheel extends our feet. But consider the problems that are arising out of this. The extension of the nervous system, electronically, means the end of privacy. As if all your interior thoughts were to become instantly public and available to everyone. Or, conversely, as if your so-called private self were to become a shared self. Let's think of it, first of all, in the worst way we can think of it: the inconvenience of everybody being able to barge in on us by telephone. Double that inconvenience, triple it with the inconveniences you can imagine for a future technology where you not only have the sound of the person's voice on the telephone, but also their visual image. It can be so worked out, technically, that everybody can be equipped with a little gadget about the size of a pocket watch. On one side there is a dialing system and on the other side there is a little TV screen. And everybody in the world who possesses one of these things has a number. And if you ring it and the number doesn't answer, your friend's dead. Imagine. Because you can't not answer. That would be unethical, that would be inhuman, that would be to advertise yourself as dead. You must answer.

Or else a busy signal. Have you ever thought about busy signals as a method of self-defense? Because we do it all the time when we, say, somebody asks you to do something you don't really want to do, you excuse yourself on the grounds of saying, "Well, but that day I happen to be busy. I have work to do." Even if you thoroughly enjoy your work—like for me: all my work is play. But I can say to people, "I have to work, I'm sorry." And I feel slightly dishonest and I don't know what to do about it.

So then, imagine, then, this situation where we have the huge electronic intercommunication so that everybody is in touch with everybody else in such a way that it reveals their inmost thoughts, and there is no longer any

individuality. No privacy. Everything you are, everything you think is revealed to everyone.

Well, now. Let's go into the history of this: this idea of privacy. It's been—for a very many, many centuries—a belief of Western civilization that there is God, who knows everything that you are. The mass in the episcopal church begins with a prayer: "Oh almighty God, unto whom are all hearts are opened. All desires known and from whom no secrets are hid." That we have lived centuries now before we—now, in this modern age, who don't perhaps believe anymore in this monarch God—but before us (our grandfathers and our great-grandfathers and so on) all believed that there was a reference point called God to whom every single secret thought that you had was an open book and was watching it all the time. Because, according to St. Thomas Aquinas, God the Father creates the universe by knowing it. In other words, you see a flag flapping out there, which you would say is an insignificant little rag on a pole. But, according to St. Thomas, that rag flaps there only because God, with his entire infinite energy, is concentrating on every single molecule of its being. And by virtue of that concentration, it exists.

So God is an every which-way intellect that penetrates everything, that concentrates on everything, and only because of that does the thing exist. So when your thoughts move in your brain, they do so only because the Lord God Almighty is supporting them. When you say, in the Creed, "Pistevo is ena Theon, Pat panto panta pantokratora." Pistevo: I believe in one God. Panto panta pantokratora: the ruler of all things. The pantocrat, not the aristocrat. The all-ruler, who therefore is in charge of everything that happens. Every happening is an expression of the divine power. But you, as an individual, are privileged with freedom to use the divine power any way you want. You can do evil with it or you can do good with it. This is the Christian doctrine. So that when you do an evil thing—when you slit a baby from end to end and eat it—you are doing so with the power of God. But you have gone against the spirit of that power, even though it supports you in doing it. Now, that's the idea.

So what I'm—I'm just bringing up this point to show that the West has had for centuries the idea that there is no real privacy, because God knows

everything that you do. And we've accepted that. And what we don't want to accept is the idea that our neighbors know what we do. But let's suppose we have a situation in which we know all our friends are listening, and all our non-friends, and there is absolutely no way of concealing our inmost thoughts from general inspection. What does that do to you? What does it do to you? Can you control the way you think and feel inwardly? What would happen, in fact, if everything were exposed? One thing would be very obvious: eventually, after attempting to control your thoughts and stop certain thoughts from happening, you would say, "To hell with it! I'll think just the way I feel like thinking and be damned. The public be damned." That's what you'd do. Everybody would have to do that. They'd have to do it in mutual self-defense. Do you see how this would release everybody? If we all could interpenetrate each other and know each other through and through, we would forgive each other all our sins. So don't be frightened of the notion that there may come a day when everybody is mutually bugged with microphones and everything so that there aren't any secrets.

Why have secrets? Why have secrets at all? But the moment you overcame the notion, you see, that you have to be defending yourself—when you've overcome that, there'll no longer be any need to defend yourself. Now, what we're afraid of, you see, is that some power will control all of us by this method. But that power, whoever is the controlling agency, must (in the kind of Nineteen Eighty-Four Orwellian horror) be the one individual whose thoughts are not public. If the super-controller has his thoughts public, then he can't be in that position.

So the horror-idea is: if everybody is circuited so that his private thoughts are public knowledge to all his friends and relations, and to the controller, but the controller's thoughts are not public knowledge, then you have a system which is a real dangerous kind of dictatorship. But if there are no private for anybody at all and we're all hooked in on the system—all plugged in—then everybody will look at each other and say, "Oh, haha, come off it!" And we'll all be free to be our inmost selves because you will recognize that everybody else is as much a rascal as you are. And we'll forgive each other because we'll understand that that is simply human nature.

This is so often the case. Somebody goes to a psychotherapist because they have some kind of sex problem that is absolutely weird—or at least they think it is. You know, they want to chew the tip of a woman's high heel, and this, only, will give them an erection. So they go to the psychiatrist and say, "I have this very strange problem." And he says, "My dear fellow, do you realize I have forty patients with the same problem you have?" Which is a great relief, you see? He's found out that he shares this. So this same sharing of our minds—which might come about through super-electronics—would (provided there is no one who is able to opt out of the system and say "You don't get my thoughts on it!"). So this is a parallel of what we're doing already: that every individual has his secret, has his privacy and, to a very large extent, identifies himself as an active individual by virtue of having that privacy. And at the same time, what he mostly has in privacy are things about which he feels guilty. They're his sins.

Sin and privacy are really the same thing. Because when you go to the confessional in the Catholic church and whisper your sins to the priest, you're in a box—a private place—and the priest has a rule that he will never, never, even under the threat of torture, reveal anything anybody has confessed to him. It's called the seal of the confession. So, in this way, we feel that our individuality depends on our privacy. And privacy and sin are really the same.

Now, everybody who is at all sensitive likes to be alone. You like to be able to go out on a sailing boat all by yourself and float in the middle of the water, or climb up the mountain, or go into the air, or just retire into your own place and relax in loneliness. But I want to make the point that loneliness—in that sense—and privacy are quite different things. The privacy of having a secret in you that should not be revealed, that's just a silly joke. In other words, we all know perfectly well that Jesus Christ had to go and excrete, although no mention is made of it in the Gospels. There are a certain kind of people who, just because that wasn't mentioned, drag it out and will draw cartoons of Jesus sitting on the toilet. Like Paul Krassner in *The Realist*: he loves to bring out this side of life, you see, where idols are debunked by being shown up as, after all, human.

But that kind of humor, that sort of sick humor, can only exist in a community where, indeed, there is a peculiar self-defensive privacy, and where we base our individual existence upon secrets. And this is why, of course, clothes—as I mentioned earlier today—are of such immense importance to us as the masks that distinguish us. In a nudist camp everybody is kind of depressingly equal. And you have what you have. If you're young and lucky and strong, you look beautiful. But if you're old and saggy and not much, you look like a kind of a wet potato. So, in order to show that you are more mind than body, that you have something in you that isn't just this flesh, you express yourself in clothes. Great, great, great, wonderful. But everybody with X-ray eyes knows just exactly what you are underneath all that.

Now let's take the X-ray deeper and read your thoughts. What kind of a going-on are you? And at first you say, "Oh God, listen to those person's thoughts. How boring. Why couldn't they be more interesting than that?" Because, you must admit, that the ordinary train of your thoughts is pretty dull. I often think what God must feel like when he has to inspect the ordinary train of thoughts of all these millions and millions of people. And they can't do that thinking without his being completely aware of it. And just think what he has to undergo! Ugh! But when you look deeper, underneath the conscious thoughts, and you see the fantastic convolutions of the organism which is responsible for this thinking, the marvelous structure of the nervous system and the brain: that becomes really interesting.

And yet, you see, here most of us are. We're all, from the point of view of our organic structure, we're miracles. We're absolutely... we're more beautiful than any kind of gem. Any work of art ever conceived. And yet we preoccupy ourselves, use this instrument—it's like using a Stradivarius to play Chopsticks or something like that, you know? [Whistles] You know? Use a Stradivarius to play that. And that's what most of us do with our organisms. And we think that's terribly important; so much so that we keep it a dark secret from everybody else.

But now, the moment (you see) we're all public to each other and there are no secrets, and I—supposing I'm the talker in this group and therefore in a

certain kind of privileged position; supposing it wasn't so—supposing that I wasn't in a unique position and that we all—everybody, equally—shared each other's full conscious knowledge. What would we do? We would have to come off it, wouldn't we? We'd have to agree with each other. We'd have to say, "Well, hello everyone! You're me."

Alright, now: we see our technology moving in this direction, inevitably. But insofar as it is doing this—insofar, in other words, as electronics is making everybody available to everybody else—what we're doing is that we are discovering, through technology, a state of affairs which in fact has existed all the time. Look at it this way: the first thing that human beings created on this planet to communicate with distant points were roads. Trails where people walked. With the coming of horses and the mastery of horses the roads became, as it were, more clearly stamped because of the hard hoof of the horse. But in the 19th century we began to go beyond roads because we discovered rails. Then wires. And the world became a network. The economic world became a network of roads, rails, and wires. But now the fascinating thing is: we are beginning to witness a disappearance of all those three methods of communication. The railways and the roads have gone to the airplane, and the wires have gone to radio and television, which require no wires to connect. And you will see that, as human beings become more technically efficient, that the scars of technology will disappear from the face of the earth. The moment that everybody has his personal hoppy-copter there will be no further need of the freeway, and the freeway will break up and grass and moss will grow over it because nobody's traveling it, and it'll disappear back into the landscape. Hooray. What an awful thing it is. You know, the concrete octopus. And these ridiculous automobiles in which we each travel around and make a nuisance of ourselves. But they will vanish because they simply are not technologically efficient.

Now you say, "Well, the helicopter will take its place." Alright. Is that really necessary? Because, as a matter of fact, if we couple the science of television with the science of laser beams we can get a three-dimensional image of anybody we'd like to see right here in this room. In other words, you can contact your friends in New York and you can assemble them all together in laser beam images by, as it were, dialing each one and say, "Can you come on? Can you come on? Can you come on?" Then we can have a

laser beam create a three-dimensional images of anybody you want to talk to, sitting right in this room. Now, there ma be some limitations to what you can do with a laser beam image of somebody else, but to all intents and purposes, there they are, sitting together. And you understand each one of them—in their own room in New York or Boston or whatever—they have an equivalent laser beam image of you and all the others who are involved in this conference. So you're looking at a certain area in a room where there are three-dimensional images of a group of your friends. And these three-dimensional images exist in the separate apartments of every single one of those people involved in the conference. So that the same conference is happening in five different places. Let's say that there are five people involved: in each one of them there's one of them there who thinks he's authentic. See? And he has these five laser-beam images—four—talking to him. And so it is in every other situation. You begin to ask then, "where are you?" And, furthermore, by means of further electronic technology, every one of these five people are not only visible to each other on the screen, in the cubic screen of the laser beam television, but also their inmost thoughts are clear to each other. There is no concealment. Imagine that.

So this kind of mutual knowledge of each other, which we could have by some sort of technology, would be wonderful. Really. If we would accept it. We would go on from this that, just as the roads have disappeared—or will disappear—and the wires disappear, eventually, the electronic gadgetry will disappear. And the electronic network that communicates from person to person will eventually become ESP, or psionic. We will get it from each other without any need for an electrical gadget. By telepathy. Because, you see, what all technology is doing: it's not creating a new situation, it is discovering what has always existed. When we started to use conscious attention as our main faculty of understanding the world and communicating with each other, we became ignorant of all the other methods of communication that exist. Because we specialized on one. And in order to function in this world we had to make this one method of experiencing things find out all the channels of communication that exist. And explain them, and talk about them, and measure them, so that we know they're really there. But as it goes on, you see—this conscious attention creating technological devices for communication—all it is actually doing, it is discovering the routes of communication that have always been there.

Now I want to take this a step further. Do you understand this now? Let's suppose we eventually discover that we don't need radio and that we don't need television because we have ESP, and that we come through our technology to make ESP respectable, so that we can admit to ourselves that there really is that thing going on (because we couldn't admit it before because it was not scientifically acceptable that there could be anything like that) the first step is we make an electronic model of ESP. And it works, obviously, because it's electronic. But then we discover that we don't need the model. We can do it anyhow. Just like homing pigeons have radar built into them and white-throat birds can navigate by the stars. How much more value are you than many sparrows? You know, you have it. So we discover that.

Well, when we have finally no need to travel, to telephone, to communicate by any technical method whatsoever—because we all instantly read each other's thoughts and have all information whatsoever available to us—is that the point? Is that the great desideratum? Is that what we want? The thing we were trying to get? You find there's still something beyond that. Because when you can read everybody else's thoughts, what information will you get from doing that? You will find that reading somebody else is just like reading you! Knowing somebody else's mind is pretty much like reading your own mind. Yeah, there are some little variations that are of interest but, basically, to know you thoroughly would be like knowing me thoroughly.

So not only have the roads vanished, the rails vanished, the wires vanished, the radio has vanished, the television has vanished, but, finally, the ESP vanishes as a line of communication. Because we've at last discovered that we are all one. And so, in a way, there is no further need to communicate because we are in total communion.

When we communicate what are we really communicating about? What is the content of communication? Because you see, McLuhan's come up with a very strange idea, that the medium itself is the message or putting it in a punny way to make it clearer, the medium is the message. Not so much therefore finally, the content of what is being said is the thing you're getting over, but what you're getting over is the way of saying it.

So we have to go into what it is finally that we are communicating about when we communicate? What do we want to tell our friends? Our other people, our other selves. And I had a great deal of trouble. Really sympathizing with McLuhan's point of view especially in what he has to say about television. Where he feels that the medium of television is highly participated and that the Mosaic technique of bringing that image across on the television screen is something entirely different say from a film, or from a painting. He expresses the notion that television is more tactile than visual, and therefore it involves you as the sense of touch involved to see because touch is the fundamental sense all the five senses are specializations of the sense of touch. So when you see, you're touching light. When you hear you're touching air. And when you taste and smell specially and smell you're touching gas. The quality of gas. And finally, with your fingers, you have a way the most primitive sounds the sense that is least acute in its differentiations. But nevertheless, you see, all of them are forms of touch. And so you could say as the Buddhists say there, is one sense behind all our senses they have a sixth sense for example they say use the word vinyana, which means consciousness and they have knows consciousness, eye, consciousness here consciousness touch consciousness taste consciousness. Five.

But behind that they have maravinyana which means mind consciousness that is to say the unifying. Of the senses so that you will put together the sight of fish and the smell of fish and be able to integrate them and say well this is a single experience the fish look so and smell so touch is so. And so by the integration of the senses all being forms of touch Kind of course eventually come to a state of consciousness where you can hear colors. And see sounds. If you are very very sensitive indeed.

So, you might say now then, that all communication is information. But I want to show you that straight information is not the final thing we're trying to communicate. You see, we live now in a culture where there is great disagreement about the values of life, what do we live for? There is no consensus. Because all the religions which you know where the philosophy is which gave us. What life is supposed to be all about they're all fragmented. And so there is, being no common religion, there is no common view as to what life is about. In default of that common view.

There is, especially in the academic world where people think out, ethical and political problems at tacit agreement that the the highest value we have that we can all agree upon is survival value. And therefore naturally when we communicate messages which have to do with survival. Where to find the food. Where to avoid the enemy. Then one says we are communicating about essentials. During the war, World War two, [a] friend of mine was in the office of the president of Northwestern University. And he had a number of watercolors around his office. And he said to this friend of mine, our war waving his hand paintings all this the development. We come down to essentials. Is this trip really necessary? Because this trip really necessary.

In other words what do you mean when you say is this trip really necessary when you say essential priority is given to essential industries and law. They are the industries of survival. Because we got it into our common sense even though we may not have intended to do this but it is fundamentally established in our common sense that survival is the thing that is good while there is life there is hope. And this of course is a really asinine point of view. Because it is not. A survival just going on. That we want. Yes we want survival. But survival in a certain way that is to say, in a certain style. And you will therefore see that in the end that book while there is always a survival content in communication, so far as that communication is information, what is finally more valued about communication than this survival value information is the style in which it's given. It's just in the same way as love-making. Finally, when it comes down to it, what do you want to say to the person. I love you. What are you going to communicate? An engineer would say when you say I love you with means that we're going to do reproduction and therefore continue the race. But that's not the point at all, it's obvious that is not what is a what are children for. Just to continue you know there to be not and how do you love things you strove to give them a massage if it moves fondle it.

And so, it is finally what you're communicating to someone you love is the rhythm. Whether it's the rhythm of sexual intercourse or whether it's the rhythm of dancing or whether it's the rhythm of verbal play as in telling a story or in singing a song what you're communicating there is a sort of caressing rhythm which says to you I'm so glad you're here and that you. And receive my communication which is about nothing only to say in this

way of a dancing with you I love you and that's not really what it's all about.

So then, you see the Buddhists call that factor of communication 'suchness.' For example, when we talk, you understand my words because each word that I use has a meaning. And so the words that I use refer to something other than themselves. So I use these symbols and you get what I'm talking about. Now listen carefully. What does that mean? That I communicate meaning to you by words, there's a situation, now what's the meaning of that situation? When you meditate a little bit on and you discover that it has no meaning at all. A cloud has no meaning, because it isn't a symbol it's what we call the thing. We were, the word cloud the sound 'Cloud' means that. But what does that mean you say it's not a word. So it doesn't mean anything. A cloud is jazz it's the, it's the part of the Dance of the universe. And so, likewise when I make sense to you and you say it makes sense to me we have a kind of interlocking that would correspond perhaps to a spider's web. Where various rings of thread are joined to rings of thread inside rings of thread is joined together, so we join together by talking, see we play together by talking but what that more means some kind of jazz. And that suchness. In the practice of meditation, the most important thing is to get down to suchness. In everything that goes on a great Japanese Zen master when he was about to die wrote a poem which said. 'From the bathtub to the bottom I have uttered stuff and nonsense.' In other words above carbon which the baby is washing in the bathtub in which the corpses washed before burial. Alpha to Omega. Maternity ward to crematorium, or in all this time, said I've talked on and on.

And this is part of the whole thing of Zen to be able to hear all voices all communications all gestures all shapes all sensations whatsoever. In their fundamental form as lowing. When the baby starts to talk in the beginning, it's speaks what Jacob Bergman called the natural language. And he says that man it is fall. Talking about the fall of Adam lost the natural language. And the natural language is understood by birds and beasts, because they speak it. Because a lot of what birds say is not communicative in our ordinary sense of delivering information, some of it delivers information.

But a great deal of what they say doesn't deliver any communication, it is just playing with sound.

And a great deal of what we do is playing with sound. I'm not particularly aware of this as a philosopher because a lot of people will be very critical of what I say and say you don't really make any sense at all you sound as if you do you but. I'll put it when the public into thinking that you haven't got something important to say and all you're doing is making noises and I say Granted that's absolutely true but if I make interesting noises and manage to make a play of ideas that is in some way musical So the fascinating people say well. It's the same sort of thing that we enjoy out of looking at a mountain or watching waves or the flight of birds. Because it is this dance. You may remember that this morning I described the situation as follows. I'm talking to you, and you understand what my words mean. Situation A. Situation B is taking the situation A as a whole my talking to you, and you understanding what I mean what does that situation mean? And we find it doesn't mean anything. This could be a way when we say something is meaningless it's a way of putting it down. But on the other hand when you consider a mountain or a cloud or a tree and ask what does it mean and you realize it's not a word it's simply an authentic existence in it's own right it doesn't mean anything, but it's great. And so, in this way the nearest thing in that kind of achievement that nature does all the time in human activities is music. Once when Gustav Holst was giving a lecture on music he started out this way he said music is a natural and universal language. He took a step backwards and said that so important I'm going to say it again music is a natural universe alone. But nobody knows what it's about.

Sometimes we say music represents emotions. But a great deal of music, although it has a very strong feeling quality, does not represent specific emotions. Inferior music copies natural noises. The sound of water. The thunder of the hooves of horses or in that dreadful composition. Eight hundred twelve overture of Tchaikovsky, you hear Napoleon's armies retreating from Moscow. Or in some of the bad work of Debussé. Like a rocket about along with he. Makes noises like bells tolling from under the water. But are very great musicians of the West, Bach Scarlatti Mozart and so on. They don't do anything with the music except create elaborate patterns of sound. Bach is very mathematical and yet curiously despite his

tremendously developed intellect the music has a very strong feeling quality. Joyous and exuberant. But it's all pure play with sound. And therefore one might say, the communication that you make with music is in a curious way the most important kind of communication you can make. Even though you're saying nothing the music delivers no information. But what a form of communication. And so it is also with dancing with somebody. All you are saying with dancing is I love you. If you're delivering any message at all. I want to play with you. All I really want to do is baby be friends with you know. What does it mean? What is the content of friendship? You can't say, what is the content of love? I want to screw you? That's a sort of it part of it it's incidental it's a way of saying. Very strongly Yes I do want to be with you.

But basically love is something we can't put our finger on at all. If we say we use such words as warmth. Tenderness. All these things they don't really get to the point. When you're you are loving somebody you are simply delighting in that person as such as if another human organism and its mental and its physical aspects were a piece of music or a work of art or a glorious morning that you were just enjoying every inch of it. And you go over another person's physical form. And look at it from every possible point of view and play with it and tickle it. And that's what it's about. It's the, it's the adoration of the form of a human being. And you do all you do that adoring in terms of physical contacts that are say dancing with your fingers across the skin or whatever it may be. But this is the this is the nitty gritty the nub of love. It is not that I here and now suddenly undertake to support you for the rest of your life. That's a delusion of the West you think you don't really love me unless you'll sign on the dotted line here give me this contract and then I know I can rely on you always. What did you want to know? Why did you want the contract? Just to be fed indefinitely? Just to be supported indefinitely? What a bore. One wants something much more than that you want to be played with indefinitely. That's more like. To have this. Vibrancy going through you.

And this then is why music of all the arts is the most meaningless. After all, music is a major industry in the United States. The the money invested in orchestras and operas in the recording business is fantastic it's at its, horseracing is a very great industry but music I think is probably absorbs

more millions in Australia. And you could make a case that this was a complete dissipation. It solves no useful purpose, it doesn't help anyone to survive. It is a noise meaningless noise, endless meaningless noise going down the drain and all these energies of orchestras are all a power of electronics that delivers this, is total waste. And people get hooked on it. They get the thing called corditis. Which is addiction to harmonics. And they have to have this repeated day after day some people get up in the morning and they can't function til they've had cup of coffee. But many more people get up in the morning and can function till they turn on the radio or guts and lose it. And what would you say then of a culture which took this standpoint?

Music not a lot of. Music is a diversion from reality. You know, you know that kind of awful utilitarian attitude. But really one of the basic things you see that we live. What makes it worth. Surviving and going on is there can be such a thing as music that can be done singing in other words that we can do things that are absolutely irrelevant so far as mere survival is concerned. Now we have the problem that all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy. Dull for work. And people who play. Justifying their play. By making it a means to that end those people never play. Because you don't really play until you get so absorbed in the music or the dancing or the whatever you're making the part of doing the calligraphy. Eat until you get so absorbed in that there is no reason for it other than what you're doing. The sheer delight of that then because you are absorbed in something. For which there is no ulterior motive which is pure play. This by way of a byproduct produces sanity. In other words, if you play in order to be healthy in order to be sane, you're not playing. But if you play just to play, then as a byproduct as something you couldn't aim at directly you are saying. And so, a culture which allows for this, which allows for this sort of goofing is a healthy culture. This is not the culture that we live in. Because it is extremely anxious about play. Everybody when they play they have to find an excuse for it. And say well this is culture. We're trying to sway the city of San Francisco to support its opera. What sort of propaganda do you have to use? You can't say, 'We should have a good opera house because we dislike going to be opera.' You say, 'This improves the city's image.' After all, they have it in New York. And that is because we do not allow ourselves the idea that life is not serious. Because somehow we feel, if you aren't

engaged in something serious. You're a loafer, you're not contributing to the social welfare.

And so in this way, the artist has a peculiar role in the society very very interesting. Because the artist is a very deceptive fellow. He appears to be the supreme luxury, the irrelevant fellow. You can afford an artist you can afford to buy paintings if you have surplus money. That's a luxury so you can support an artist and we call it fine arts. The completely useless person. Who makes paintings which are sort of big labels or posters that you stick on your utilitarian walls to decorate them. But on the other hand, the artist is the man who shows you the future long before everybody else sees it. The artist is the Eye Opener. Just because the artist is distinct in role from the preacher and the philosopher, the artist can get away with all sorts of things. For example in our culture, if you're a university professor a doctor or a minister like these three professions, teacher, Doctor or a minister. You have to be very careful about your private life. Because the moment you have any alliances come not quite regular, people's tongues begin to wag. And why do they work because they say the way you behave is inconsistent with your profession with what you profess you are teaching people the good life, the healthy life, and you live in this disreputable way. You have a mistress you have something going on. But the moment an artist should take a mistress this is what is expected. Everybody says oh he's an artist in other words he doesn't matter he's irrelevant. He is an entertainer some sort of clown but on the other hand if you belong to a high culture, you patronize artists.

So these the role of the artist is very fascinating. Because he appears to be the is the clown the jester, the absolutely unimportant and irrelevant person. And yet it's actually through the artist that we learn how to live. Not through the preacher, not through the philosopher, not through the professor. It is the artist teaches us, whether he does it visually painting or sculpture actually over the above all, in music.

So, a man like Mozart, who could well claim to be the greatest man in European history was a kind of a gay happy go lucky fellow. With problems money, illness, etc. But what a songbird, what a nightingale. And so then to this day listening to Mozart as a in England the Glyndebourne opera this is

about the forest out fashionable aristocratic thing you can do. Go to this lovely country house in Sussex and hear the Mozart operas. It's as much a matter of status as going to church. Almost moreso.

You should read if you can get hold of an interview with George Harrison one of the Beatles in a recent issue of the East Village Other. Where he explains the deep philosophy of music that they understand and follow. How the the very nature of sound reveals the meaning of the world and why because of this, he regards himself as a Hindu. In Hinduism, the fundamental source of life is called Vok. Vok in Sanskrit means the word to speak, but not so much the word that communicates as the sound the utterance, the flow of tone. So you have in India the use of mantra. The use of chanted words. As one of the very basic forms of yoga, understanding the mystery of the world. The Hindus use the word ohm. Which would be spelled out a-u-m. Because the letter A. is in the back of the throat. You push it through the vowel of. And is of the lips. So the word comprehends the whole range of sound. It's called the problem. And ohm simply means. Well it is the sound all sounds are basic to the sound of but there is the word that not only signifies but also is what there is. Everything is ohm. Ohms sweet ohm. The whole universes and his ohm. And so if this is a very good word because you can use it instead of God. God has all sorts of nasty associations attached to it of the root the political boss of the world the preacher the prig the, the, nosy Parker in charge of everything the rotten grandfather. And all that, the sentimental mother of the world or whatever. And the word god therefore is a distasteful word now to most Westerners.

But ohm has no associations with it. In you might have encountered it in a Vedanta society in associated with swamis in yellow robes. But on the whole only has no association so it is a clean a clean word and it has no meaning, except it is the very pulse of life.

So I'm spreading a rumor, in Buddhism you know, there is a mantra from ohm mani padme me from. Ohm means nothing except everything money. Means a jewel partner is a Lotus own is correct you know. So the jewel in the lotus. In other words, imagine a monologue you see which is a lotus flower with all those petals spreading out from it and right back in the middle of that there is a little crystal ball or a diamond. And you look into

that, and it contains the reflection of everything. You go way way way into that thing down, down, down, down. And that's the ultimate turn on. So ohm. And at the end. Hum. H. you M. and say I am in English and. You are. There's a new religion just being called hum. And this religion has no hierarchy, no organization no doctrines whatsoever. No words. Only music and ritual. And, we will find in a little while that hum is really what most people belong to. But you can't pin it down. There is no address to write to, there's nothing to join it just something people do like the shaving brush their teeth in the back, so they hum.

Well now, it's very very fascinating for purposes of understanding music as communication. To look for a moment at different fundamental differences between Western and Oriental music as I know a very very great musicologist who thoroughly understands the world of Bach and Beethoven. And is one of the greatest scholars and really. Of around. But went to his ear Hindu music is childish. And he sees no subtlety. He's quite deaf. But when it comes to Chinese and Japanese music, most westerners are flabbergasted, because they can't make any sense of it at all, because it sounds as if somebody were making the most ridiculous noises. So when there's a Japanese. No drama, singer and dog. [sings] Sounds like he's being strangled. But he's giving sounds of passionate love. For them into our ears that's a deplorable you know when you want to. Give examples of love the. Dot E O O you know you know we're really upset we're in love. Well now, here's the thing, in Western music, when we study music, the first thing we've done is notation. We have, most people begin with a piano. Or a generate some instrument Well the important thing is to be able to read the music and then do the stuff from the the written paper.

Now this limits you in a curious way because our notation. First of all, is based on the chromatic scale. And secondly it has fixed rhythmic intervals you have you see your whole note half note quarter note eighth note sixteenth note, and you can change the value of the dotting them to give them half their value. And you tend to write in bars four four, three eight or whatever it may be and when an Oriental listens to our music it doesn't matter whether it's a love song or a Grandiose paean of praise or whatever, all of it sounds like a military march because it's that one two three follow up to the fall one two three four one before the quantity of the class of the

year that. All the time. And he hears a mechanism and you see he hears this absolute regularity.

Now in Indian music you'll have bars. Very long measure you can count twenty to the Bar none of them are. And when you do you learn music from a Hindu teacher, you don't. Learn notation. You learn directly from the teacher. In other words, he takes the instrument and plays it and you copy them. With the same instrument sitting in front of them. And they think, you see, that notation could never record music they do use a notation they use a notation to remember simply themes. There is a certain rag, a certain theme, and they've that you can write that down. But they don't play from it. What they do is they according to certain traditional procedures they improvise on the basic forms. And you, therefore play the instrument, and what you're trying to do is to make it as completely as possible responsive to the subtle motions of which a human organism is capable. In other words, just as in in moving your hand, there's an infinity of waves you can put it through.

So likewise in using your voice, there is an infinity of sound that you can produce. Because the same you can with a strained instrument in moving your finger whether or no rigid stops as there would be on a piano so on the continuum of a violin, you can move your finger and produce an infinity of subtle sound. And what they do is they delight in the infinite possibility of making sound of the human organ, and they like instruments which are very easily and directly related to the organism. So the flute, the vena, the drums, so these are direct human contact with an instrument with a piano you've got something interspersed you've got a hammer mechanism. And every bit tune string. With a harpsichord the same way, the pluck, and went Wonderland Mosgrove marvelous as she is plays the harpsichord you get a hurdy gurdy effect to get a kick top top top top to kick talk to get a tick tick tick tock clock tick tick tick tick tick tick tick tick the of this going on all the time with a clavichord there's a difference because the track record doesn't have a mechanical relationship between the finger and the straight so that by. Every variation of touch you make on the clavicle is represented in the sound. In other words the piano in the harpsichord alike. Electric typewriters which have a uniform touch whereas the type because it is more like an old fashioned typewriter however hard you put it has some effect on

the on the print. So, the it is in Oriental music, while there is an incredibly subtle discipline. And the Hindu drum can do the most astounding things, and you can count it out, he counts it out in these very very elaborate patterns but at the same time there is a an attitude about of the Sixers just fascinating. We attended a concert of the DeYoung Museum a few weeks ago where the son Ali Akbar Khan's orchestra, and there was a drummer in this it was just out of this world. Wonderful thing about it was that as he was playing with the rest of the orchestra they were all talking to each other with their instruments. And if they made eye contact, while they were playing, and this guy it was just it sheer delight, he was laughing as he was playing, and all the other musicians were just loving it so that he was of the dead honest person looking at his music you know reading that doing he was joining in with everybody dancing to his fingers were like. Butterflies. Hummingbirds, that is to say, just vibrating in the most extraordinary way because it takes years and years and years to learn. But he would really a joy. But what was he saying?

They have a language for the drums and they can speak a drum by using syllables like the that done. It does or didn't mean one kind of a hit and then and ten didn't ten didn't ten didn't think that they did it if that if they don't get done that that dahdahdah, dahdahdah, dahdahdah, you know and they do they explain a rhythm like that sometimes. First, they say it, and then they play it. But it's all it's all about, that's all about. Dit-da. Dit-da. I suppose some of you have read a book of mine called The Joyous Cosmology, in which I referred to once a very curious experience I had with Hindu music. I happen to have acquired from Timothy Leary some of this extraordinary Mexican mushroom. And I was feeling awful. I'd come back from a trip to the east, and was tired, and had a sore throat, it's just lousy. So I took this thing. And at the first just felt just are all right everything turned into mud. You know what you expect of mushrooms the fungus everything Fungo it kind of land. But after a while it all changed, and I found myself listening to this Hindu music. I didn't know what it was, because the, my host, whose house I was at, didn't explain things. And I thought when I listen to this. What kind of idiocy is going on? I thought you see, my friend with whom one is spending the day is a pretty wild kind of fellow. And I thought he'd put on a tape recording of his and his friends antics. Because they weren't doing anything that anybody is supposed to

do. It was like children making faces. You know are they to go this. Use of children up to put those on the proof awful faces and make weird noises I just thought this is just something absolutely absurd. And then came this dit-da business you know. So I said Roger, Hey let me see the album. I got the case here it's says, Classical Music of India. It did by Ellen Donohue. Who is the most scholars respectable pundit subject into music I said somebody is pulling my leg. No not at all here was this just babbling sounds one of the do the DAR business but they also could use their voices like oboes you know how that. And we got a close get on those and do an oboe stuff and it sounded like to us it was just the whole kind of dozens of children. Just going out of their heads. Well I listen to this and I suddenly realize. That that's what life's all about. And you know it was the most fantastic sudden recognition that everything in this world is gloriously meaningless. And it's curlicues like confidence. We get mixed up about it because sometimes we think that if play that is going on when you sit when you see a phone. It has first of all the main branch then it has subbranches and all of the Sopranos has come sub-sub branches and out of the sub sub branches come sub sub sub branches and so you get a further. So now if you couldn't number each of these levels on which things are happening you say well this is a number one level of this is the number forty two level this is number sixty five level.

And you judge events and say it's good it's bad it's proper it's improper but what you don't recognize is that you say something is improper because you thought it was a sixty three level whereas that really it was a hundred twelve. And you didn't know, you didn't realize the level the thing was on, so actually, in the whole play of human life with all its joys and sorrows, its trials and its evils its good is just something like a phone. It has to be Masonic that means just simply another plan is making its life there. The Atlantic bugs the sun tan the living to they're doing their stuff they're living off the phone the phones living off something else we're all dealing on each other in one way. And I saw the whole thing as this fantastic play.

So, in order to get into the—can you get into that state you see? You get into it by listening to sound. That's one way and there are lots of ways and one of the easiest ways is through concentration on a tone. Because you see, this is the easiest way to stop thinking for most people. If you just concentrate

on a single sound. It's very easy to do it and this stops your thoughts. In other words, it stops you talking to yourself inside your head verbalizing. And the important thing is if you want of the vision of the world as it really is you have to stop talking at least temporarily. Doesn't mean that talking is a bad thing, it means it's too much of a good thing. So that if you silence talking and you experience yourself. Just in the same way as you experience you [nyaahh]. It's what's going on. And it may be going on you know you know kind of a way that you call nice features. Like you know maybe gone that way. But so what, finally does that? That's what's happening and you know what we're all taught by mothers and fathers to put a value on. See, when it goes a certain way, the rhythm of life goes in a certain way when we say oh, watch out, watch out, watch out, watch out because that may be the end what will the end be one. What's wrong with that? Things that start have to stop. Things that go on have to go off and things that go off have to go on. But you see, we get involved by putting a value on it all. Now I could say that's bad you should do it but at the same time getting involved and putting values on the top of the game too. Getting hung up getting hooked. So you don't get unhooked by saying to yourself I shouldn't be attached. I shouldn't do this I shouldn't do that. All you do is you see that getting hooked on is simply another form. More nonsense. More jazz, but deeper jazz so like you feel you have an ego that's an illusion. But it's a very weird illusion the very far out scene. Person who you might call a square who thought really committed to. The illusions of Standard Life is a very far up person because he doesn't know where he started. He's completely lost. But you could say it's a great show to get that far to get that involved in seriousness. So when you look at a square with houses. Terming set on inflexible attitude you have to say secretly you laugh and say why you're doing a wonderful job. How far. You can learn in this way to love squares. And this is the only way that will ever change in. Humans never condemn the scale of harsh language. Because they're very far out they don't. Get involved in other words the ultimate curlicues.

It's like a labyrinth, you see, all life is a labyrinth it's a system of tubes. And there are tubes within tubes within tubes. And form on the very very great friend is of this labyrinth you get all kinds of hothouse growth. Very complicated games, so complicated that the people involved in them are lost. But that's simply a function of being a long way from the center. When

a fern or any form of plant expands from that center what is happening is this. Inside the Stephens and the stocks and the two which constitute the Solomons and all the little creatures and they're going travelling along, and they're getting up there they want to go out cos as always somebody along with them says, 'Now be careful,' if you get too far because you get too far and spoil the form. Instead of keeping inside the bounds of the fern you just go off into gas and that will be awful to you because you're fern, you're not gas.

But those little creatures out there on the end say, man would like a gas so that. He would want to get way off but it is a result of the tension between those little fellers that want to go way up see other people want to stay in. Which you get the are on the clear form really. They're working against each other but they are working even though the one thinks it's right the other things it's right they're both right and they're both wrong they're both right and wrong but they do by being both and in a counter. Position like this they create what we call existence what we call the shape of the leaf the form of the phone. So, you will find of course, that some of them are ours in fact escaping, and some of them are going off into gas. And some of them are not some of them are staying put. And if there weren't some of them going off into gas, there would be no energy in the things. You see, all energy is a quality of follow through when you hit a golf ball you mustn't stop to hit up the ball you have to go really like that see right through so all energies of life are have in them a possibility of an excess, of going too far.

When you bring up your children and you tell your children your various far out ideas and the children suddenly believe in. I'm horrified. No, all kinds of philosophy I've talked about is being believed by children. And they're taking it literally. Oh my God, what will they do next? But everybody feels that way. In regard to the strength of a younger generation is coming because it's younger generations. And we think about young people. We have terrible ideas, we think that we know what life is, and that they have to be told. They will learn it from us and be like us. We don't take that attitude when we see the new vegetables come up in the spring. We don't say the vegetables have to be educated to be vegetables. We say, we're ready at last young vegetables with all the life and energy. New meals for everything so when we see young people come up say Good gracious

isn't this great to see the human race is still doing its stuff. I wonder what they'll have to teach us. Because wisdom doesn't come from about down it comes from below. Wisdom. Surging into us. The old people, they have a function. But they have it in order to fulfill that function they have to understand first. That they can learn from the young sources. If they understand that, then they can be wise and be teachers. If they don't understand that in the recount to be wise you have to that's the meaning of the saying that to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, you have to become again as a child. And finally, to get back to my point, to become as a child means that you do things which adults. Consider unimportant. There is a wonderful Buddhist character. His name is Hote, in Japanese, Putai in Chinese. [And] he carries around a bag enormous back in which he collects rubbish. Every kind of inconsequential rubbish and gives it away to children. Because children understand the meaning and significance of rubbish. Something which... My father when I was a small boy once said you are a picture up of unconsidered trifles. Because the rubbish is the most wonderful thing in the world from the point of view of a child.

So, once a Zen master was asked what is the most valuable thing in the world, and he answered the head of a dead cat why? Because no one can put a price on. So in this man see who is wondering around picking up rubbish. All the trivialities of life you see is the leaves floating down the wind and laughs that. This is becoming again as the child, in other words, from the child's point of view the things which the adult considers irrelevant to survival are perfectly important. And so children collect pebbles and colored glass and all sorts of trivia which they consider as precious as diamonds. The adults say 'Oh, frippery.' But they really have the secret.

Now the child, as child, doesn't know how to play the adult game which is a power game. And so has to be educated to learn the values of the power game to learn what's what and what is important. But when he has mastered that game, he realizes it has no rewards. That all the things that the adults thought they were gaining by their power games are after all not worth having why you can be rich and miserable. So that having learned and having seen through the adult power game, you come back to the point of

the child. [blows lips] Well let's have a brief intermission will suffer sessions after seminar. Just destruction.

Unknown Tag

Seeing Through the Game

I suppose that some of you have read a. Very fascinating work that was written many years ago by a C.G. Jung. A commentary that he wrote to a translation of a Chinese classics by Rikard Vilhelm called the Secret of the Golden Flower. Now you may remember, that in that commentary he takes up the very fascinating problem of the dangers inherent in the adoption of Oriental ways of life by Westerners, but more particularly the adoption of Oriental spiritual practices such as yoga. And I remember I learned a great deal from that essay and appreciated it very much and I was in many ways. Because even in my own fascination. With fondness of our intell philosophy, I have never been tempted to forget that I'm a westerner. But as I think this essay over. I'm not sure that young discouraged the practice of yoga by Westerners for quite the right reasons. I find so often the difficulty in Jung's ideas, lies in his theory of history. Which is I feel a hangover from nineteenth century theories of history. Encouraged by Darwinism. Namely that there's a sort of orderly progression. From the ape. Through the primitive. To the civilized man and of course naturally at that time that was all hitched in with the theory of progress and it was highly convenient for the cultures of Western Europe which were then one up on everybody else to consider themselves in the van of progress and when they visited the natives of Borneo and Australia and so on to be able to feel that they were perfectly justified in appropriating their lands and dominating the macaws they were giving them the benefits of the last word in evolution.

And therefore are under the influence of that sort of theory of history which is felt in the work of both Freud and Jung, one gets the feeling of there being a kind of progressive development of human consciousness and your own as charitable enough to assume that because the Chinese and Indian civilizations are immeasurably older than ours. They've had to foster the possibility of far more sophistication in psychic development. Even though he feels and probably rightly that there are things they can learn from us.

But the reason why he discourages the western eye from the practice of yoga, is that he says this is a discipline for a far older culture than ours which along certain lines has progressed much further. And has learned certain things that we haven't mastered at all yet. And that's he points out that when somebody embraces Vedanta or Theosophy or any yoga school in the West and tries to master a discipline of concentration. In which. They have to oust from their consciousness all wandering thoughts he says that this for the West and I may be a very dangerous thing in. Read because just exactly what the West and I may need to do is to allow a free reign to his wandering thoughts and his imagination and his fantasy because it's only in this way that he can get in touch with his unconscious and that his unconscious will not leave him in peace until he gets in touch with it and then assumes the members of oriental cultures have done this long before they went in for yoga practice.

Now I don't think this is quite true, but I do think there are other reasons. Why western people need to exercise a good deal of discrimination and caution in adopting Eastern disciplines and ways of life. In other words, it's rather like the problem of taking medicine. You know, if you don't feel very well and you go to a friend's medicine cabinet and you sort of look at over and see bottles of medicine and now and you say I'm sick I need medicine or you take some medicine any medicine will do well it won't. According to what's the matter with you so the medicine has to be prescribed. And I don't think that the things which some of the eastern disciplines are designed to cure, are quite the same things that we need. Now it's fundamental to my view of the nature of such forms of discipline as Buddhism and Taoism. That they are ways of liberation from a specific kind of confinement. That is to say, they're ways of liberation from what I've sometimes called the social hypnosis.

In other words, every culture, every society, as a group of people in communication with each other, has certain rules of communication. And from culture to culture, these rules differ in just the same way that languages differ. And a culture can hold together on very very different kinds of rules I won't say any kinds of rules but very different kinds of rules always provided that the members agree about them whether they're forced to agree whether they agree tacitly or whatever the reason may be. And

these rules are in a way very much like the rules of a game. In other words, take a game like chess. You can have the kind of chess we play with an eight square board or you can have a kind of chess that the Japanese play with a nine square board. It doesn't make any difference so long as you both play on the same board by the same rules. But simply say this is. A chess as a game. And in the same way the development of human cultures is also in a way a game and that is to say, it's the elaboration of a form of life. And the fun of it in a way is the fun of elaborating it in just some interesting form. That's the same as the fun of a game the fun of a game is it has a sudden interest. But it doesn't follow. That the rules of the game correspond to the actual structure of human nature or to the laws of the universe. The Because in every culture it's necessary to impress upon especially its young. Remember that these rules jolly well have to be kept. They are usually in some way or other connected with the laws of the universe and given some sort of divine sanction. And there are indeed cultures in which the senior members of the group realize that that's a hoax, that's as if it's a made up and is done to terrify the young and when they become senior members of the culture themselves they see through the thing but they don't let on They keep it quiet, they don't let out to those who are supposed to be impressed that this was really a hoax to get them to behave.

But anyway. After a great deal of careful study I've come to the conclusion. That the function of these ways of deliberation is basically to make it possible for those who have the determination. And we'll see why in a while to make it possible for those who have the determination. To be free from the social hypnosis. In other words, if you were a member of the culture of India. That almost any time between maybe nine hundred B.C. and eighteen hundred A.D.. It would be for you a matter of common sense about which everybody agreed. That you were under the control of a process called karma. Not exactly a law of cause and effect. But a process of cosmic justice. Whereby every fortune that occurred to you would be the result of some action in the past that was good and every misfortune to you would be the result of some action in the past that was evil and for the model this action in the past might not have been done in this present life but in a form in life it was simply axiomatic to those people that they were involved in a long long process of reincarnation. Reaping the rewards and

punishments. And there were not only there was not only the possibility of being reincarnated again in the human form, but if you were exceedingly good you might be born in one of the heavens, paradises and if you were exceedingly bad you might be born for an insufferable period of years not forever in a purgatory. And the purgatories of the Hindus and Buddhists are just as ingenious the horrible as those of the Christians.

Well of course. Everybody knows I mean anybody seems to have in a sense that all this. Imagination of postmortem courts of justice is a way of telling people well if the secular police don't catch you the celestial police will catch you, and therefore you had better behave. And it's an ingenious device for encouraging ethical conduct. Now...but remember, that for a person brought up in that climate of feeling where everybody believes this to be true it seems a matter of common sense that it's so. And it's very difficult for a person so brought up, not to believe that that is the state of that. Take an equivalent situation in our own culture. It's still enormously difficult for most people to believe that space may not be Newtonian space. That is to say, a three dimensional continuum which extends indefinitely forever the idea of a four dimensional curved space seems absolutely fantastic and can't even be conceived by people that aren't versed in the mathematics of modern physics. Or again as I've often pointed out it's very difficult for us to believe. That the forms of nature are not made of some stuff. Called matter. That's a very unnecessary idea or from a strictly scientific point of view but it's awfully difficult for us to believe it to believe in other words that there isn't this underlying stuff. And not so long ago, it was practically impossible for people to conceive that the planets did not revolve about the earth encased in crystalline spheres. And it took a very considerable shaking of the imagination. When astronomers began to find out that this need not necessarily be so.

All right, so now let's go back to the problem of somebody living in the culture of ancient India here it is a matter of common sense to see that he is going to be reborn. Now, there's some perhaps exceedingly intelligent person who for one reason or another discovers that this idea is not so. After all, when you get such disciplines as Vedanta and Buddhism they say that the ultimate goal of the discipline is release from the rounds of rebirth. And incidentally also which is fundamental to that release from the illusion that

you are a separate individual confined to this body. But so far as both of these things are concerned, they also say that the person who is liberated from the round of rebirth as well as from the illusion of being an ego, sees when he is liberated, that the process of rebirth than the whole cosmology of reincarnation and karma as well as the individual ego, are in a way illusions. That is to say he sees that they are maya. And I would like to translate my out of this moment not so much in Newton as a playful construct. A social institution. So he sees you see that those things are not so. They are only pretending to be so. And you see, he ceases to believe in karma and reincarnation and all that in exactly the same way that a modern agnostic no longer believes in the resurrection of the body at the Day of Judgment. I I know this to be so because. Although you will get very many Hindus and Buddhists who say that they believe in reincarnation, and come over here and teach it as part of the doctrine of Vedanta or Buddhism. The most sophisticated and the most profound I'll say perhaps profound rather than sophisticated. But is that I have known have said that they don't believe in it literally at all.

And, so I could say that those who do believe in it believe in it simply because. It's part of their culture. And they have not yet been able to be liberated from it. And so it seems to me very funny indeed. When Western people who become interested in Vedanta or Buddhism. That is to say, in forms of discipline to liberate Hindus and Chinese people from certain social institutions, Western people adopt it and then also adopt. The ideas of reincarnation and karma from which these systems were designed to liberate them. Of course, they adopt them because they feel it's consoling that one will go on living and that wasn't the point at all. Or that it explains something that all why one suffered in this life was not because the universe was unjust but because you committed some misdeed in the past.

And so, Westerners who take up the Oriental doctrines in that spirit. Unfortunately take out the very illusions from which these doctrines were supposed to be ways of deliverance. Now that may be difficult to see just because. So many practicing Hindus and Buddhists say they believe in reincarnation and this whole process of the cycles of karma and so on. And they after all, are practicing it and they should know. When I look here there's a certain good reason why they shouldn't. Of course, I'm making an

exception of the Indian or Chinese who's been educated in Western style. And he ceases to believe maybe in the cosmologies of his own culture but he's not liberated in the Buddhist sense because in receiving a Western education he's become a victim of our social institutions instead and then you just exchange Well one trouble for another but. When you take the situation as it stands now as it did stand in India isolated from Western culture. Obviously, no society can tolerate within its own borders the existence of a way of liberation a way of seeing through its institutions without feeling that such a way constitutes a threat to law and order. Anybody who sees through the institutions of society and sees them far as it were created fictions in the same way as a novel or a work of art as a creative fiction. Anybody who sees that of course could be regarded by the society as a potential menace.

But, then you may ask well, if Buddhism and Vedanta and so on were indeed ways of liberation. How could Indian or Chinese society or Bernie's society have tolerated their presence. Well the answer lies simply in the much misunderstood each. Terraces some of these disciplines. In other words that those who taught them the masters of these disciplines made it incredibly difficult for uninitiated people to get in on the inside. And, their method of initiating the men away was to put them through trap after trap after trap to see if they could find their way through. In other words, such a master would not dream of beginning by disabusing the neophyte, and saying well you know all these things you heard from your father and mother and teachers and so on were fairy tales .Oh no indeed. He would do what is called in Buddhism exercise the use of Upaya, the Sanskrit word meaning skillful devices or skillful means. Sometimes described as giving a child a yellowed leaf to stop it crying for go. After all, when you approach one of these ways of liberation from the outside. It looks like something. Very very fantastic. Here you are literally going to be released from a literally true and physical cycle of endless incarnations in have arms and heralds and all kinds of states. And therefore naturally to do that why. An undertaking that must be what I'll wonderful likes rotten repast and you've got to become. And so the neo fight is ready for almost anything. And the teacher, because of the fundamental problem in this whole thing is for him to get rid of the illusion you see, that he's a separate ego if there's no separate ego Aust of souls then there's nothing to be reincarnated so all the

teacher really in has all kinds of complicated ways of doing it all that he really says to him is by now. If you will look deeply into your ego, you will find out that it is a non ego that you are self is the universal self that he might say if he would have it down to us or if you were a Buddhist you might say if you look for your ego you won't find it. So look for it and see, and really go into it. And so he gets the man meditating. And trying by his ego to get rid of his ego. Well that is a beautiful trap it can last forever. Until one sees through it.

In other words this is like trying to you know, sweep the darkness out of a room with a broom. Or its life gets worse and out. Lao-Tzu or Chuang-Tzu have a nice figure for it beating a drum and such of a fugitive that's to say you know when the police go out because they had a telephone call it was a burglar. They come racing to the house with a siren full blast in the. Burglar hears and runs away. Because of course to try and get rid of the ego for one's advantage in some ways an egotistical enterprise and you can't do it. And so of course the student gets to the point where he begins to realize that everything he does. To get rid of ego is egotistic. And this is the kind of trap in which the teacher gets him. Until of course he comes to the point of seeing that his supposed division from himself into say I and me the controller controlling part of me in the controlled part of me the knower in the known and all that is is phony. There is no way of standing aside from yourself in other words and as it when changing yourself in that way he discovers this finally. At the same time, he discovers, almost at the last minute you might say the fallacy, or rather, the fantasy nature of the game like nature. Of the system. Of cosmology which has existed to. As it underpin all. Give the basic form of the social institution of his particular culture or society.

In other words, you may put it in a in another way one of the basics things which all social rules of convention conceal is what I would call the fundamental fellowship between yes and no. Say, in the Chinese symbolism of the positive and the negative the yang and the yin you know you've seen that symbol of them together like two interlocked fishes. Well the great game I mean the whole pretense of most of the side is that these two fishes are involved in a battle with the opposition the down fish the good fish and the bad fish and there's out for a killing and the white fish is one of these

days going to slay the Black Fish. But, when you see into it clearly you realize that the white fish in the black fish go together they're twins they're really not fighting each other they're dancing with each other. That you see though, is a difficult thing to realize. In a set of rules in which yes and no other basic and formally opposed. When it is explicit and a set of rules, that yes and no positive and negative are the fundamental principles. It is implicit but not explicit that there is this fundamental bondage of fellowship between the two theories you see that if people find that out. They won't play the game anymore I mean supposing a certain social group finds out that it's enemy group which it's supposed to fight is really symbiotic to it. That is to say the enemy group fosters the survival of the group by pruning its population. With never a do to admit that it never never do to admit the advantage of the enemy just as George Orwell pointed out in his fantasy future in one nine hundred eighty four about. A dictatorial God. I'm asked to have an enemy and if there isn't one it has to invent one. And. By this means by having something to fight to see having something to compete against the energy of society to go on doing its job is stirred up. And what the Buddha or Bodhisattva type of person fundamentally is one is one who seen through that. Who doesn't have to be stirred up by hatred and fear and competition to go on with the game of life.

Tribute to Carl Jung

I'm sitting late at night in a lonely cottage in the country surrounded by many favorite books which I've collected over a number of years. And as I look up at the shelves, I see that there's a very large space. Occupied by the volumes of one man. Carl Gustav Jung, who left this world not more than a few weeks ago. And I'd like to talk tonight about some of the great things that I feel that Jung has done for me. And also the things which I feel to be his enduring contributions toward the science of psychology of which he was such a great master. I began to read Jung when I first began to study Eastern philosophy in my late adolescence. And I'm eternally grateful to him for what I would call a sort of balancing influence on the development of my thought. As an adolescent, in rebellion against the sterile Christianity, in which I was brought up, I was liable to go absolutely overboard for exotic and foreign ideas. Until I read the extraordinarily wise commentary that he wrote to Richard Wilhelm's translation of the Chinese Taoist text

called the “Secret of the Golden Flower.” And it was Jung who helped me to remind myself that I was by, upbringing in by tradition, always a Westerner and I couldn’t escape from my own cultural conditioning.

And that this inability to escape was not a kind of prison but was the endowment of one’s being with certain capacities, like one’s arms and legs and mouth and teeth and brain, which could always be used constructively. And I feel it’s for this reason that I have always remained for myself in the position of the comparative philosopher, wanting to balance east and west rather than to go overboard with enthusiasm for exotic imports. But there are aspects of Jung’s work far beyond this that I want to discuss.

And first of all I want to call attention to one fundamental principle that underlay all his work and was most extraordinarily exemplified in Jung himself as a person. And this is what I would call his recognition of the polarity of life. That is to say, his resistance to what is to my mind, the disastrous and absurd hypothesis that there is in this universe a radical and absolute conflict between good and evil, light and darkness that can never never, never be harmonised. This conflict has come up to us in a very vivid way in recent days with the trial of Adolph Eichman and with Arthur Kuster’s passionate denunciation of any sort of philosophy of life —— and he has in mind particularly eastern philosophy is like Buddhism and Hinduism which so slur the absolute differences between good and evil that in their Name one could justify the sort of crimes which were committed in the concentration camps of Germany. And it’s interesting too that certain people accused Jung also of Nazi sympathies. Because he too would not subscribe to the absolute state of a war between good and evil — going down to the very roots of the universe. Obviously, when certain crimes and catastrophes occur human emotions are deeply and rightly aroused. And I would, for myself say that were I in any situation where an Eichman was operating I would be roused to a degree of fury that I can hardly imagine my present existence — but I know it would come out from me. I would oppose those thoughts of villains with all the energy that I have, and if I was trapped in such a situation I would fight it to the end. But at the same time, I would recognize the relativity of my own emotional involvement. I would know that I was fighting a man like Eichman, in the same way, shall we say, as a spider and a wasp — insects which naturally prey upon one another

and fight one another. But as a human being I would not be able to regard my adversary as a metaphysical devil, that is to say, as one who represented the principle of absolute and unresolvable evil.

And I think this is the most important thing in Jung — that he was able to point out, that to the degree that you condemn others, and find evil and others, you are to that degree unconscious of the same thing in yourself — or at least of the potentiality of it. There can be Eichmanns and Hitlers and Himmlers, just because there are people who are unconscious of their own dark sides. And they project that darkness outward into say Jews, or communists or whatever the enemy may be and say “there is the darkness” — it is not in me, and therefore because the darkness is not in me I am justified in annihilating this enemy, whether it be with atom bombs or gas chambers or whatnot. But to the degree that a person becomes conscious that the evil is as much in himself as in the other — to this same degree he is not likely to project it onto some scapegoat and to commit the most criminal acts of violence upon other people.

Now this is to me the primary thing that Jung saw. That, in order to admit and really accept and understand the evil in oneself one had to be able to do it without being an enemy to it. As he put it “you had to accept your own dark side.” And he had this preeminently in his own character. I had a long talk with him back in 1958 — and I was enormously impressed with a man who was obviously very great, but at the same time with whom everyone could be completely at ease. There are so many great people, great in knowledge or great and what is called holiness, with whom the ordinary individual feels rather embarrassed — he feels he sits on the edge of his chair and to feel immediately judged by this person’s wisdom or sanctity. Jung managed to have wisdom and I think also sanctity in such a way that what other people came into its presence they didn’t feel judged. They felt enhanced, encouraged, and invited to share in a common life. And there was a sort of twinkle in Jung’s eye that gave me the impression that he knew himself to be just as much a villain as everybody else.

There is a nice German word, *hintergedanken*, which means a thought in the very far far back of your mind. Jung had a *hintergedanken* in the back of his mind, that showed in the twinkle in his eye. It showed that he knew and

recognized what I sometimes call “the element of irreducible rascality” in himself. And he knew it so strongly, and so clearly and in a way so lovingly, that he would not condemn the same thing in others and therefore would not be lead into those thoughts, feelings, and acts of violence towards others — which are always characteristic of the people who project the devil in themselves upon the outside, upon somebody else, upon the scapegoat. Now this made Jung a very integrated character. In other words, here I have to present a little bit of a complex idea. He was man who was thoroughly with himself — having seen and accepted his own nature, profoundly. He had a kind of a unity and absence of conflict in his own nature which had to exhibit additional complication that I find so fascinating. He was the sort of man who could feel anxious and afraid and guilty without being ashamed of feeling this way. In other words, he understood that an integrated person is not a person who has simply eliminated the sense of guilt or the sense of anxiety from his life — who is fearless and wooden and kind of sage of stone. He is a person who feels all these things, but has no recriminations against himself for feeling them. And this is to my mind a profound kind of humor. You know in humor there is always a certain element of malice. There was a talk given on the Pacifica stations just a little while ago which was an interview with Al Capp. And Al Capp made the point that he felt that all humor was fundamentally malicious. Now there’s a very high kind of humor which is humor at one’s self. Real humor is not jokes at the expense of others, it’s always jokes at the expense of oneself — and of course it has an element of malice in it. It has malice towards oneself, the recognition of the fact that behind the social role that you assume; behind all your pretensions to being either a good citizen or a fine scholar or a great scientist or a leading politician or a physician or whatever you happen to be. That behind this façade, there is a certain element of the unreconstructed bum. Not as something to be condemned and wailed over, but as something to be recognized as contributive to one’s greatness and to one’s positive aspects, in the same way that manure is contributive to the perfume of the rose.

Jung saw this and Jung accepted this — and I want to read a passage from one of his lectures, which I think is one of the greatest things he ever wrote, and which has been a very marvelous thing for me. It was in a lecture

delivered to a group of clergy in Switzerland, a considerable number of years ago. He writes as follows:

“People forget that even doctors have moral scruples and that certain patient’s confessions are hard even for a doctor to swallow. Yet the patient does not feel himself accepted unless the very worst of him is accepted too. No one can bring this about by mere words. It comes only through reflection and through the doctor’s attitude towards himself and his own dark side. If the doctor wants to guide another, or even accompany him a step of the way, he must feel with that person’s psyche. He never feels it when he passes judgment. Whether he puts his judgments into words or keeps them to himself, makes not the slightest difference. To take the opposite position and to agree with the patient offhand is also of no use but estranges him as much as condemnation. Feeling comes only through unprejudiced objectivity. This sounds almost like a scientific precept. And it could be confused with a purely intellectual abstract attitude of mind. But what I mean is something quite different. It is a human quality: A kind of deep respect for the facts — for the man who suffers from them and for the riddle of such a man’s life. The truly religious person has this attitude. He knows that God has brought all sort of strange and unconceivable things to pass and seeks in the most curious ways to enter a man’s heart. He therefore senses in everything the unseen presence of the Divine Will. This is what I mean by unprejudiced objectivity. It is a moral achievement on the part of the doctor who ought not to let himself be repelled by sickness and corruption. We cannot change anything unless we accept it. Condemnation does not liberate. It oppresses. And I am the oppressor of the person I condemn — not his friend and fellow sufferer. I do not in the least mean to say that we must never pass judgment when we desire to help and improve. But, if the doctor wishes to help a human being, he must be able to accept him as he is. And he can do this in reality only when he has already seen and accepted him as he is. Perhaps this sounds very simple, but simple things are always the most difficult. In actual life, it requires the greatest art to be simple. And so, acceptance of oneself is the essence of the moral problem, and the acid test of one’s whole outlook on life. That I feed the beggar, that I forgive an insult, that I love my enemy in the name of Christ. All these are undoubtedly great virtues. What I do unto the least of my brethren that I do unto Christ. But what if I should discover that the least

amongst them all, the poorest of all beggars, the most impudent of all offenders, yea, the very fiend himself — that these are within me? And that I myself stand in need of the arms of my own kindness. That I myself am the enemy that must be loved. What then?

Then, as a rule, the whole truth of Christianity is reversed. There is then no more talk of love and long suffering. We say to the brother within us: Rocca, and condemn and rage against ourselves. We hide him from the world. We deny ever having met this least among the lowly in ourselves. And had it been God himself who drew near to us in this despicable form, we should have denied him a thousand times before a single cock had crowed.

Well, you may think the metaphor's rather strong. But I feel that they are not so needlessly — this is a very very forceful passage and a memorable one in all Jung's works. Trying to heal this insanity from which our culture in particular has suffered. Of thinking that a human being can become hale, healthy and holy by being divided against himself in inner conflict, paralleling the conception of a cosmic conflict between an absolute good and an absolute evil, which cannot be reduced to any prior and underlying unity. In other words, our rage, and our very proper rage against evil things which occur in this world, must not overstep itself. For if we require as a justification for our rage, a fundamental and metaphysical division between good and evil, we have an insane and in a sudden sense schizophrenic universe, of which no sense whatsoever can be made. All conflict, Jung was saying, all opposition has its resolution in an underlying unity. You cannot understand the meaning of "to be," unless you understand the meaning of "not to be." You cannot understand the meaning of good unless you understand the meaning of evil. Even Saint Thomas Aquinas saw this when he said, "the just as it is the silent pause that gives sweetness to the chant — so it is suffering, and so it is evil which makes possible the recognition of virtue." This is not, as Jung tries to explain a philosophy of condoning the evil — to take the opposite position he said and to agree with the patient offhand is also of no use, but estranges him the patient as much as condemnation.

Let me continue further reading from this extraordinary passage.

“Healing may be called”, Jung says, “a religious problem. In the sphere of social or national relations the state of suffering may be civil war and this state is to be cured by the Christian virtue of forgiveness and love of one’s enemies. That which we recommend with the conviction of good Christians as applicable to external situations we must also apply inwardly in the treatment of neurosis. This is why modern man has heard enough about guilt and sin. He is sorely beset by his own bad conscience. And wants rather to know how he is to reconcile himself with his own nature how he is to love the enemy in his own heart, and call the Wolf his brother. The modern man does not want to know in what way he can imitate Christ, but in what way he can live his own individual life, however meager and uninteresting it may be. It is because every form of imitation, seems to him deadening and sterile — that he rebels against the force of tradition that would hold him to well trodden ways. All such roads for him lead in the wrong direction. He may not know it, but he behaves as if his own individual life were God’s special will which must be fulfilled at all costs. This is the source of his egoism, which is one of the most tangible evils of the neurotic state. But the person who tells him he is too egoistic has already lost his confidence and rightly so, for that person has driven him still into his neurosis. If I wish to effect a cure for my patients, I am forced to acknowledge the deep significance of that egoism. I should be blind indeed if I did not recognise it as a true will of God. I must even help the patient to prevail in his egoism if he succeeds in this he estranges himself from other people. He drives them away and they come to themselves as they should for they were seeking to rob him of his sacred egoism. This must be left of him. For it is his strongest and healthiest power. It is as I have said a true will of God, but sometimes drives him into complete isolation. However wretched this state may be it also stands him in good stead. For in this way alone can he get to know himself and learn what an invaluable treasure is the love of his fellow beings. It is moreover only in the state of complete abandonment and loneliness that we experience the helpful powers of our own natures.” ~

This is a very striking example of Jung’s power to comprehend and integrate points of view as well as psychological attitudes that seem on the surface to be completely antithetical. For example, even in his own work when he was devoting himself to the study of Eastern philosophy, he had

some difficulty in comprehending the, let's say, the Buddhistic denial of the reality of the ego. But you can see that, in practice, in what he was actually trying to get at he was moving towards the same position that is intended in both the Hindu and Buddhist philosophy about the nature of the ego. Just for example as the Hindu will say that the "I" principle in man is not really a separate ego, but an expression of the Universal life of Brahman or the Godhead.

So Jung is saying here, that the development of the ego in man is a true will of God and that it is only by following the ego and developing it to its full extent that one fulfills the function which this you might say temporary illusion has in man psychic life. For he goes on and says here, "when one has several times seen this development at work one can no longer deny that what was evil has turned good and that what seemed good, has kept alive the forces of evil. The arch-demon of egoism leads us along the royal road to that in gathering which religious experience demands. What we observe here is the fundamental law of life — an enantiodromia, or conversion into the opposite. And it is this that makes possible the reunion of the warring halves of the personality and thereby brings the Civil War to an end." In other words, he was seeing that as Blake said, "a fool who persists in his folly will become wise." That the development of egoism in man is not something to be overcome or better integrated by opposition to it, but by following it. It's almost the principle of Judo, not overcoming what appears to be a hostile force by opposing it, but by swinging with the punch or rolling with the punch. And so by following the ego the ego transcends itself. And in this moment of insight, the Great Westerner who comes out of the whole of tradition of human personality which centers it upon the ego — upon individual separateness — by going along consistently with this principle, comes to the same position as the Easterner. That is to say, to the point of view where one sees conflict — which at first sight had seemed absolute, as resting upon a primordial unity. And thereby attaining a profound, unshakable peace of the heart — which can nevertheless contain conflict. Not a peace that is simply static and lifeless, but a peace that passes understanding.

Unpreachable Religion

I have often made the remark, that it seems to me a great mistake to regard the civilization of the United States as a materialistic civilization, which is a very common assumption among the peoples of Europe and Asia. The Americans and especially that aspect of American civilization that we call the Anglo-Saxon subculture is constantly accused of being interested in absolutely nothing but material values. But it seems to me on the other hand that if you can make any really broad generalization about something so complicated as the civilization of the United States. That it is fundamentally an anti-materialistic civilization not perhaps so much by intent as in the general effect of its action that seems dedicated almost I might say to the United Nation and destruction of the material world. And to its conversion into a junk heap of unimaginable dimensions. I travel around the country a great deal. And more and more one sees. A thing that is called the growth expanding community is. An extension of something over the landscape. That sometimes is almost indistinguishable from a rubbishy. One goes down the main streets of all kinds of small towns. And it seems to be if you look at it. As you pass by in a car or in a train you just see a mass of all kinds of higgledy piggledy pieces of cardboard and pile, decked-up with neon lights and wire and automotive junk yards and. All sorts of parking lots and dumps of every conceivable type yes there are some nice residential areas out on the Kong but by and large we seem to be converting the world into a dump heap. I have called it the progressive Los Angeles-ization of everywhere from Honolulu to Nantucket.

Now, what is at the root of this why is it. That we don't seem to be able to adjust ourselves to the physical environment without destroying it. Why is it that in a way this culture, represents in a unique fashion the law of diminishing returns that our success is a failure. That we are building up in other words, an enormous technological civilization. Which seems to promise the fulfillment of every wish almost at the touch of a button. And yet, as in so many fairy tales when the wishes finally materialize they're like fairy goat they're not really material at all. In other words, so many of our products, our cars, our home, our food, our clothing, looks as if it were really the instant creation of pure thought that is to say is utterly insubstantial lacking in watch the connoisseur of wine cold body. After all, we've made the soil incredibly productive. But it's products so largely appeal to the I rather than the stomach. People have been saying all kinds of

people been saying this is by no means my idea my feeling. That vegetables and fruits and above all that simple bread, is just a kind of visually attracted to pith or foam rubber. And although it has all kinds of vitamins introduced into it what I think many of us want of our nutriments is not so much medicine as food. And in so many other ways, the riches that we produce are ephemeral and as a result of that we're frustrated with terribly frustrated we feel that the only thing is to go on getting more and more. And as a result of that the help the whole landscape begins to look like the nursery of a spoiled child who's got too many toys and is bought with them and throws them away as fast as he gets them...plays them for a few minutes.

Also we're dedicated to tremendous war on the material the basic material dimensions of time and space. We want to obliterate the limitations. We want to get everything down as fast as possible we want to convert the rhythms in the skills of work into cash. Which indeed you can buy something with but you can't eat it. And then rush home to get away from work can begin the real business of life to enjoy ourselves. And, you know, for the vast majority of American families. What seems to be the real point of life what you rush home to get. To. Is to watch. An electronic reproduction of life and you can't touch it, doesn't smell, and it has no taste. You might think that people getting home to the real point of life in a robust material culture would go home to a colossal bank with our knowledge of love making or a riot of music and music and dancing but nothing of the kind. It turns out to be this purely passive contemplation of a twittering screen. As you walk through suburban areas at night it doesn't matter in what part of the community it is you see mile after mile of darkened houses with that little electronic screen flickering in the room. Everybody isolated, watching this thing. And thus in no real communion with each other at all. And this isolation of people into a private world of that is really the creation of a mindless crowd. Some time ago, it occurred to me that. A crowd could be defined as a group of people not in mutual communication. A crowd is a group of people that is say in communication with one person alone I regret to say that you are listening to me at this moment not by constitute a crowd we're not really in full communication with each other and naturally it's terribly difficult to bring about mutual communication between a large number of people. But that is it does seem to me to be the essence of a

crowd and the thus of a community that is not a community not a real society but a juxtaposition of persons.

Now, one other thing that one notices about this anti-materialism is its lack of joy or I prefer to call it its lack of getting. A little while ago I was reading a book called motivation and personality by A.H. Maslow, who's Professor of Psychology at Brandeis. And he had amassed together a very amusing set of quotations from about thirteen representative and author originated American psychologists. And they were all saying words to the effect that the main drive behind all forms of animate activity was the survival of the species. In other words, all the manifestations of life are regarded by these men as intensely purposive, and the purpose and the value for which they strive is the value of survival. And Maslow commented on this that American psychology. As a result of its contact with the culture is over pragmatic over Puritan and over published. That no textbooks on psychology ever on psychology have chapters on fun and gaiety or on aimless activity or on purposeless meandering and puttering and so on and he said they are neglecting perhaps what may be. One whole and even the most important half of life.

In other words, it is a basic premise of the culture, that life is work and is serious. And herein lies its lack of joy. Life is real, life is honest. What do we mean when we say life is serious. What do we mean when we differentiate work for. Play. Well work it seems to me is what we must do in order to go on living in order to survive. And play is pretty much everything else. But now you'll notice that in this culture play is justified and tolerated, insofar as it tends to make our work more efficient we have the saying all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy but that really means dollop work. Play is recreation something you do to get refresh to go back and face the great problems of life. Now this is old and well but that saying, even to play. The play is necessary you must play I remember in England we used to have the institution of compulsory games in school as a result of which I developed an intense loathing for most of the games that we played like cricket and football and so on. They were forcing you to apply. And so in the same way the thought that. The supreme value is survival value. The thought, in other words, that it is absolutely necessary for us to go on living is a basis for life which takes the joy out of life and is really contra to life.

And I feel that I think biological process that we call life. With its marvelous proliferation of the numerable patterns and forms, is an essentially playful. By that I mean, that it doesn't have a serious purpose beyond itself it's in it's an art form like music unlike dancing. And that point of these art forms is always that present unfolding the elaboration of an intelligible design of steps and movements through time. That is not to say, that the goal is the present when you think of the present simply as a headline on a watch the immediate instant the present is that's only an abstract present. As for example, in listening to music. A person who hears a melody he doesn't hear simply a sequence of notes he hears the steps between the notes. A tone-deaf person hears only the notes what a person is able to hear music, he has is therefore steps in a certain order and this is what this diffuse present is what I would call the real office a call present. And I feel life is very much something of this nature. It is a play and it is its own end.

But now if you say to a form of play you must happen you've got to go on you immediately turn it into work. And you immediately turn it also into what we call colloquially a drag. Are we surviving as it had duty to survive in order that children may go on living well if we think that our children catch the same point of view from us and they go struggling along for the sake of that children and the whole thing becomes a fatuous progress to an ever-eluding future. And it is because I think fundamentally that we have this compulsive view of the necessity of existence that our culture is distinctly lacking in gaiety. Now it seems to me that this attitude rests on to further premises. The first is the idea of God that we inherit from the European Protestant and. To some extent Catholic and Judaic background. This conception of God as creating the universe for the fulfillment of His purpose is a conception of God Quite strangely lacking in either humor or joy. Despite some hints to the contrary in the Bible. But, they they haven't made very much impression there was a passage in the Book of Proverbs where the divine wisdom which is God's creative power is represented as playing but in the King James version that's translated rejoicing. Now to rejoice is something that one can do very properly you can rejoice by singing the more joyous him. But that's not quite the same thing as playful joy or gay it. In other words look at our church is symbols of our attitude to God. Must we not admit the fact that the vast majority especially of small

town Protestant churches in the United States, are absolute triumphs of architectural gloom. There is nothing in the remotest beautiful about them they have a calling windows of an indescribable brown yellow, motley stained glass. They have vanished wooden pews and pulpits and altars and hanging of plush and usually dock red or a dismal and unspeakable green.

I've looked at so many buildings lately of an ecclesiastical nature and muffle at the pure ingenuity for religious arguments that lies behind them. And this you see reflects the idea of God. As a very solemn serious father of the universe who's created the world for some purpose to which our attitude is supposed to be sort of a stiff as Marines looting the flag. It's something that more or less resembles an everlasting church service. And in view of the kind of churches we have for the most part plus there are exceptions but do the kind of churches we have this is exceedingly gloomy prospect for the spending of eternity. And, but unfortunately, this is the idea of God that is in the back of our minds. And that state of mind persists even in people who don't really believe in that kind of God anymore but for whom God remains a symbol for a sort of moral idealism in the same way that Uncle Sam is a sort of symbol of the people of the United States.

Now that's I think one root of the attitude the other root of the attitude is our conception of man. And this conception of man has the same history, because it comes from the same cultural roots as our conception of God. And this is of course the conception which Lance White has called the European dissociation the conception of man as an unhappy amalgamation of mind body spirit and matter. Ego and not-ego, subject and object known. And this concept of man has very curious consequence as I've mentioned a lot of them but one that I that strikes me more and more is that it's a non participated conception of man. By that I mean. It causes us to feel ourselves. As observers of life, whether that life is inside our own bodies or whether it's outside in the external world we are observers we are the subjects and all that is the object and that is to say it confronts us it stands over against us. And we are looking at it and in a way this is symbolized in our whole. Way of life in so far as it's and an object seems to be to confront the television screen which is non participative contemplation of something which has been impoverished in its material and physical reality. Deprived of say touch and smell and taste and so on. And so. Because we have great

expectations out of this contemplation whether it be of television or of mundane existence. But we are not with it. You see we don't believe we are our bodies. We say I have a body and we say I have instincts we never sound I am a body or I am instincts. And the body is that we allow ourselves to have a little bit pseudo I mean. There are elegant surfaces. The ideal body is I mean you know Marilyn Monroe it's an elegant surface, but it's not supposed to secrete sweat or it's not supposed to smell at all. It's insides or other improper and one is expected to give it attention in a sort of aloof way but spend one's life on the whole being as unconscious of one's body as possible. All right then, so we have a conception of ourselves which is estranged from our physical organism and therefore our whole life is a strange it is as I've said not participated. And this comes out in a very marked way in the current attitude off this subculture to sexuality. Because here, where we represent sex as a necessary instinct.

Now of course we all know, sexuality in this culture is the big thing. The sex really seductive is used to catch the eye, and to advertise anything and everything however remote it may be from. The sex to a process that advertises beer, it advertises automobiles. It advertises undertakers. Bakeries. Anything because it will catch the I know that the. The thing is made for the. Fall that sense. Which rests upon the surface of things. And thus it comes about that our attitude to sexuality is a superficial attitude. And again, a basically non-participative attitude. As I said, it's an attitude that's changed a bit in recent years we can talk about sex matters very freely. We don't. Have the proof of some of our ancestors but just the same although we can it's all good clean fun you know although we can talk about it in terms of psychoanalysis and we can admit that yes the sexual drive is a very necessary thing and some outlet has to be provided for it. We're not with it. It's become a duty. Look, for example at the McKinsey report. This in a way it was a very remarkable job but it's a catalogue off sexual that it's. As if. Just all Gaza was a thing. As if, in a way, we had to have this outlet in order to reduce tension in other words to get rid of the urge. But note that in speaking of an instinct like sex or hunger as an edge. That we've set it away from Ansel's we've represented it you see as an instinct of the body which drives the mind. And the mind is therefore moved to it. And it admits that it is unfortunately necessary to be moved by it but we say for example in teaching children about the birds the bees and

the flowers that nature or God has given us the sexual instinct, in order to make the reproduction of the species is attractive on the assumption that if it wasn't attractive we wouldn't do it on the further assumption that life itself is a rather boring thing which we have to be made to undergo by rewards and punishments. By the seductions of sex, or by the penalties of pain which ensue with disease and not living a healthy life but these rewards and punishments are regarded as extraneous as things which drive us. And therefore to the extent that we feel that this is. The sexual urge to eat or any other so-called instinct in so far as we feel that is an alien an animal thing that exercise is a compelling power over us and here the us is the cut off dissociated little ego inside the body that is driven around by all this. Then naturally, our fulfillment of these instincts is fundamentally lacking in zest. We say, sex is necessary. On the assumption I suppose that if it weren't it oughtn't to happen. And that goes back you see to our psychology about play play is only justifiable to the degree that it's necessary and play is only necessary to the degree that it felt as work all right the same attitude with regard to sex around that it's only justifiable because it's necessary. Either to reproduce the species Well some new fangled ideal such as rounding out a complete personality. No one seems to have the courage to admit that it's intrinsically a good thing and that the urge the basic biological urges are not mechanical drives, they are our own inmost wills. Why don't we get with it? If we got within ourselves. And really admitted. That we are organisms. We might also get with each other. There again I pointed out how little we actually get with each other how in this television world everybody stays at home and if you walk out in the streets in the evening the police stop you and wonder whether you're crazy and especially if you're not going anywhere because going for a walk that's deep. Listen specialise I mean a person has to have a purpose you see he must be going somewhere. And so. We don't get with each other except for public expressions of getting rid of our hostility like football or prize-fighting. And even in the spectacles one sees on the television. It's perfectly proper to exhibit people slugging and slaying each other. Oh dear no, not people loving each other except in a rather restrained way one can only draw the conclusion that the assumption underlying this is that expressions of Physical Law far more dangerous than expressions of physical hatred. And it seems to me that a culture that has that sort of assumption is basically crazy and devoted unintentionally

indeed, but nevertheless in fact devoted not to survival but to the actual destruction of life.

Laws of Karma

I was talking in the last program about getting rid of ghosts. And showing to what an extent, the so-called problems of life [are] the result of asking the wrong questions. And after all, getting mixed up and spending an enormous amount of effort. In trying to solve riddles that have no answer. Now you know, in Indian philosophy, whether it be Hindu or whether it be Buddhist. There is apparently a great life problem. And that is the problem of how the individual is to be released from what is called karma, k-a-r-m-a. Strictly speaking, the word karma in Sanskrit simply means action or activity. But. In popular Indian conception it has a more specific meaning than that. And it means something like our Western idea of causality. As the Buddha put it once this arises that becomes. And although I don't think he meant this statement in a causal sense nevertheless. When you look at how the ordinary people of India understand karma. It works out in practice as being a law of retribution. That is to say, if you are in good circumstances in this life, it must be attributed to good things you have done in times past. It in bad circumstances to bad things and so the individual has a conception, a kind of explanation of his lot in life by referring it to past causes. And so he believes, that when he can so act and so think. That he stops generating karma. He stops doing action that looks for a result. He'll be liberated. He won't have to be born into this world or other worlds again and again and again and again in the endless repetitious cycle which is called. Samsara the round of births and deaths. And so. The ostensible objective. Of the way of life. Of Vedanta, or yoga or Buddhism, is to stop this process going on.

Now, most interpreters of this philosophy whether they be Westerners or Asians, take this objective in a very literal sense. They understand that by doing all these complex spiritual exercises somehow the reality of being subject to karma and being reborn again and again and again is actually altered. But, I feel that something rather different happens in fact. And that is quite simply, that the individual comes to see, that this whole conception of karma, of cause and effect in other words governing his behavior and reincarnation is an imaginary and thus false conception. And I think for this

reason, there is a considerable parallel between a way of liberation and some of the effects of Western science. After all, you must realize that people living in the ancient culture of India felt that this theory of the world, this cosmology, was real fact. In other words, they didn't choose it as a belief out of a multiplicity of different beliefs it was say completely in the atmosphere just in the same way a certain things a perfect common sense for us. And it would be very difficult for them to think otherwise. I was talking in the last program about. How we at one time thought that the planets were moved by reason of being encased in crystal spheres. And at one time, nobody questioned this everybody thought so or everybody thought that the earth was flat. They knew it was.

And so for people for whom these conceptions are realities it's an extraordinarily difficult undertaking to get free of them. But I think that the liberation of man from this particular cosmology is parallel to the way for example in which. The state of scientific knowledge as it is today makes the cosmology of say Dante, extremely implausible. I mean nobody has disproved it nobody has shown positive evidence that there is no God on a golden throne that there are no angels and that there isn't a simple destiny of man in the afterlife of a choice between Heaven Purgatory and hell. And so on. Nobody has brought out any evidence that this isn't true. But of course you must remember, that one of the characteristics of all of what we might call metaphysical propositions is that the person who proposes them can never suggest what evidence could be offered to show that they weren't true. In other words, if you ask somebody who believes in the sea a stick God. What sort of things would show you that this wasn't so. You'll find you can't think of any. I mean after all if God came and told him that God doesn't exist this wouldn't be evidence that God doesn't exist. And that's about the only sort of evidence you could imagine.

And so in the same way, a group of psychoanalysts was asked a little while ago what evidence would you accept as proving that there is no such thing as the tipis complex and they couldn't think of any. So one always has to be rather suspicious of ideas propositions therians for which there could be no contrary evidence. So what in effect has happened is that the scientific description of the universe as we have it today makes that kind of explanation of it an implausible sort of explanation. It just somehow doesn't

fit, not the quantitative scale of the World As We Know It, but even the qualitative scale. And therefore it is simply dropped away. And it hasn't only dropped away for very many intelligent people because it seems implausible but also because it seems unnecessary he doesn't really seem to explain what it claims to explain. And therefore you see, to a degree, the world view of science has liberated many people in the western world from a cosmology in which they thought they were trapped. In which they thought they were hopelessly or pleasantly involved. And in just the same way then, the mental discipline of Buddhism, or Vedanta or yoga is likewise a way of seeing through. And realizing the shall we say fictional nature. Of the cosmology of ancient India.

Now as I said, this cosmology involved the conception of karma. And this in a way. Is crucial to it. Karma. I write it down again. From the Sanskrit root Akri, to do. And as I said Strictly speaking it means your doing. And thus in a way there are two senses of interpret it you might say there is the unreal sense of looking upon it as a law of cause and effect. Or a profound sense in which you interpret it as action. And when you say thus arises, This arises that becomes to quote the Buddha. You may take it to mean because this happened it is it follows It is therefore necessary that something else happens. But on the other hand, you may take that in quite a different sense. Instead of being a kind of chronological cause and effect one thing starting up another as for example when you arrange a row of bricks and they're all standing on end and. You push one down and then as a consequence all the others fall down. Not like that. But rather in the sense, this arises that becomes, of certain things go together. Like yes and no, figure and ground and all these various illustrations which I've used to show the principle of relationship or mutuality.

But let's think for a while about cause and effect and the idea that there is a kind of necessity in nature. I was talking also last time about the work of Ludwig Wittgenstein, and there is a passage in which he says there is no necessity in nature for one thing to happen because another has happened there is only logical necessity. And this again is one of these things that startles common sense. These ghosts who see the ghosts say of necessity of causal necessity is very very in firmly firmly entrenched in our thinking and when somebody suggests that it isn't really so, it's quite a shock. And so,

it's worth examining this conception rather closely. And see if we can lay the ghost of necessity.

First of all let's consider a few ordinary causal ideas. We say that any living creature must, of necessity, have food. And if it does not it will of necessity die. And here we seem to have a perfectly clear case of cause and effect. But if we look closely into what actually goes on. We shall find something rather different. What are we really saying when we say that any living creature needs food. Well first of all. A living creature is of course constantly absorbing or assimilating food. And when we say that for example does your food agree with you? Does the climate agree with you? This is really saying. Are you consistent with your environment. Do you go together. If you do go together with your environment of course you are there as we say you exist if you don't go together with your environment if you are not consistent with it you are not there. It's as simple as that. Now when we say, you see, there's an organism needs food. Of course, this is only to say that it is food. Because what happens you see when anything eats. Is that it transforms as much of the environment as is consistent with its own pattern into that pattern and what isn't consistent it either doesn't eat or it eliminates it. And so, what we call an organism is a constant transformation of food. Would into the pattern of the organism. And of course you could say describing it more elaborately this is the transformation of the pattern of the food into the pattern of the organism.

And so, the moment that the organism stops, all this process of transformation stops the organism isn't there and so long as it is eating it is still becoming food food is still transforming into it and this is what it means to say that it exists. Now of course, we are also likely to say oh this organism eats because it is hungry. Now I wonder what we're saying that. Is hunger something as it was some kind of power that moves the organism to look for food. I think again if we examine this carefully what we're saying is. That an animal eats because it is hungry what we're really saying is that it eats when it's ready to eat. And hunger is the initial stage of eating, it is a way of perceiving readiness to eat. And then again, when we say it dies because there is no food. If you look into this carefully what you are actually saying is. That when food is not in the environment and therefore is

no longer being transformed into the pattern of the organism then that pattern isn't there anymore. It dies.

But, you see what is happening here. All we are doing when we say because is that we are describing what is actually happening more carefully. In other words, the organism dies because there is no more food. If we simply say instead of this word because we simply say. The organisms death is the cessation of food being transformed into its pattern. You see, we've eliminated the word because. And this is actually what we're doing all the time when we explain things. We're not really describing their cause is. That seems to be what we're doing when we don't know the full nature of the event but what we're really doing is we're describing the event that puzzles us more completely. It seems to be a description of causes if we say say death is one event. And not having enough food to eat is another event if we split the two events in the first place then, it will seem that one event causes the other. But it's much simpler to say that all we're doing is we're describing the event called Death more carefully. And this makes it more intelligible. Because you see, while we separate events and say that one is the cause and the other is the effect it's always difficult to show exactly how. No the cause turns into the effect. We had the same difficulty. In trying to show how mines all spirits influence matter. If they were to substances a completely different order how does one work upon the other. And we found in other words, that what appeared to be an explanation wasn't really an explanation at all. If you ascribe, in other words, the intelligent activity of a human being which he manifests in such physical things as his action and his speech if you were scribe this to some altogether different kind of into your substance called a mind well how does it effect it. And this is a puzzle nobody was ever able to answer in just the same thing because when you want to know how a cause brings about an effect you have introduced a gap here, thinking that you were explaining something and as a matter of fact you have made the situation more puzzling than it was in the first place.

And so too, when we take such simple problems as what we call gravity I suspect this is another ghost. When we say, when I let go of a stone it falls to the ground that's a perfectly straightforward simple description of the situation but then if we add to that and say the stone falls to the ground because I let it go. Now let us imagine what evidence is there for causality

here. Let's see what evidence could we bring against it. Supposing, in other words, the world a situation were to arise in which I let go of the stone and it didn't fall to the ground it went up in the air instead. I think that if this happened, we should say that what I had had in my hand was not a rock but a balloon. Because you see it is part of the definition of rocks that when unsupported they fall to the ground things that don't behave that way aren't rocks. And so when we say that a released rock must fall to the ground, this is because that sort of behavior is part of what we mean by a rock. So the must in there, is not as a matter of fact something in nature it is something in the dictionary in the book of definitions. Because the objects that behave that way are so defined.

Take another illustration. The sun flower. Now the sun flower is so arranged that when the sun apparently moves across the sky, it keeps its face following it. And that is what it does. And now let's say a sunflower must turn its face to the sun. In this case, what we're really doing is saying that it turns its face to the sun is part of the definition of a sunflower. If the sunflower didn't turn its face to the sun it would be behaving like say a tool it. Or some plant that doesn't behave this way in the same way if it. Didn't turn its face to the Sun It might also say have Blue Leaves and this would make it in other words a different kind of flower which would have a different sort of definition. And so in this way. We manage to relieve ourselves of the fixed idea that there are such things as natural necessities that in other words nature is being pushed around by something that events are being pushed around by other events and that there is therefore this whole picture of what we call causal determinism. Wittgenstein also produces a rather interesting idea to explain, why there is not natural necessity and there is logical necessity which is a variation of an idea that I have sometimes explained in other ways. You remember that in discussing the idea the Indian idea of Maya, I have very frequently used the illustration of making sense out of natural formations by superimposing upon them a grid or grill. After all we think of the Newtonian grill say, or the three dimensions of space and the linear dimension of time and these are what constitute the coordinates what we call the coordinates the three coordinates of space and one coordinate of time now of course we know very well that the holes of space isn't full of rods or lines arranged to be a height and depth and. And so on there isn't such a thing as the process of time going

on and on and on there are clocks indeed. And when we say we time things we are comparing their behavior with talks All right so we have the. Events of life whatever therefore may be and then by superimposing the grill over them we may have as Wittgenstein points out, a mesh grill whose pattern is simply of squares like square paper in an arithmetic book or we could have some other pattern they could be circular or they could be triangular and any pattern will do so long as there are regular. And then you see, we are able to describe what we have seen through this pattern, in terms of the regularity of the patent. And so actually what we are describing when we describe natural laws when we describe causality or any kind of logical necessity, we are describing the regularities of the patent. And not regularities that our inherent in the structure of nature.

And so, it's important in a way to keep these things distinct. And not to confuse one with the other. And the confusion of the two, is in a way another of these ghosts I've been talking about. So, however, the human being elaborates patterns of this. Time. Language, for example, is an elaborate pattern with certain kinds of regularity and it. Just in the same way to our fingernails and our teeth. And our organs of digestion, and are also a kind of grid. And they're constantly as it were sorting out what is in the world in order to assimilate them to us and in the same way our words our language ideas are patterns which sort out the world. And we assimilate the world to these patterns so you take the idea of a triangle is probably nothing in nature which is a triangle perfectly Euclidean triangle but a triangle is a sort of approximation to things we can translate things that are probably approximately triangular into triangles. This is about we're doing. Converting nature into our pattern.

Symbolic and the Real

I'm talking about the symbolic and the real, and from the very beginning I have to make it clear what I mean by these words. I think one of the very best illustrations of the difference between symbol and reality is the difference between money and wealth—and a lot of people don't know the difference. Nowadays, we're all accustomed to shopping in a supermarket. And when we go there we get a great cartful of produce and groceries and liquor and what have you. You take it through the cashier's... gangway-

place—you know?—and she taps away on her machine, and she produces an enormously long strip of paper and tears it off, and says, “Thirty dollars, please.” And most people, at that moment, feel slightly depressed because they had to get rid of thirty dollars! And that’s [a] very strange and odd reaction, because you got rid of paper. And in exchange for this paper you got wealth: real edible food, usable things—riches—and you should go home in a very happy mood that you got this great bundle of stuff. But somehow, the loss of money hurts us a little bit.

The relationship of money to wealth is very much the same kind of relationship that words have to reality. But when I use this word, “reality,” what on earth am I talking about? If I produce any kind of object in front of you, and—the most convenient happens to be a piece of money; a quarter—and I ask you, “What is it?” and I show it to you, most people would say, “Well, that’s a quarter.” But, obviously, it isn’t. Because the quarter, when you say, “It’s a quarter”—“quarter” is a noise, isn’t it? Quarter: that’s a noise. It’s a noise you make with your mouth. What noise is this? [Alan flips the quarter.] That doesn’t sound like “quarter,” does it? You think it does? A dime would make the same sound. So, what this is is this, you see? [Alan points at the coin directly.] Just that! Like that, see? That’s what it is.

And so we would distinguish between a world of physical events—physical reality—and on the other hand a world of names, and numbers, and noises, and signs which refer to physical reality. And the fact that we can arrange this in this way, the fact that we can make symbols for the world of physical events, is the thing that peculiarly characterizes human beings, makes them different from almost all animals, and is the root and ground of civilization and culture. You can see, in other words, that being able to make a world of symbols standing over against the world of physical events depends upon being able to stand aside from things and look at them, and also to stand aside from ourselves and look at ourselves. There is something in the nervous system in man, some function of the cortex in the brain, which enables him to do just that.

There was a young man who said, “Though

It seems that I know that I know,

What I would like to see

Is the 'I' that knows "me"

When I know that I know that I know."

And that's what we call self-consciousness. And self-consciousness entirely depends upon something in us which enables us to stand aside from the immediate situation. For example, you may be happy. And in the middle of being happy you say, "My God, I'm happy!" That disconcerts some people, because the minute they begin to know that they're happy it starts to disappear. They wonder how long they're going to keep it. But, you know, if you were happy and you didn't know you were happy, wouldn't that be too bad? There'd be, as it were, nobody home to enjoy it. See, knowing that you know is like singing in the bathtub. Everybody has a good voice in the bathroom because the bathroom gives you resonance. It gives you echoes. It amplifies the sound in the same way as a great cathedral amplifies the sound of a choir. And so in just that way we have, as it were, an echo system inside our skulls so that we know when we're happy, we know when we're sad. And when we exist, we know we exist.

And that is simultaneously the grandeur and the tragedy of being human. Because along with knowing that you know [goes along with] all kinds of things, the most important of which is the knowledge of time. You know the myth of the Garden of Eden and the Fall of Man? That when Adam and Eve had eaten the fruit of the tree of knowledge, death came into the world. Why? It wasn't that there wasn't death before. All creatures in nature come and go, everything is born and dies. But for the first time, having eaten the fruit of the tree of knowledge—that is, having invented a system of knowledge: the world of symbols—people knew that they were going to die. A cat approaches another dead cat, he sniffs it and sees that it's good to eat, decides that it's not and goes away. Probably—although we don't know for certain—probably, the cat doesn't reflect: "I will one day be a corpse like that."

But human beings predict because they are able to think about events with symbols and words. They are able to see what the future will be. And we all believe—don't we?—that this is the most useful kind of knowledge that we

have: to know the future and, therefore, to be able to plan for it. To have your savings account, your life insurance, to plan for your old age. That's great. But at the same time it has very serious disadvantages, because the more you know the future, and are thereby able to control it, the more you realize that you can't control it ultimately. That you're going to come to a bad end. And so that's what makes human beings so strange. All human beings are, therefore, slightly anxious, slightly depressed. There's a certain kind of sadness in human nature which the Japanese call *aware*: a melancholy, deep down in us, because we know—in the words of the song —“But it all comes apart in the end.” And even diamonds come apart at the end.

And so it's a curious thing whether a human being is really a logical construction. It's a great question. Whether a human being is not actually a self-defeating organism, a creature who knows too much for his own good. Because—you know the proverb “What you gain on the roundabout you lose on the swings?” So with man: what you gain in power by having foresight and dexterity in controlling the world through symbols—what a price we pay for it! Because no one of us can any longer afford to be spontaneous. Imagine a life in which you don't have to take any provision for the future. You do just what you feel like on impulse. Now, you'd make many mistakes, and you might do things that would be quite fatal. Like a moth which can't distinguish between a candle and the sex call of a female, and so it flies straight into the flame and it blows up. Is that too bad? In a way, from the standpoint of the universe, it's a fairly good arrangement, because if this didn't happen there would be too many moths. And every time a moth plunges into the flame it's a sudden disaster. The moth isn't worried about this—I mean, it doesn't have anxiety about it before it happens—and the moth goes out, just like that. With a glorious explosion. And so, in the same way, all these creatures who don't think what to do next—cats don't lie awake at night worrying about what contracts they're going to have to make the next day, and yet, nothing can match the dignity of a cat when it walks, and when it licks itself. What a magnificent creature. So imagine a world in which there isn't any worry. There will be disasters, but you won't know it's going to hit you.

But we have figured out how to beat that world, how to last longer and to be more smart than any other creature on earth. But the price is anxiety. The price is lying awake nights. The price is having an ego, a thing in us that we call “I,” “my self.” A compound of all the memories that we have of our experiences; a history. When you are asked to give an account of yourself, what do you do? You give your, kind of, biography: where you were born, where you were educated, where you have been, where you have traveled, what things you are competent in. It’s your life story, it’s your history. And we learn to identify ourselves with our history. And that is a series of symbols representing the actual events through which we have passed in our lifetime. And that history is something with which we fervently identify ourselves. But all histories come to an end. And so the more we know about our history, about ourselves in that kind of a way of knowing, the more anxiety we have about the thought that this history cannot go on indefinitely. It cannot be a story of complete success.

Now then, I want to go into some of the properties of the human mind upon which this sense of our own existence is based. And the most remarkable property that we have which enables us to create a symbolic world standing over against the world of physical reality and, of course—may I just put in parentheses—when I talk about the world of physical reality, this is a symbolic noise. And many people, when they hear physical reality spoken about, react to it in terms of 19th century scientific mythology, which is that the world of material, of energy—the world outside human skins—is mechanical and stupid. That was one of the dogmas of 19th century scientism which carries on into the common sense of the 20th century. So when I say the world of physical reality, please don’t put any such ideas on it. We really don’t know very much about it at all.

So then, the ability—the peculiar ability—of the human mind that underlies being able to create a symbolic world alongside the world of reality—and, through this, to manipulate and control and play god towards the world of physical reality—the thing that underlies this is what we call consciousness. Consciousness is conscious attention: the ability to focus our senses on what we call one thing at a time.

Now, consciousness is, therefore, comparable to the use of a spotlight which casts a narrow, bright beam upon certain areas. We all were taught to use this as children because, when we went to school, one of the most frequent things our teachers said to us was, [loud clap] “Pay attention!” Because the children were doing this, and they were doodling, and looking out of the window, and so on—having a wonderful time. But the teacher wants to get you to be able to focus on a point. See? Now watch my finger. Who else does this, other than teachers? Who else does that? Hypnotists! Hypnotists and conjurers; magicians! They’re always saying, “Now, watch my hand. There’s absolutely nothing in it.” And when you watch the hand, you know, he’s busy pulling a rabbit out of his pocket or something. So teachers all do that. And the children comply by tightening their legs ’round the legs of the chair and frowning, and looking at the teacher with a fixed gaze, because by that the teacher will know—so children think—that they’re really attending.

Now, so you see, by this means we are taught to focus our awareness—that is, say, the total sensitive power of all our five senses—to focus it on certain areas of the external world, sometimes the internal world, which are called significant. What is significant? What is important to notice? Many of us—you know, let’s say men—go out to a luncheon meeting where all sorts of people are present and we’ve got some kind of business to transact, and we go home, and the wives say to the husbands, “Well, you were at this luncheon meeting. Was Mrs. So-and-so there?” “Yes, she was there. I sat opposite to her.” “What was she wearing?” “I didn’t notice.” See? He looked right at it, he saw right in front of him the dress that this woman had on, but he didn’t notice it. Because from his point of view it wasn’t significant. He might’ve been interested in what was underneath it, but not what was on top, so he didn’t see it. And so, in the same way, you can drive your car daily into town, and talk with a friend, and you’re absorbed in conversation, and you don’t remember—you don’t even think about driving. And yet, you go through all these complicated stoplights, you avoid all the other maniacs on the road, and you get in comfortably. But you didn’t notice it. Because there is an aspect of your total awareness that is not consciousness. It reacts, and it reacts intelligently, but it doesn’t enter into what we call the stream of consciousness: the stream of events which we focus on with our spotlight and consider to be important and significant.

So there are many, many different versions of what is significant about our world. The world, you see, is in many ways like a blot in a Rorschach test—I presume you are all familiar with a Rorschach test?—where you have an ink blot that is made by pouring ink on a piece of paper, and then folding it over, and then opening it up so that you get a symmetrical pattern. And the person being tested is asked to describe what he sees in the blot and, according to what he describes, the psychologists believe that they can evaluate his personality. Well, actually, the whole world is a Rorschach blot. It's all fundamentally wiggly. Clouds are wiggly, mountains are wiggly, plants and waters and, above all, people. People are peculiarly wiggly. And then the task, you see, of consciousness is to make sense out of it all, is to tell a consistent story about the wiggles so that we can keep track of them. And what happens is: in human society, our forefathers—the more persuasive among them—invented a story about the universal Rorschach blot, and they pounded their children and made them believe it, too. And so, now, we all accept approximately the same version of the thing. And so, by this method of attending to one little bit of the wiggle, and then another little bit of the wiggle, we can make sense out of the wiggle.

You see, you do it the same way—supposing, instead of a Rorschach blot, you have a piece of territory: you have the Monterey Peninsula. And on the map it's a wiggle. But if we superimpose over this map a grid, simply lines—north and south, lines of latitude and longitude—and then we describe where each wiggle is in terms of the numbers up or the numbers across of these lines, we can measure the area. Well, that's the basis of calculus. That's the basis of all careful, accurate description of our wiggly world. And so, by concentrating on the wiggles, area by area, bit by bit, we learn how to manage it, how to make sense out of it. Just in the same way, for example, your mouth has only a certain size and therefore you can't eat a whole chicken at once. In order to be able to absorb a chicken you have to cut it into pieces. So you get a cut-up fryer. And even then, you have to reduce it to bite-sized units so as to assimilate it. Well, in exactly the same way, the physical world has to be reduced to bite-sized units in order to be assimilated by our intellect. And those bite-sized units we call “things” and “events.”

There are, in nature, in the actual physical universe, no such things as things, and no such happenings as events. They're all invented by us in the same way as we invent lines of latitude and longitude, inches, meters, minutes and hours. They're all measures: they don't really exist out there. But we choose certain lines—for example, we choose the boundary of the human skin and we say this divides me from everything else. Inside this bag of skin is “me,” inside those bags of skin is “you.” And outside that is a foreign world that isn't me, that isn't you. But that's not true! The skin, from one point of view, can be said to divide us from the external world, but from another point of view it is exactly what joins us to the external world. The skin is full of pores through which we breathe the air. The skin is full of nerve ends through which we become sensitive to what goes on around us. And if, as a matter of fact, the air pressure outside the skin was not exactly fifteen pounds per square inch—if it was anything less than that—we'd blow up. The pressure inside would be too much for the outside. See? What we don't—we are carefully educated not to notice certain things, because once you start noticing it—in other words, using your spotlight to concentrate on certain areas—at the same time as you notice, you also ignore, you also don't notice.

Often I take a blackboard and I draw a circle on it. And I say to people, “What have I drawn?” And they'll say, “A circle,” “a ball,” “a sphere.” Very few people ever say, “A hole in the wall.” A few smart ones do. In other words, do you notice what's inside the circle, or do you notice what's outside? Because what's outside is just as important as what's inside. You know, the fundamental secret of life—I'm going to tell you this, and this is worth all your price of admission; it's the ultimate secret! The ultimate secret is: for every inside, there is an outside. And they go together, and you can't have one without the other. And that's the whole problem of metaphysics, of religion, of life and death, so be of good cheer. But normally, you see, the way we are trained to attend our attention is captured by the area inside just as it's captured by an object that moves rather than one that's still. In other words, if a mouse were suddenly to go skitty-skit across the floor here, everybody would notice the mouse. And I keep moving a little instead of standing still, like this, while I talk to you so that you will notice me a little, see?

Motion against relative stillness, the background of the curtain, captures our attention. And my figure against the curtain captures your attention. Imagine what would happen if the total consciousness of the curtain vanished and your entire field of vision was filled by me only. Then do you see what would happen? I would disappear, and what you would become conscious of as the thing presented to you would be my necktie, or something like that. See? So by that I mean the inside always goes with the outside.

Now then, the whole use of consciousness—this is the point I'm making—the whole use of consciousness is the isolation of certain areas which we pay attention to. And we pay as the price for that kind of attention ignoring what stands outside them. For example, most people think that space is nothing. Space is just emptiness through which we all move. Interstellar space—the space between planets, the space between galaxies—is nothing. But every painter and every architect knows that space isn't nothing at all. Architects sometimes talk about the influence of space upon behavior. And to the uninitiated this sounds like nonsense. And if you paint, you realize that you have to paint the space as well as the things in the space. In other words, if you work in oils on canvas, you have to work on the background. You have to paint the background in. And you realize, therefore, that it's something that's there.

Can you imagine a solid without a space 'round it? Why, you can't possibly do so! Can you imagine a space without a solid in it? You can't possibly, because you have to constitute the solid to imagine yourself in the middle of an empty space. There is no way of having a space without a solid just as there is no way of having a front without a back. They go together.

But we are trained by our education and by our language—by the patterns of thought which our culture instills in us—to notice the solid and ignore the space. So, in the same way, we notice ourselves as we exist inside our skins and ignore ourselves as we exist outside our skins. And that gives us our peculiar feeling of insularity, of being skin-encapsulated egos who feel ourselves to be different from, to confront, to meet an alien, external, and largely hostile physical universe. And this is the supremely difficult price that we pay for our ingenious ability to use symbols, and to divide the world

into the symbolic and the real, the significant and the insignificant, the important and the unimportant.

We have lost the fundamental physical elemental sense that every single one of us is the entire works, focused here and now. That is to say, every human being—every beetle, every mosquito, every living cell—is something that the entire cosmos, the whole universe, is doing in a particular way. Just as when you hold a magnifying glass to the sun, and you focus the sun as a vivid little point of light at that particular spot on that particular leaf, so every creature that exists is a focus, a special case of what the entire works of existence is doing. Only: we have been taught to forget that. By being concentrated on the here and now—who I am, what circumstances I'm in, what I'm doing, what's important for me—we get absorbed in it.

Supposing, for example, you got under a microscope some of the little animals that are working inside your blood stream. You would suddenly become aware through your narrowed attention of a great conflict going on. There's a thing with wild whiskers on it and eyes all over that's going to eat that thing, which is more humane-looking because it's only got eyes on one end. And you see this awful thing through the microscope about to eat that and you get panicky. What's the result going to be? What's going to come out of this? See? But from a larger point of view you realize that if that fight weren't going on, you wouldn't be healthy. Because the constant conflict of microorganisms at one level is, at another level, your ongoing life and health. But if you look at it intensely—I mean, if you concentrate and ignore the context of what's happening—you get involved in this struggle and think, "Oh! It's going to eat it!" Well, that's the situation we're all in. We're all absorbed in our daily success, our business opportunities; whether we're going to make it or not.

See, that's one of the great philosophical questions. There are really four philosophical questions: Who started it? Are we going to make it? Where are we going to put it? And who's going to clean up? So this "Are we going to make it?"—see?—arises immediately; someone has started it. And what they've started is this concentrated attention: looking at the little details. Those details are fascinating! I mean, you know, it's the details that matter.

It's whether a woman's nose goes this way or that way that determines whether she's attractive or not, whether she goes this way or that way that determines—you see? It's the details. And it's the details that differentiate between each individual personality. And we get absorbed in that. It's marvelous! Beautiful!

But unless you can keep the details in balance with the background you get so sucked into the details that you lose yourself. You lose your balance. And so, in this way, the narrowed attention gets you involved into believing that you—I, myself, ego—am just some kind of a thing inside this skin. I'm a sort of chauffeur in my physical body. And I believe that. It's a hoax, but I believe it. And the whole of society conspires to make you believe that. The whole of education is designed to give you that particular sensation. But it just isn't so. Because if every inside goes with an outside—like the head goes with the feet; you don't find heads without feet. You don't find cats that have tails but no heads. Only manx cats have heads but no tails. They go together. So, in the same way, a living organism goes with an environment.

But fascination with symbols—the fact that we can talk about the organism as if it were something separate from the environment, because we can talk about “I” as if I was something separate from you—hypnotizes us into the feeling that we really are separate. And so we lose the sensation of being really at home in the world.

You know, you might use an illustration: Here's a tree. A barren tree; dead branches. And from nowhere at all a bunch of birds come and alight on it. There they are: birds from somewhere else alighting on a barren tree. That's the way most people feel themselves in the world: human beings in a world largely composed of rocks, and fire, and electronic jazz which has no feelings, no sense of values, no intelligence. But we just live here by accident. The other image is the tree, again, that suddenly gives rise to leaves and fruit. What a different situation. But according to all our knowledge of the sciences—of biology, ecology, evolution, and so on—we are leaves on a tree. We live, we express—each one of us—a world which produces human beings in precisely the same way that an apple tree produces apples. After all, when we see the apple tree in the spring it has no

apples on it, only blossom. And in the winter not even any blossom. And you might go by the apple tree and say, “Just a tree.” And you come by later and you see the blossoms, and you begin to get interested. And then, later in the summer, you go by and it has apples on it. And you say, “Excuse me!”

So, in the same way, this solar system might have been visited ten million years ago by someone in a flying saucer from Alpha Centaurus, and he would’ve looked ’round and said, “Just a bunch of rocks,” and gone away. Now he comes back in his flying saucer again, and looks at us and says, “Excuse me! I see you were, after all, intelligent rocks. Because you are human-ing just as the apple tree apple-s,” you see? A world which does us is an intelligent world, is a human world. At the very least it may be something more. Goodness only knows what it might do next! But at least, you see, it does us.

Now this, then, is my moral: the ability to cut the world up into pieces as a result of our facility with symbols and words is marvelous. It enables us to analyze things, to predict the future, to see all the details and to bring out the value of the details. That is a wonderful thing. But you can have too much of a good thing. You need to underpin, to background this vision of the details with something to support it, otherwise you go insane. Otherwise you get lost in a detail. You get lost in a point. You get so absorbed that, as we say, you can’t see the forest for the trees: we can’t see the world for the selves. And this isn’t just a matter of theoretical understanding, not just grasping a new theory. We need to find ways in which our actual everyday consciousness—our sensation, our physical feeling of being alive—is so transformed that each one of us feels himself not only to be alive inside his skin, but also to be definitely, substantially identical with everything going on around him. So that when you move and talk to me, I feel that that’s just as much me as it is you. Because these are the facts. This is the way it is. The outside goes with the inside, and you don’t find them apart from each other anymore than you find the front of the coin without the back.

Look: supposing I’m interested in another human being, but this is a human being who thinks only about themselves—has no interest other than what is defined as themselves, socially. In other words, the interior of the bag of skin. Well, this is the most boring kind of person you could imagine. Has no

personality whatsoever, even though they're entirely concentrated on themselves. When I feel that a person has genuine personality—is unique, and different, and alive—that is a function of their interest in things outside themselves—in other people, in their ancestry, and so on. You know? It's wonderful to look at a person and say, "I think your background is... hmm... a little bit French, slightly Irish, touch of Yugoslavian." Wow! See? Then I'm beginning—the person might say, "Well, you're not talking about me, you're just talking about my parents." But you are your parents, you see? That makes you interesting. And then your interest in music, in fish, in birds, in trees, in clothes—anything you want to mention—makes you more interesting. In other words, the more related you are to your external world, the more unique and interesting you become.

My fingers—all of them move separately and independently, but only because they are part of the hand, and only because the hand is part of the arm, and so on. So underneath our marvelous ability to analyze the world through concentrated attention and through symbols—words which suggest that a tree is a tree. The word "tree" is different from the word "ground," and therefore it seems that the tree is different from the ground. But it isn't. The tree is the ground reaching up to grab at the sky. And, you know, enjoy. It's the ground swinging. So, in the same way, each one of us is the whole cosmos waving and saying, "Yoo-hoo! I'm here!" So that knowledge is necessary. That knowledge of being one with the totality is necessary to underpin and support the knowledge of being different, and unique, and individual. Without it, the individual goes mad. Crazy mad, not angry mad. Crazy mad, because he feels unsupported, and therefore he seeks security in the collective—that is to say, in religious or political merging of individuals into the crowd, into the mob, into the mass—to escape the terror of being alone.

Study of Asia

For the past six years, I have been involved in an experiment. Concerned with the introduction of the study of Asia into higher education. During this time, I have been brought into contact with almost every phase of the problem. Not only of the study of Asia, but other special problems of higher education as a whole. Everything from raising funds for vital and

imaginative but unfamiliar ideas through the appalling red tape of the academic system. To the intimate personal problems of the vocational counseling of students. But as a result, I have begun to have a vision of what the study of Asia might mean for the Western world. Though I am sorry to say that I have a good deal of difficulty in communicating this vision to others concerned with the formal area of Asian studies. At one end of the problem, I have been faced with those who cling to the utterly discredited notion that scholarly and intellectual pursuits are of no value unless they are. Rather platitudinously, obviously a practical. And at the other, with the pundits and pedants. For whom the study of a share means exhaustive research into the manufacture of Chinese writing ink between eleven forty three and twelve fifty two. Somewhere in the middle, lies the general impression that a shirt. Constitutes a formidable number of foreigners dropped by modern transportation into the next door yard. Folks with rather odd and backward notions which we need to understand in order to get along with them. Yet I'm forced to admit, that for me, this whole range of ideas about the study of Asian culture is intolerably boring and unfruitful. I'm very happy and very grateful that I have been born at a time, when the problems of Human Nature and Destiny have been particularly exaggerated and thrown into sharp relief. By an unprecedented development of human power. I feel that the peculiar direction of Western civilization has achieved something fantastically wonderful. It has given human beings the technical means of amplifying and exploiting almost every idiosyncrasy of which we are capable. And at the same time, of taking the most brutal hardboiled and realistic view of man's place in the universe.

Western science and technology have given us the H.-Bomb, the T.V. commercials and the modern hospital. And they have given us the most rigorous discipline. In looking at facts without wishful thinking. That the Western world at least has ever known. If I may put it in another way, I feel that Western culture, Western science philosophy sociology psychology and political theory. Have raised the basic question is the fundamental problems of human life as no one else has ever raised them. And they have raised them unintentionally quite as much as intentionally. This achievement, this if I may call in a phrase supremum criticalization of the human situation this sense of living always in the midst of a

cosmological crisis. Is the ultimately valuable if nerve-racking contribution of the West to human culture.

Because of Western science, we are seriously able to contemplate the imminent possibility of destroying life upon this planet. We are able to consider problems of human population and ecology of moral and ethical relativity of the relation of the individual to society are the deliberate control of the brain in mind of the conquest of disease and the lengthening of life of the displacement of thought and labor by machinery. And of the management of natural resources and to consider them in a way which has never before been possible. In short, we have the most acute, well-informed and sensationally telling ways of confronting ourselves with the most radical problems of man's relation to his world. Yet at the same time, this vast extension of human knowledge and power is accompanied by an increased awareness of being out of control, of lacking the wisdom necessary to deal with the enormity of our information and technical skill.

Now, it would be a rather silly oversimplification to say that the necessary wisdom for this predicament is to be found by looking to the timeless philosophy of the ancient East. This is another approach to the study of Asia which I have come to feel as nearly unfruitful as the others. It implies that what we need at this time is a sure guide, a sure authority based on centuries of experience. But my feeling is not that we are going to find any solution to these scientifically highlighted problems by resort to imported philosophers and cultural institutions. However weighted with the experience of centuries. The point is rather this: that having raised the problems of human life in such an acute and dramatic way what we need to do first is to examine the premises upon which these problems are based. To put it in another way. We need to take a clear and critical look at the commonsense and nearly unconscious notions upon which Western civilization is founded. We need to ask for example, whether the survival of human life on Earth is the basic measure of practical value. Whether there is any real meaning. In the idea of progressive improvement of the human situation. And whether any actual progress results from the increase in control of ourselves and our environment. We need to take stock of the fundamental goals towards which our natural instincts are supposed to lead. To find out whether what we want is what we want. Or what we have been

talking we want. We need to ask whether we really feel ourselves to be individuals, facing an alien environment or whether it is only through cultural conditioning that we think of ourselves as egos in bags of skin.

We need also I think to take a good hard look at our actual sensations of those highly marketable dimensions of time and space. And find out if the way we measure them actually corresponds to the way in which we feel them. These may be highly philosophical questions yet at the same time, they are brutally practical since they form the context and the fundamental incentives of all our technological, commercial, political and social activities. Now I know no better way of approaching these questions are finding out in the first place what our basic premises actually are, than by studying cultures which have grown up in relative isolation from our own. We do not have to agree with or copy these foreign cultures. We have only to use them to discover our own boundaries and definitions. For all definition is, by comparison and contrast. As one knows the shape of a figure by its contrast with the background Kipling who said that East is East and West is West and never twain shall meet, said also that he does not know England who only England knows Similarly we do not know what Western civilization Western culture is if we do not know any other. If we do not know what it is we cannot judge it we cannot tell whether it supposed progress is in fact progress or regress. But more important still we are not even aware of the fundamental premises upon which we act until we bring them into relief by contrast with others. And this to my mind is the chief reason for a study of Asia. It is to find out who we are and whether we want to be that way. And thus it is a started to be undertaken. Not as a narrow specialty. But in intimate relation. To the front of the problems of Western science philosophy and sociology. It is a study to be undertaken not in the exclusive company of professional Oriental us. But in the company of mines representing all the major branches of knowledge. And its purpose is to fructify and challenge these branches of knowledge by bringing their premises into focus so that the economist the political scientist the mathematician the psychologist and yes, the Professor of Commerce can discern more sharply the hidden presuppositions of their crafts.

A striking example of the sort of thing I'm driving at is the marvelous study of Chinese science and civilization, which has recently been undertaken by

a great English biologist Joseph Needham. Having achieved some notable research in the field of biology before he was even thirty. Needham devoted some twenty years to the study of China without giving up the pursuit of his interests in Western science. And in the past two months, he has published the second of what are to be seven large volumes of his science and Civilisation in China. A book which could never I think have been written by someone specially specializing narrowly in signology, Chinese studies. For it took a biologist a student of Whitehead. To appreciate the real value of Chinese ideas of the organic and non-mechanical order of nature. And thus to write one of the most illuminating essays ever written. On the nature of human and natural law. So that even such a professional Orientalist as Arthur Waley has called it not only an epoch-making contribution to the history of technology and general culture but also the best handbook on Chinese general history and geography that has appeared. Now, a work of this kind is a real expansion of knowledge. A splendid example of what Asian studies should really be. For just because Chinese science did not at all follow the direction nor have the obvious success of western science for this very reason it illumines the whole character and scope of Western science by contrast.

On the other hand, it seems obvious that no such expansion of human knowledge can arise from the sort of area studies or international relations approach to Asia now fashionable in American universities. An approach of this kind might be suitable for extension causes for the benefit of businessmen and consular officials requiring some knowledge of Asia for their political or commercial ends. But, to make such matters the main preoccupation of our study of Asia in education is to make it an intellectual backwater. It is of course obvious, that for political and economic reasons we need information and insight about the day to day problems of modern Asia. But surely, the supplying of such information is the sphere of the competent journalist rather than the scholar. But from the standpoint of the scholar or scientist primarily concerned with the expansion of knowledge and the enrichment of culture, Modern Asia with the possible exception of Japan presents a rather sad picture. As I suppose we should too had we suffered two hundred years of colonialism. Yet contemporary India and China, Persia and Arabia are producing little or nothing of the same intellectual interest as the fruits of their great ages in the past. Sad to say it's

hard to call to mind a single living figure from these parts of the world of the same intellectually creative stature as say Jushi, Nagarjuna, or Avicenna. Or of the men who conceived Ankor Watt, the Temple of Heaven of the Alhambra. One can but hope that they are present but as yet unknown to us. For such reasons then. Contemporary Asian culture. Contains rather little to stimulate the creative thinker of the West be he philosopher or physicist architect or surgeon. On the other hand, what Asia has achieved in the past is as I think Needham has shown are far more than merely historical and antiquarian interest. We have already seen the applicability of Japanese concepts of space, of design. Of the use of materials and architecture and even of the conservation of natural resources. But we might inquire for example, into the ideas which the Japanese physicist Dr. Kunijihashida acquired from studying the thirteenth century Buddhist philosopher Dogan. We might explore the uses of the Chinese language as the best kind of notation for expressing biological and field concepts which involve complex relational situations. We might ask whether the Indian logician Diginyaga had anything to tell us about the science of linguistics or semantics we might ask some questions about the type of experience from which there arose the astounding Islamic art of the Arabesque. And whether it has any connection with similar concepts of pattern or lattice which can be produced by lysergic acid. A new drug of considerable interest to psychiatrists. We might look into some Indian and Chinese ideas about the structure of personality, about natural law and social change, and ask whether they do not fit the course of events a little better than our own. But all this would be nothing more than a beginning. What I really have in mind, is a little like an experiment which is I think being conducted at MIT to promote inventive thinking. The process is to imagine intelligent creatures with body structure quite different from our own. And then to consider forms of architecture furniture technical appliances and even social institutions that would be appropriate for them a form of fantasy which produces many new ideas for our use.

Similarly, I would take instead of an imaginary body structure the basic premises of Asian thought and culture of various types and then ask now what would happen if we applied these premises to science and technology rather than our own. Perhaps this is like asking, what would happen if we built a house on water instead of a pond solid earth. But the answer would

be a ship. As a result of this inquiry I would expect to find directions of investigation and types of development and creative activity which we have altogether neglected. I might discover that a number of problems which we are failing to solve by technology are unanswerable, because they are at root meaningless questions. I would also expect to find out a great deal about the future development of an industrialised Asia. And I can't imagine anything more conventionally practical than that.

In short, I think it is clear that what is really the matter with our standard approach not only to the study of Asia, but also to many other lines of historical and cultural investigation. Is that it is horribly lacking in imagination. Of other scholars has become afraid of fantasy which is the very root of creative thinking. But our scientists are not afraid of fantasy we're not keeping a cold eye on facts in a lab they are reading Astounding Science Fiction or galaxy. They are not afraid of Dare we say it, meditation and calm and the contemplative useless life. At the Institute of Advanced Studies in Princeton, mathematicians may fool around for years with utterly abstract puzzles about n-dimensional spaces and no results are expected of them. For they have discovered that the human mind is fruitful almost to the precise degree that it is not compulsively trying to get useful results. Useful results are a by-product of pure play, pure imagination. On the other hand, the humanities, and some of the new sciences like psychology are trying to become more respectable by aping the rigor of the mathematicians without the imagination of the usefulness of Engineers. Without the pattering. Thus their departments are increasingly populated with Drudges is who are simply scared to death of not seeming to be academically sound terrified of publishing anything that is not in form and content as dull as possible and documented to death. Fortunately however there are still a few marvelously unsound people like Northrup and time B. who can produce vast and fascinating speculations like the meeting of East and West in the study of history but they're all men unafraid of losing the dubious dignity of a good academic reputation the same with young age eighty and psychology. Of course all institutions of higher education are increasingly dependent upon the government. Or upon the great corporations for their financial support. And these gentlemen want results and would like to see professors punching clocks and being productive. But this is seem to be quite so much the case as the academic world itself imagines. The Rand Corporation, the

brains of the Air Force has of all things philosophers on it's stuff. Bell Telephone has even Gerald Herd as a consultant. And especially in the advertising world, the new type of conference call that the brainstorm is spreading like wildfire the conference where the whole office staff sits around and fantasizes as freely as possible about any technical problem with no realistic criticism allowed. The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. So government and business are still telling the professors to get results quick it would seem perhaps that the men in charge are fuddy-duddies who because they have no imagination will soon be left out of the market.

So, to get back to the study of Asia why do we need on the academic and institutional level our situations like the mathematicians have a Princeton, and the behavioral scientists at Stanford we need places where well trained scholars and outstanding graduate students can go and play and forget for a while about being sound practical. They must not be told to go and play because we feel that this is really the best way of being useful and inventive. This isn't playing the game as the Hindu say that that would be like trying not to think of the monkey while taking medicine because if you think of a monkey the medicine doesn't work. No. They must simply be allowed to play. To be as fantastic, as contemplative as esoteric and as useless as they like. With a single proviso that they be men of proven accomplishment and learning in the first place. Perhaps but in one of two real screwballs to shake them up. Indeed this whole principle of the useful as the unsorted byproduct of useless contemplation pursued simply for its own sake is one of the major themes of Asian thought. Exaggerated indeed in Asia. But a real catalyst for the overpurpose of West. For purposeless action is one possible translation of the Taoist way literally non-doing, of not acting out of accord with nature which Lao-Tzu said that by non doing nothing is left undone. The sense of it is to act without seeking a result without pursuing a goal in the future. Without any self-conscious and affected attempt to be virtuous useful sound and constructive. For superior virtue is not deliberately virtuous Thus it is virtue. Inferior virtue does not let go of the idea of you thus it is not a virtue. Superior virtue strives not, and has no aim. Inferior virtue strives, and has an aim.

Return to the Forest

During the past few months I have been studying an extraordinarily interesting paper written by Joseph Campbell, whose name will be familiar to many of you as the author of a book on mythology called *The Hero With a Thousand Faces*. Joseph Campbell is also the editor of the post you must works of Heinrich Zimmer, which had been published by the *Bowling Green Foundation* and as a matter of fact an extraordinary amount of those works is his own original writings and they were compiled from Heinrich Zimmer's notes. But the particular paper I mention now was presented I think in one hundred fifty seven in August at the end on us conference in US Kona in Switzerland a meeting of scholars and philosophers and psychologists and scientists which gathers every year under the auspices of a lady who has for a long time been interested in the work of C.G. Jung. And the particular paper which Joseph Campbell presented at this conference was called the symbol without meaning it isn't published in this country as yet and only appears in the book for nine hundred fifty seven which was published in Switzerland. But I expect it will shortly be forthcoming in the *Ex UPS* from the papers delivered at those conferences which are published by the *Bowling Green Foundation*.

Now this particular paper the symbol without meaning is an exploration. Of an extraordinary phenomenon in the history of religions, which you might call the in the beginning the development and the dissolution of cosmologists of great views of the world under religio- philosophical auspices which are the, as-it-were, languages about the universe devised by various cultures. Now he distinguishes between two great phases in man's religious history. Which he equates with two styles of culture which predate our own technological style of culture. And these are respectively the hunting cultures and the agrarian cultures. And he points out that the kind of religion which is characteristic of a hunting culture is what now generally goes by the name of Shamanism although this particular word is a distinctive of Mongolian styles of so-called primitive religion nevertheless the phenomenon known as shamanism is found distributed all over the planet.

Shamanism is characterized by the fact. That it's a very individualistic type of religiousness that is to say the religious experience of the shaman is not something which he gets from an authoritative priesthood is not something

handed down from generation to generation. For which he goes to a human teacher. The Shaman is a solitary medicine man. A man of power. When variably has to find his experience for himself. Usually it is by going alone into the dangers of the forests or jungles. Or holing himself up for some days in his own heart and undergoing some kind of ordeal. Not necessarily on the physical level so much as on the psychic level going through an adventure in the psychic. Well the world of spirits and when he comes through the ordeal. He comes out and initiate of. The reason why one must a tap so much importance to the individual character of this experience is that it goes along of the general style of a hunting culture in which every individual man contains the whole culture. That is to say, [it] is not the kind of culture in which specialized functions on needed in which there is a division of labor the hunter spends much of his time on his own. And he has to learn to take care of himself in the forests without any other human aid. And although there are societies and social groups there composed of men with women and children men who are equals because of the type of life that they follow.

Now an entirely different state of affairs arises when we get a settled agrarian culture. Here because the style of life is more complex, a division of labor is required. And you begin to get not only a separation of human beings into various costs and various functions, but also the necessity of devising far more complex complex languages and institutions to provide communication between them. And this always involves a very very powerful socialization of the individual. Spending his time more and more in a settled place and therefore having greater intercourse with other people, he has to learn to think in accordance with common patterns. Whether these patterns be based on language or on the type of work, the geographical features of the area which he inhabits or whatever they may be each individual has to subordinate himself more and more to a socially implanted view of life. Because only on these are these conditions as communication between the individuals possible.

And so it comes about that the style of religiousness which one associates with an agrarian as distinct from a hunting culture is a traditional and authoritative style of religion in which the individual derives his experience from a tradition usually embodied in a priesthood. And the Campbell goes

on to point out, that the first historical instances of the appearance of the familiar circle symbol which is called in Sanskrit the Mandala is associated with the agrarian cultures. No example of this kind of symbol is found archaeologically. Prior to the development of an agrarian community. Now I might say something about the Mandala as a world mythological symbol although anybody who's studied the works of C.G. Jung is very familiar with it. A mandala is essentially a circle, really divided into four quarters or multiples of four, and has in it as it were the general theme of the integration. Of a community. It is not unlike for example a stockaded. Village or city. A ring of defense around. Senta. And Campbell shows that the symbol represents the formation of the kind of society we're talking about where. The human functions are divided and we find in many of these ancient societies that the functions are precisely divided into four. Four groups. Just as in medieval Europeans society we had the spiritual power, the priesthood. The temporal power, the nobility. The Commons and the serfs. And so, in ancient Indian society we had the Brahmana, the priesthood the kshatriya caste, the rulers and soldiers. The vaishya caste, the commoners or merchants and the Shudra caste, the laborers.

So these four castes, represented as it were, represented by the fall of divisions of the Mandala the common integrated encircled community. And, the important point that he makes about its religiousness is as I said that it was an experience carried down by tradition. And experience in which a priestly caste was the authority, and which had to be a common experience just because the whole style of life in a community of this kind depended upon communication. And we can communicate with each other by virtue not only of sharing a common language but also and more importantly by sharing a common view of the world, a common type of sensuous experience which is because why those who have the type of sent to us experiences which we call hallucinations and delusions do not fit easily into a community. But every so often, his paper goes on to show, social cosmologies, his views of the world held in common by societies tend to break up. And actually he starts the paper. In the fifteenth century when through the expansion of the Western world through not only exploration of the surface of the globe but greater knowledge of astronomy begins to break up the geocentric view of the Ptolemaic universe, the view of the world under which Christianity itself had come to birth. And this he looks upon as

a breaking up of the Mandala, a breaking up of the common all agree stable picture of the world by means of which men were able to communicate with each other, and a breaking up therefore which involves a disruption of all our means of communication. And a throwing of culture into a fundamental confusion. It is perhaps, if this be true, just because of the breaking up of a unified worldview. And an entry into the confused world of the relativistic world of modern thought. That the Western peoples have become interested in other and forma attempts to deal with. Life as it as it must be lived when. The Mandala as it were, breaks up.

For after all. The idea of going beyond the come in all view of the world and somehow managing to get along without it is not a new thing. And it's very interesting that in ancient Indian society and to some extent even still in modern Indian society, that when a man has done his work in the society and is able to hand over his caste duties, whether they be priestly or political or professional to his son or sons. That as I think you all know he as it were abandons the world. And gives up cost and becomes what is ordinarily called a sannyasin. We speak of that usually as holy man or hermit. Or a spiritual devotee of some kind but what is of particular interest in this connection is that the so the abandonment of cost is also called entering into the state of Varna trust path of honor prosper and Sanskrit means a forest dweller. And in this sense, the batter who gives up cost. Goes back as it were. To the style of life that predates the agrarian culture he goes as it were back to shamanism. And this is true not only in Indian culture but also in Chinese thought whereas the Confucian way of life represents the community development shop that is what the Mandala corresponds to. The enclosed nice little tight little world. World in which we feel we understand each other understand our environment. In China. And the Taoist philosophy corresponding to the Indian. Search for liberation or Moksha liberation that is to say from the socially conditioned view of the world and. There is evidence to show that the dollars solitaires say. Has. Some sort of ancestral connection with the shaman. And it is possible that the words from Ana in Sanskrit and Sherman and Chinese both have their origin in the Tom Sherman. And Bush Rama indicates the Sunyata and the man who has given up social life in the world and likewise the Sharman in Chinese is the lonely sage in quest of immortality who has gone by himself into the mountains and the forests.

Of course we should not suppose, that the entry into the stage of Ana Prost or the return to the forest by the DA is sages in the strict sense of the word or regression. It's no more aggression and when we speak of a wise man as one who has become again as a child we don't mean that he has literally become childish that he has forgotten how to think and speak and behave in human society. And in exactly the same way the person who enters in the stage. Van across the does not as it were become a wolf man a sort of wild savage who runs around in the jungle naked and wears no clothes and eats his food off the ground with his teeth he doesn't do anything of the kind but the some sort of analogy and other words between. Going back to the shamans religion, going back to the life of the hunter, and at the same time going beyond the place where we find ourselves in a society where the world view is a conditioned social pattern. And now in what sense and in just what way is this going beyond. And likewise, how does it apply to our own situation where we are not as it were going voluntarily beyond a nice clear. Or thorough Tate even comfortable view of the world but rather being forced beyond it by the very pressure of events by the uncertainty of our times and by the confusion. And instability of modern thought which offers us no secure and humanly comfortable picture of the universe. Well first of all it must be obvious that. One of the things that is principle involved by a social system of communication. Is that it is a form of what Korzybski has called time-binding. The whole possibility of thought and language involves a codification of experience. It involves. A form of thinking about life which is basically after all description.

Now, description is a way of coding. Putting into symbols the events that go by us. And as we begin to be able to put events into symbols we develop most peculiar powers of memory. It becomes much easier to recollect and to formalize what has happened to us and along with this naturally gives the ability to project our recollection into thoughts about the future course of events. And this apparently is something which. Primitive, very primitive types of human being in which animals do not do to any great extent. But the price that is always paid for this ability to describe and to prefigure what is going to happen to us is that it has a very very alarming effect upon our emotions. Because we are able by being able to think about all sorts of future possibilities to experience the emotions appropriate to those possibilities as if they were present happenings. In other words the civilized

man tends to be in a state of chronic worry and fear and anxiety because he is always confronted not with the simple actuality of what is happening before him but with the innumerable possibilities of what might happen. And since because of this his emotional existence tends to be in a chronic state of anxiety and tension. He loses increasing the ability to relate to the concrete world as it manifests itself to him in the actual present in which he lives he becomes so tied up inside that as it were the annals of his sensibility become blocked he gets a kind of neurological sclerosis a kind of inability to give himself. To be spontaneous to be alive with full joyous abandon thus the most civilised we become the most stuffy we get.

And therefore the various. Ways of liberating oneself from. A society of entering what the Indians call vanprastha, the life of forest going back to the forest when a person reaches a certain point in life when he says Now look here, I've had enough of all this I'm simply tired of. Making life not in the least bit worth living by going through the horrors, as to what might happen. Of going through all this in the name of efficiency and membership in the community let me for a while get away from it all and find out what the score is for myself I'm tired of being told what I ought to believe I'm tired of being told how I ought to see how I ought to behave how I ought to feel let me find out for myself who I really am. And so, these institutions of going back as it were to the shaman state of religion of getting away from the community interpretation of how one ought to think and feel, arises in very many great cultures of the past. Now they are arise therefore again today, and it's perhaps impossible and misleading to try and have what I would call authoritative attitude about this phase of man's spiritual exploration. Sometimes for example, when a person wants to find out who he really is, he goes to a psychiatrist and occasionally he will find a kind of psychiatry just who does not have an awful rotated view of what human health is and who simply helps the individual to find his own way. Other times unfortunately we will find the doctrinaire. Psychotherapists who think they know what an integrated healthy and normal human being is and to have a whole theoretic pattern of what is believed to be that it actual fact all of what are believed to be the actual facts of human nature the actual design of the psyche and they attempt consciously or subconsciously to wangle the patient into accepting this view.

Alternatively, we may get from the Orient accounts, books about authorities about their ways of liberation which in many cases however have tended to harden into an orthodoxy and to present a traditional spiritual experience just as if they were the kind of spiritual experiences which it is the function of that social office of the priest to impart. And thus, when we get Swamis representing an orthodox interpretation of Indian moksha or liberation or when we get. Even Zen masters are representing perhaps an orthodox Buddhist experience of seeming to represent one we should be suspicious because these are the kind of experiences which cannot be transmitted, which for their very nature are something which one finds out for oneself and which if they could be explained if they could be transmitted would not be the very thing which they are intended to be. Because they are discoveries of something authentic of something genuine or something which is first hand between oneself and one's universe. And thus it's in the nature of things that they can't be codified, they can't be made a factor in social communication.

And so it is that it is in a way fortunate, that we here in the Western world do not have too many authoritative or attentive masters and teachers to whom we feel we can now go for enlightenment more and more of us I think tend to feel that we are all alone together whistling in the dark that we haven't a Savior there is no statesman a clever enough to understand the frightful tangle of international affairs is already there to do anything very much about it there is no. A psychologist office issue an awful lot of us who really impresses us as having the last word on everything more and more each one of us are thrown on our own resources and this is to me to be a perfectly excellent state of affairs. So that we become in a symbolic sense, back in the forest. Like the hunter of old. Who is nobody around him to tell him how he ought to feel and how he ought to use his senses and must therefore make his own exploration and find out for himself. But you know, when you study the records of these self discoveries, the fascinating thing is. That there seems to be such a common measure of agreement between all those who find out for themselves. And yet always, the way in which he has to find out is not through seeking agreement with others not trying to find what others are found, but only to find what his own senses and his own direct experience tell him when he as it were goes into his in a closet goes into his own secret place. And asks for direct encounter with the

world. And no longer as it were looks out of the corner of his eyes to see if everybody else is doing with same thing and getting the same results it is in the sense that a person becomes in the truest sense of the word a self. And original authoritative source of life, as distinct from a person in its original sense a mask, a role that he is playing in a society.

Reconciliation of Opposites

It's always interesting to me to see how often psychologists and psychotherapists talk about the problem of reconciling opposites. Anybody who knows anything at all about the elementary principles of say of psychoanalysis, knows that according to the ideas of both Freud and Jung, own who are in a way the great patriarchs of what we call depth psychology that according to their ideas. There is a kind of compensatory relationship between what is conscious and what his unconscious in our mental life. And that to the degree that one is as it were light above one is dark below or to the degree that one is dark about one is light below. And it's often pointed out. That very many people who wrote the most scurrilous books such as Abile lead the most exemplary lives whereas on the other hand a lot of people who wrote very pious and holy books actually lead disreputable lives. And I think there is a great deal of truth in the way Freud so often points out. That what is expressed in the world of dreams is the opposite side of life to that which one is living consciously, and that therefore, the problem of integrating a person of making him whole. And it's interesting isn't it that the word is etymologically related to the word holy. But the problem of making a person whole is to get together has to apparently opposed sides. And underneath all this there is the recognition. That so many things which seem at one level to be opposed to each other are at another level mutually necessary.

And this is something that's terribly difficult for us to admit. We don't like the basic harmony which very often underlies things that we would rather prefer to see in opposition to each other. Take for example, the fundamental opposition of life and death. Isn't it perfectly extraordinary the way we manage to conceal or most people manage to conceal, the fact that they keep alive, by death. Day in and day out, after all we are constantly transforming dead animals and plants into the shape of our own organisms.

But on this kind of thing you know is conveniently put away the slaughterhouses somewhere in the back district or Chicago and we don't get to see what goes on. And of course we conceal deaths in so many ways the whole art of the mortician as he likes to starve themselves, is to conceal death. And therefore, because of the Death is constantly repressed. We begin to forget. How much life and death go together. And so, to the degree that we fail to recognize. The inseparability of things that we call opposites to that degree we keep running into problems that baffle us and that we don't understand. We don't understand, for example. How our unnecessary. Our enemies are to us. How the things that we fight against. Ass things which stimulate us to call out our images. And while in other words it seems to be necessary to muster or our strength to oppose the thing. If we should overdo it. And muster too much strength, and succeed in getting rid of our enemies, we might very well collapse. And I think that an insight into that fact. Underlies the celebrated sayings of Jesus Love your enemies. Interesting it doesn't necessarily say does it make friends of your enemy it says, Love your enemies. And fair something of this kind underlies. The very very usual idea in Eastern philosophy of the truth lying in the middle. In other words, in Confucianism, one of the cardinal principles of Confucianism is the so-called doctrine of the mean. And interpreted one level, this is rather just the platitudinous doctrine of moderation, that one should be moderate in all things. And in the same way, Buddhism is called the middle way. And that too, at a certain level level of interpretation means nothing more than that this is a doctrine of moderation used. In the Buddha's time, roughly six hundred years before Christ. Run of the main forms of. Indian spirituality whereas the search for liberation through extreme. Self-mortification. When Guatama Buddha himself was a young man. He was the son as you probably know of a north Indian tribal King in the clan of the suckers. And his father, had at the child's birth, consulted the soothsayers. And they had foretold. That he would either be a great monarch. Or else he would be. A brother. And the father didn't want his son you know to get mixed up in this religious business and did. Everything to encourage him. To follow in his father's way he surrounded him with luxury and Intel is to him. In a palace where he should never see any sight or hear any sound that would make him think about the so-called problem of life.

But the story goes that by chance. He caught glimpses of suffering, of Death, of disease, of poverty. And this so plague his mind he just had to find out. Rise such things should happen to human beings. And the story goes on to say that he finally arranged to escape from the palace. But he cut off his hair, shed all of his luxurious garments and donned rags. And became a mendicant. In other words he followed for seven years. Those teachers who said. That wisdom and peace ultimately lie only through its true mortification of the desires of the flesh. But after seven years, he found out it didn't work it hadn't brought him any peace at all. And so, after some time, during which he thought that he really had discovered the secret of the problem. He proclaimed what he called the middle way and as I said at a kind of low level. This signified simply, that on one level, the one it stream there was this. Mortification of desire and of the flesh of the other extreme there was hedonism the attempt to solve the prob. Him of life by getting as much since he was pleasure as possible. And so he took the middle way between these extremes. But that as I said is only part of the point. Because rap is the middle way. Really comes to is not moderation, it isn't compromise. But really, a profound understanding of the unity that underlies all oppositions. You know so often we think logically. That life consists fundamentally in oppositions that as it were conflict is the most fundamental reality that is we look upon life in other words as an encounter this happens in all sorts of different ways the encounter of spirit and matter, the encounter of mind and body. And also the encounter, of oneself and the world as if these things came from. Unimaginable distances apart and suddenly met each other and by reason of being as it were logically opposed to each other there is there upon conflict.

But obviously, there can't be a battle unless there's a battlefield. It's often said very difficult to arrange a battle between a tiger and the shark because they have no common field. Wherever there is a battle, preceding the conflict, prior to it underlying it is something in common. As the very fact that two people having a fight have something in common that there's something they both want to get and so fighting over what they want to get, they have in common. And because they have the same desire, they're the same kind of creature, they have that life in common. And so underlying every contest. There is a fundamental agreement. As in Alice, Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee agreed to have a battle. So, the real meaning of the

middle way, and Buddhism is often simply called the middle way, is to go down underneath conflict to discover harmony. And I would like to talk a little bit about two kinds of following of the Middle Way which have occurred in the history of Buddhist philosophy. And these might also be called dialectic. Now, the word dialectic has as it were, a sort of double sense. It's related to dialogue to a conversation. As say between a teacher and his pupil. The Socratic Method, the teacher as it were eliciting understanding from his pupils by a dialogue in which the teacher asks the right questions. That other side of the meaning of dialectic is that there are opposed positions. Thesis on the one hand, antithesis on the other and as a result of the dialectic between these two opposites we arrive. Live at a synthesis. And in both the senses of the word the middle way is a dialectic. As you know, Eastern teachers don't advertise for students. Because their basic attitude is really [that] they haven't anything to teach. That may seem surprising but it is based on the insight. That at the deepest level beneath conflict prior to conflict. Because it's prior to conflict. Life isn't a problem. This is a very obviously difficult thing to understand, but most people feel it is a problem. And therefore, constantly go around looking for someone who will tell them how to solve it. And so it is in this way that the Inquirer comes across the sage we'll say the Inquirer comes across going back now into the history of ancient India comes across such a man as the Buddha. And says to him, my problem is that I suffer, and I want to know how to stop suffering this was the whole problem with which the Buddha dealt and if we start from this raising of the question by the student we can then follow out the steps of a dialectic so that the student is brought to the middle way that is to say to the point where the conflict expressed in his suffering is reduced to the harmony that underlies it.

So the first thing that happens then is the student comes to question A comes and poses the problem. I want not to suffer. And the teacher answers with a counter proposition. And says You suffer because you desire. A lot of people think that's all the Buddha really said. That if suffering is the result of desire, all you gotta do is stop desiring and you won't suffer. Simple, yeah. But this wasn't the project all this was simply the first step in a dialogue. And so, the next step is that if the student takes that to be the answer he comes back with the question well, how am I to stop desiring? And so the next question from the teacher might well be do you really want

to. And this would make the student scratches head a little look as he realizes that [if] it's true, as the Buddha seems to say, that in order not to suffer one must cease desiring surely I want not to desire this is also desire. So to escape that trap the student must answer. Well yes and no. I want to make an end of the kind of desires that lead to suffering but I don't want to make an end of the desire to do that.

So the next step in the dialogue is the teacher says well suffering comes from desiring more than you're going to get. So don't desire more than you're going to get desiring more than you're going to get is or more than you have or can get that is anguish. And the student thinks that one over for a while. And then comes back with this question yes but supposing I fail in not desiring more than I have or can get Won't that lead to anguish too. And the teacher comes back with the proposition. Don't desire to succeed in this enterprise, more than you can succeed or will succeed. Now I wonder if you have been able to notice what's happening here? On the one hand, there is first of all we start from the student trying to control his desire, as a student and there is his desire, his hunger. And at each step in this question and answer, the Buddha as the master of the dialogue is taking the student to a higher level. At the lowest level the conflict is simply between his own inner appetites. And the state of affairs the facts of life as we call them the hard facts. But at the next step, he has made the student see that his own feeling is part of the facts. To put it in another way, if you learn not to desire more than you have or can get you are learning to accept things as they are. But among the things as they are your own feelings. And these may be as it were unacceptable or unpleasant feelings. So he turns the attention of the students' attention to the fact that all right. You've got to accept your own feelings as well so the student says Well supposing I can't accept my own feelings, he says well, don't desire to accept them any more than you can. And that goes up to another level.

And you see what happens ultimately as the conversation goes on. The student comes to regard his whole inner life his feelings he's become completely objective about them those become part of the world that was his problem. And he suddenly wakes up one morning to find himself in a very strange situation. He's thought that he stood opposed to the world he identified himself with his desires. And there outside him is a world that

negated him. Suddenly, all this is gone but a bit changed. His inside his desires his emotions is feeling and the outside world are all the same. And so well is left to the person who had the problem. He is reduced Of course for a moment to nothing but a witness. A kind of passive observer of an outside world and is only in a life and his feelings that they all go together. And at the last minute flip. Even the one who seems to watch it turns out to be all one, with what is being watched. It's another way of saying. To be aware of something you don't have to have on the one hand and never under known. The whole process can be described much more simply as a knowing.

The other form of dialectic is perhaps simpler to explain. And it's based on a form of Buddhist philosophy which originated about two hundred years B. a D.. Now in Indian logic. There are other called for propositions. The first one is yes. The second one is no. The third one is yes and no. And the fourth proposition is neither yes nor no. And these as a kind of fundamental classification of statements. That, we may say for example that the world exists. Or that it doesn't exist or that it both exists and doesn't exists or that it neither exists nor doesn't exist this sums up the whole possibilities of philosophy and other words this would be the person. Who is a realist, like say Aristotle or Sir Thomas Aquinas, who equates the ultimate reality of God with being. But this On the other hand would be a sort of Hume-ian standpoint where you would say there is no such thing as being that is an abstraction it's just a concept here is number three you would get a sort of Hegellian standpoint, of synthesis between being and nonbeing and in the fourth you would get the extreme nihilist agnostic skeptic or whatever.

Now then the point of this particular dialectic is that it is fumes that deep down every human being really clings to some such opinions, some metaphysical opinion which can actually be put under one of those categories. One might not think this. One thinks that most people are sort of an intellectual and don't think about these things and have no philosophy but scratch a human being carefully enough, and you will find out that there is some promise which he clings to further. And so what the dialectician does he waits for someone with a problem to turn up he scratches him to find out what is the opinion to which he most deeply clings. And then, because the nature of this dialectic is a philosophy for refuting any opinion

that anybody can hold the flaws of himself has nothing to say he says if you propose Yes I can show you that yes has no meaning without no. Any affirmation you make has no meaning without the denial. And by such means as this. He gets the person to become insecure. He doesn't know what to cling to. And as he looks for a new opinion to cling to to give himself a sense of psychological security, the philosopher destroys that one too, so that in the end he has absolutely nothing left to hang onto.

And this is actually, the bringing of a person to liberation and to health because it is clinging to life. That is at the root of anxiety and anxiety which in turn is at the root of all manner of discordant activities and problems. Once lets go and doesn't try to clinging to life with his mind, he is then released, and talked out of his own self-strangulation.

Problems of Preaching

Anyone who talks a great deal about religion has a hard time of it not being mistaken for a preacher. A preacher is a person who tells people, including himself what they ought to do. In order to improve themselves in the world. And there's a place for this kind of thing. For, within limits, our behavior and our circumstances can certainly be improved. But the limits are rather small. For the permanent gains of human reason and kindness of moral effort and social concern are palliatives rather than solutions to the great basic problems of being sensitive and alive. They redecorate the interior, but don't repair the fundamental structure of the house. It isn't that they're on important. Small, relative, limited gains are never an important. Often enough they represent immense effort and skill. And it would be simply ungracious and unfeeling to minimize them. Think of the energy and devotion of medical men which has increased our average life expectancy from forty five to sixty five years. Twenty years is a long time. Until it becomes the accustomed matter of course. Or until it begins to run out. Or think what this same devotion has done to get rid of physical suffering which is again the most marvelous relief. Until this relief in turn becomes the norm. And free from the struggle with physical agony of the mind becomes aware of the torturing potentiality of anxiety. Sometimes it seems that every victory over fear and pain, simply opens up new and subtler depths of suffering, as if man were by nature a self tormenting animal or as

if pleasure and pain were the inevitable terms of sense experience changeable in form but never in presence.

Perhaps it's true that part of the various zest of life. Lies in fighting endlessly against a limitless element of evil. Just as the fun of say playing cards lies in pitting one's wits interminably against the element of chance brought in by repeated shuffling of the pack. Yet perhaps this isn't a good comparison, for the physical and emotional shock of evil and suffering is hardly in the same class as mere disorder. It has a variance and a bite so intense that men often wonder if the game's worth the candle. Especially when it seems that in the end the victory will go to the side of destruction. For it's pretty cold comfort, to believe that despite the inevitable destruction of the individual, the race or life itself will go on and on if not here then on other planets in other galaxy is remotely forever. Remote is the word for to the extent that living organisms are individuals and feel as individuals this is other life. Each organism faces its death and destruction alone. And in this apparently final and solitary defeat, others are strangely helpless and far off. It's against this totally unavoidable eclipse of the individual that the games of science and ethics seem so small. And this is all the moreso, when the whole trend of moral philosophy has been to stress the value of the individual. And thus to make every man more and more conscious of his individuality. In this sense, moral concern seems to hinder as much as it helps. The Christian and Western conscience revolts at the callousness of other cultures. At the way in which Indians and Chinese have let millions of as a matter of course. But this Christian pity for others is rooted in the most intense awareness of oneself. It is the realisation that others are living selves just as I. And this realization, this valuation of the individual person ever more intensifies the sensation of being an individual and never momentum if I is the problem that to all outward knowledge the destiny of each and every individual is destruction. Indeed, sympathy, and love for the individual. Is an emotion so poignant and so apparently hopeless, that our culture is in many ways trying to withdraw from it. Accustoming ourselves to the statistics of violence so as to be able to think of Belsen and Hiroshima without going insane. And without technical powers this is a very very dangerous kind of insensitivity. But what's the alternative?

For most thoughtful people it seems to be less and less plausible that the individual is an immortal soul fundamentally impervious to destruction and the ravages of pain. And so to many it must seem that the intense consciousness of individuality is a luxury we cannot afford. And that sanity require as a swing back to the collectivist mentality, to the feeling that each man lives for the race and not the race for man. Thus one might easily assume, that all ideas about the basic unreality of the human ego so familiar to the student of Eastern philosophy are part of a general trend towards a collectivist and depersonalized view of man. Of, in the Western world at least, a reaction against the Christian valuation of the individual. Yet no one can go it all deeply into Indian or Chinese thought at its best, without realizing that it seldom idealizes points of view which are extremes of opposites reactive to each other. And this includes also points of view which are compromises between extremes. Eastern thought is generally speaking non-dualistic which in this case this would mean that it regards the individual and collective mentality is as equally beside the point. It isn't however quite correct to call this non dualist position Eastern, for this is to local and geographical. It is I think better to call it the standpoint of a certain level of spiritual inside of religion or whatever you want to call it which is in fact Universal however unusual it is east and only in the sense that it appears somewhat more frequently in the eastern spiritual traditions.

Now this is a level of religion which has little if anything to do with preaching with exultations to change oneself or the world as I've suggested it's not against such acts of exultations. It is not merely indifferent to them. It is in a difference here. But this is a sphere in which we must be awake and aware if moral and social concern are to have any point at all. It underlies ethical activity in somewhat the same way. That space underlies motion space does not of itself Force One to go left or right. But without space one can do neither. To put it in another way all concern for human improvement for growth and positive change is a matter of time. Of hopes, and ideals whose realization requires a future. But the deep level of religion of which I'm speaking is not a matter of time its concern is not with the relatively narrow limits in which man on the world may be improved or deteriorated saved or damned. It's concerned with the immeasurably larger and even limitless realm of situations which we cannot change. With the

universe as it was in the beginning is now and ever shall be the world without end.

This is at times an easy world to ignore. For we are naturally preoccupied with things which we can control with details and confined spaces upon which our vision can easily focus. But according to the Buddha this ignore and it's this ignorance is the root of our agony. Let it be said again however, that this eternal and uncontrollable sphere of things does not exclude or stand in opposition to the world of practical concerns. It underlies it, it interpenetrates it at every point. Perhaps the simplest most ordinary way of getting some Theel of it. Is to go up by oneself at night and look at the stars. At such a moment it's merely a superficial cliché to think in the face of all this immensity I do not matter. That isn't the point at all. As Basho said in one of his haiku poems, When the lightning flashes how admirable he who thinks not life is fleeting. The point is rather, that while the whole site of the heavens never fails to move us with its glory. We do not differentiate between good stars and bad styles. Nor between well and badly arranged constellations. Paraphrasing a Zen poem we might say, in the scenery of Heaven there is neither better nor worse. The shining stars are by nature some great, some small.

So also when we. Look at mountains we do not blame the valleys for being low nor praise the peaks of being high. The high peak implies the low valley and vice versa. Furthermore, the scattered constellations the outlines of mountains. The shapes of leaves and clouds always strike us as models. And are indeed the very prototypes of our notions of order and beauty. They don't copy all imitate our abstract theories of proportion and design these are just our feeble attempts to explain why they affect us. On second thought, beauty is not the right word. For what we feel in the presence of these things. It's too human, too moral, too good. What we feel is rather holiness. In its ancient sense of the all inspiring the wonderful the uncanny. From the most remote times the Heavens have given men this weird feeling. And this is doubtless why they have been thought to be the abode of God. Yet this gives a new twist to the old idea that by spiritual insight we find that heaven lies within us the point being that at a certain level every human being that lives is also holy. However good or bad, healthy or sick, interesting or dull. Every living creature is an uncanny strain. Almost other

to himself. So that he could say with the Psalmist Behold I am fearfully and wonderfully made. For looking within, we confront the same unknown, the same uncontrollable depth of reality into which we gaze outwardly when we look at the most remote regions of space. What's more, on the inner side, the deepest and most unreachable unknown of man is right inside the ego itself the very root of consciousness and will of the controller who is so impossible to control. Tennyson used to evoke the queerness of being an individual by repeating his own name. And the weirdness of I being eyes so spooked him that he passed into a kind of cosmic consciousness in which he felt the actual identity of the deepest inside of his ego was the father just outside of the stars. And at that moment, the feeling shifted from the uncanny, to a joyous and exuberance certainty that down at the very center he was not Alfred Tennyson, but that, as when the Upanishads say, tat tvam asi.

Now, unfortunately, all kinds of religious systems make this type of certainty this cosmic feeling. Into a goal which people ought to reach. In this way, it is dragged down into the domain of preaching and into the sphere of time something to be produced in the future. All kinds of cults implicitly or explicitly offer this experience as a hope. As a higher state of realisation into which you can move all grow in some tomorrow. Perhaps with the idea. That if only enough people felt this way the face of the Earth would be transformed. But this is a red herring. At this level religion has nothing to do with transformation. We are looking here at the way things are and always have been. At the secret glory of millions of people who lived and died long ago in what we should call the darkest ignorance. For at this level, religion goes beyond all human standards which is what louder meant when he said that heaven and earth are not humane. And that the Sage also is not humane. He sees that behind both the good and the bad of our social existence. There lies the immeasurable wonder of our natural existence. And I use natural here in the Chinese sense of spontaneous. The existence which comes about of itself and governed by the conscious will like the structuring of our bones. Ultimate religion is the recognition that this basic existence is infinitely more miraculous than any achievement of reason or art. The point is put very well in the words of an Arabian Gnostic mana emas known only for this single quotation. Learn whence is sorrow and joy and love and hate and waking though one would not and sleeping.

One would not and getting angry though one would not and falling in love one would not. And if thou shouldst closely investigate all these things, that I will find God in my self one and many just as the atom. Thus finding from myself a way out of the self. The same thought as expressed by the Taoist Chuang-Tzu when he says. You move but you do not know whence movement begins you rest but you do not know how you come to stay you eat but do not know how you taste. For all this is the mighty insistence of the universe. How can it be grasped or held.

Now, these are all ways of showing how the human being seems to transcend and surpass himself when he tries to find out who or what he is deep down inside. He cannot penetrate this inner world. It silences his clever intellect shuts up his thinking. For before one has done or achieved anything at all whether good or evil ones sheer existence is simply unbelievable. Myself almost scares the wits out of me. Because it's no longer little ole me. But the astonishing intelligence which I observe when I look at nerve fibers under a microscope. I haven't about heaven below stars above stars below all that is over under shell show happy who the riddle read it. Now, you cannot preach about Wonder. You cannot tell people that they ought to wonder. That they should be teased out of thought either you are all you want. Or you can say is look into yourself and you may be amazed or you may not. Beyond amazement you may realize that you are that or you may not. But if you can't see it by looking straight at it no amount of words will make it any clearer.

But there's no way of making a duty out of this kind of thing, because the whole point is lost when we try to be utilitarian about it. To make out that existence is good for us. For existence at this deepest level is not good for anything. It doesn't need to be. It's the which than which there is no whicher. This is why Aristotle said that philosophy begins with wonder. And that action ends in contemplation. Which is simply a more silent and in raptured kind of wondering. The fiasco of school philosophy as it's now widely practiced is that it permits no existential amazement I wonder it feels as a disease that descends upon us when we are not thinking clearly when words beguile us into asking questions that have no meaning, and so no answer. Well, schools have unhappily become institutions solely for teaching and explaining. And when they can't explain the school men feel

out of role, and abruptly change the subject. I don't say this to minimize the value of scholarship. The fragments which it adds to our knowledge are no less important than the relatively small improvements which science and art make to nature. All of which are also important. Because the more our knowledge and skill increase. The greater are our grounds for astonishment at what comes into being without our aid.

Well in short then, there is no need to anesthetize, to blunt the consciousness of being individuals in order to make the human situation tolerable. There's no need at all to recondition men into some kind of collective all mass consciousness so that they can cooperate with each other and with the state like bees. The problem of the poignance and intensity of individual consciousness contains its own answer. For it is as it were, a brilliant concentration of light which just because it can foresee its own dissolution, can be vividly aware of existing now. And can wonder. As other forms of life apparently do not wonder. Just how it manages to be. And from what inner roots it springs. It is just here, that the restrictive and limiting quality of individuality, explodes through its own intensity. Because, when reflecting upon its own existence it finds that it's beyond itself beyond its own understanding and control. And thus, as much outside itself as the most distant stars.

Individuality therefore ripens into an altogether new sensation of selfhood and identity which I've been calling the recognition that you are that. As good a word as any I can imagine. For that indescribably holy and eternal something or other which we feel. When night enables us to look out into the whole immensity of our universe. I keep returning to this image because it seems to me to be so common to all of us. Incidentally, it's the image with which Dante concludes each of the three sections of the *Divino Comedia*. Perhaps, because it seems to convey more than his most elaborate symbols of the glory of God. Ultimate religion, the level of religion which lies beyond all ideals and improvements. Yesterday, today and forever is also the recognition that that is this where this refers to our every day. Monday in sensations to the stream of perceptions and feelings which make up an ordinary human life.

In the usual way, this realm of experience is regarded exclusively from the dualistic standpoint of good and bad success and failure. Pleasurable and painful. But now it is seen that the configurations of this well may also be seen in just the same way as the configurations of the stars. Without ceasing to be pleasurable and painful, it is also perfect and miraculous at every moment. No effort, no human contribution is required to make it so. But if we make any attempt to feel this to be so, the feelings so constructed will not only be artificial and shallow like all cultivated religiousness. We shall also fail to see. That our everyday feelings and experiences are miraculous just as they are before we make any attempt to recognize it. Once again this is no matter of a preaching for saying what ought to be done. There is nothing to do. For this is the way things are of themselves. Either you see it or you don't, and if you don't the very not seeing is also it. Of course we have bitterly afraid that any such view of our ordinary existence will obliterate the moral and social conscience. There are indeed people who adopt this as a philosophy to justify their economic status quo. I call this the wisdom of insecurity, for others. These dangers indeed exist for ultimate religion... like radioactivity, is a very dangerous thing. But as soon as a man knows that he is really free to be just what he is. That his existence is wholly of itself, beyond good and evil. Here is a man to whom we can preach and say listen, now that you are free this is what you ought to do.

Play and Sincerity

It often strikes me that one of the most fascinating conventions in the world is the Proscenium arch. The arch over the stage which divides, so-called reality from play. And extraordinary effects can be produced upon any audience, when the players put them in doubt as to where this art actually stands. As for example, when there was a murder on the stage which is all seems to be part of the play and then suddenly one of the actors calls for is there a doctor in the house. And then of course a prepared actor in the audience steps up on stage and the audience begins to worry as there actually been a minute on the stage or is this part of the play? And it's very fascinating to notice in how many dramas recently, the convention of the proscenium arch has been played with in this way. But behind that lines, running what is the home test and countered of sanity. In almost any society. A person insane I think if he gets the two news. As to whether rods

or action or gesture are intended seriously or intended playfully. And it's often struck me. That nobody really ever tells us how to interpret those cues. Of course, very often a father or older brother or an older friend takes a child aside and says now listen you mustn't take that. Seriously he was only teasing you or you mustn't say that sort of thing people will take you seriously. But taking that advice depends on the child's part in believing the person who tells and believing that it's not a lie, believing that what is said to him in this confidential way is set in seriousness and not in play. And a kind of panic can overtake us when we begin to be in doubt as to whether people really mean what they do, and sometimes we can even come to the point of thinking that the whole of life is a play. And get a very very curious sense of unreality. A sense which is as I said, sometimes to some people deeply unhinging.

The more perceptive we become, the more we become aware of what psychologists call our own ambivalence. The more term we become Don't fall. Of the seriousness of a great many things that we feel and do. The ability of the human being to be divided, to say one thing and mean another or to stand aside from himself as it were and inspect himself. The fact that we possess this kind of feedback, is of the genesis of this whole problem, of wondering whether we are serious or whether we are playing. A lot of people think that animals have no sense of humor. But they're always serious that is because they are unable. Perhaps to stand aside from themselves and be self conscious. When an animal plays it only. Plays perhaps in the sense of taking exercise or of enjoying meaningless activity. But the division of the split of the human mind. To be able to reflect on our own actions makes it possible for us to question almost everything that we do, as to whether we really mean it or whether we're only pretending. And this is of course aggravated by the fact that civilization calls on us in so many ways to pretend. To say Pleased to meet you when you're not. To say well have a good trip when you hope the person doesn't drown. I think of that kind. But as we become deeper in our self knowledge. We can very easily come to the point. When we wonder who we really are? A lot of people talk saying I haven't found myself yet I'm trying to discover what I'm really supposed to do in life. As if somewhere deep down in the center of us there is a real me. That is to say and I gave of ideas that I really meant

feelings that are really felt. Well no one has a completely honest call however many mosques that may be overlying it.

And as in the process of self knowledge we start peeling off these masks, there come sometimes the frightful moment when we may wonder whether there is going to be anything inside at all. Whether there won't be masks behind masks. Until real can of them all off and disappear like a peeled onion into just a set of fragments.

For very many people, the sensation of being in doubt as to whether there is any reality underneath, begins to provoke an extraordinarily strong sensation of guilt. After all, there is supposed to be the see something that we really do intend is something that we do stand for with all our hot. The possibility that there is something to which we could commit ourselves. Although perhaps something a little more than that is involved in the test of true sincerity because there are a lot of people, who will commit themselves to things in which they don't believe profoundly. There is the person who will feel for example that he's not. Anything special in the way of a patriot. He doesn't really believe in the righteousness of his country's cause, but he may nevertheless quite willingly go to war. And in this sense commit himself in a very very profound way to something in which he doesn't absolutely believe life often requires that we commit ourselves. Every time one walks out of doors and away you take a risk every time you ride an automobile I'll go on a plane you commit yourself. But obviously this isn't always an act of total sincerity it isn't an expression of something in which you believe with your whole being.

And therefore when the perceptive person begins to analyze himself. And find you know that behind organs there is an ostensibly loving and kind the activity is there's a very deep self interest when he starts questioning that self interest does he really love himself. And he finds that just because he's discovered that he always act in self interest it. Makes it very difficult for him to love himself. He may indeed despise himself. And then what is he got left what is the car in which he believes. And so he begins to be guilty. And to be oppressed. This is the course basically the same oppression that afflicted those great Christians like St Paul, St. Augustine, and Martin Luther. When commanded to love God with all the heart with all the soul

and with all the mind that is to say to love with an act of total sincerity they found themselves to be unable to do so. Or when urged to repent sincerely of their sins to have what theologians call true contrition. They found that beneath them a contract feelings lay fear of consequences or shame. Damaged pride or something of that kind and not true contrition. Based on the love of God at all. And then for such a person he wonders how can he possibly be saved what is there in him that isn't false. Is there really any solid core to one's being at all. But of course it's in pursuing that line. That there arises the kind of person whom we might call a saint. Because it is just, if he can go that far, it is just at the moment when he discovers that he's not is sincere about anything at all. It's at this point that he suddenly able to becomes and see or about everything. And the reason is. That when the point arises when he discovers a sort of total hollowness of his sincerity, he's also discovered at the same time the hollowness all the unreality of our apparent ability to divide ourselves from ourselves.

In the last broadcast I made I was discussing this problem in some detail. Trying to distinguish between an actual division of the psyche, into the knower and the known. The Thinker and the thoughts, the feeler of the feelings between that on the one hand. And every marvelous feedback system on the other. Which is simply the capacity of a perfectly unified pattern of psychic activity. To contain within itself patterns which represent its own form of states. And these. Memory patterns as we call them are of course inseparable from part and parcel of the total pattern of psychic activity at any moment therefore we are not really divided within ourselves into two entities at all. But when we seem to be so, and therefore, we are unable to doubt ourselves, then the capacity for calling not only for calling in question our sincerity but actually being insincere arises for a mind which is integrated which is not divided against itself, there is really no possibility of insincerity. And it is for this reason you see when, one begins to find oneself as it were only insincere. That the what is actually being discovered is the unreality of this division in the psyche. And so at the moment when the Saint finds that he is shall we say as bad as can be thoroughly. Corrupt through and through, as the prayer in the Anglican provokes as there is no health in us no that is holiness. Then at that moment, a kind of psychic flip occurs. And the person finds himself whole, all of a piece. Because he has, as it were exploded. The reality of his ego by finding

that his observing self the self that observes him self has after all nothing in it. It's only a pretense, an as-if self. It's as if I could look at myself as if I could separate myself from myself and observe my own motives and judge in a way. But I can only really observe in jobs and way as if motives never real ones. As it was soon as any psychic content any feeling any thought. Appears to be an object of knowledge and we begin to look into it the very act of looking into it as it were born as a whole in it and it becomes hollow by the very act of doing that. This is why one can interest. Specked almost indefinitely one dissolved oneself away and away and away. And if that arises a fear that this point then comes an unconscious block. If we are afraid of this discovery that we are totally hollow we think sometimes at last I've come upon something that I really am. And this may you see it just be an unconscious block to investigating any further. Whenever we encounter the solid. Whether we encounter it in the form of what we think is physical substance or psychological substance mind substance. This really means that we've encountered something which we haven't or are not going to investigate, because whenever we investigate the solid, we find structure and form and space inside it however closely in it.

And so in the same way, the person who finds that he has to go through that block and he is not content with the solid inner self which he discovers. And says now that at last is me I have really found myself I am someone. If he doesn't stop at that point it goes on. He'll come to the kind of valley of the shadow the dread passage where he seems to have disintegrated to nothing, to be a mockery all the way through to be nothing but masks. And then it's just in that moment as I said that there is a switch a transformation and. He becomes altogether real. To put it in another way, the distinction between play and seriousness disappears, when we find say that everything about us is play at this moment it becomes the same thing as saying everything about us is sincerity. I prefer perhaps sincerity to seriousness. I think seriousness death's appears altogether from a really integrated person. I was lovely remark which G. K. Chesterton made in his book orthodoxy. That the angels can fly because they take themselves lightly. Seriousness is having us it arises whenever we think we have hit as it were the solid substance of our psyche in a life. But when we discover that there is no substance there is only form and form in a way is analogous to, or parallel to, play substance to seriousness. And when that substance disappears we

find only form isn't it interesting how we use the word form as the outward shape the pretended thing the substance of the inner reality.

So when we find there was only the shape. Shapes of nothing, shapes around nothing hollows inside everywhere. However small however minute ultimately just hollows. Then the form itself. Shall I say becomes the substance. And action. Acquires a totally genuine quality. Play in other worlds and genuineness becomes an aim. And this is of course. Probably think inner meaning, the dramatic conflict of Hindu mythology, where the whole world is looked upon as the self-masking of God. The one God, playing the parts being the one acting in everyday life whether human or animal vegetable or mineral or whatever it may be the whole world seen as the leader playing of the Godhead. But of course when many Westerners hear that they think. Do use eyes and stuns phrase he doubted that God plays dice with the universe. Because you see, the something in the attitude of play that taken so far repels us a little. Does this then mean that the Godhead Brahma doesn't really mean it is he just playing with us is all this life a mockery. That you see, play in the sense seems to have the atmosphere of mockery. Are something deceitful. When it isn't one hundred percent play. It seems this way to a divided being who thinks that he can sometimes play and sometimes be serious. He doesn't realize that. There is a kind of play which is identical with total sincerity, where as it were, the proscenium arch of the psyche has altogether dissolved. We find this division. In really two kinds of people: the crazy man, and the profoundly innocent or wise man.

There's a story about the old Zen Buddhist monk and poet Riokan who really was the most astonishing innocent. He was playing hide and seek with some children one day. And he had to go and hide and he was waiting for the children to call it the children forgot all about it they ran off to their homes for dinner and real con because he really believed they would call him he stayed all night hiding behind a bush until someone discovered him in the morning. Of course, we can be wise and well and say well that's not very practical. Indeed no. But this is a wonderfully riveting story about an innocent man. Who was playing, you see. Playing a game with children and yet at the same time totally sincere. His playing, his sincerity being one in the same.

Parallel Thinking

One of the most surprising thing with that has happened to me in my study of Eastern philosophy over the years is to find that as I thought I was studying something that at first seemed wholly foreign to the western world. At the same time, I discovered all kinds of relatively new forms of thought and exploration of man's consciousness arising indigenously within the Western world which in various ways paralleled the approaches of Eastern philosophy to the problems of human life. Maybe this is related to the curious problem of what is called simultaneous discovery in science, about which some years ago the British by a physicist L.L. White, wrote an article in Harper's magazine. Showing how for example apparently quite independent investigators in various parts of the world engaged in scientific research hit upon discoveries at the same time. And of course in the scientific world this is usually explained. By reference to what is called the State of the field in other words if in a given field of science say a certain department of physics knowledge has advanced to a certain state a certain level and all the workers in this field off a million with this knowledge through the journals and other sources of information then because they possess information in common they are liable to hit upon the next step in several places at once and so you get simultaneous discovery of new things. However in some ways, the same thing has happened between east and west that is to say that at the same time that the West became aware of Oriental culture. It of itself, apparently developed forms of thought and forms of insight very closely paralleling things that had existed long before in the Asian world and the interesting thing is that these were in many cases developed by people who had no direct knowledge or contact with literature. About Asia and in this way there seems to be a dissimilarity between. What has happened in this case and what happens in the sciences. The apparently anti-metaphysical and even anti religious trends. Of what is called scientific comparison and sometimes logical positivism. Especially as this movement is represented in the early work of Ludwig Wittgenstein. The work say that he did about 1914. Contains some quite extraordinary parallels to developments that occurred. In Indian philosophy and logic between shall we say two hundred and seven hundred A.D..

And, again in an offshoot of these developments. In the field of linguistics and I'm thinking particularly of the semantic philosophy of Korzybski, and the metal linguistic thought of Benjamin Lee Whorf. There are even more striking parallels to some of the later developments of Buddhist philosophy. In other words the insistence on the distinction between, the actual physical world. And the forms of words, that is to say, of linguistic symbolism grammar, and logic one must recognize that these two things are in a way distinct and that you mustn't confuse the order of words with the order of reality you must keep clear the distinction as courtships key is to say between the map and the territory Well that's one development in the West striking a parallel to ideas that have been strongly influential in the east the parallel. Ways of thinking that exist. Between a Chinese Darwinist and Neo Confucian philosophy. And, the growth of ideas in modern biology. Joseph Needham has pointed this out of course and it is remarkable. History of Science and civilization in China. And incidentally he is himself a biologist before he devoted himself to the study of the history of Chinese science before even he was thirty years old he had made some remarkable discoveries in biology and he has pointed out. That the Darwinistic theory of nature and of man, is non-mechanistic, non-theistic but rather organismic, in the same way as the biological theories of people like Court Gilstein, Ludwig Von Bertalanfy. And Woodrow. In England. And also, the man I mentioned a little while ago biophysicist LL White.. And none of these people that I mentioned Goldstein but a man feared cetera and Needham before he began to study Chinese signs none of these people had had any direct contact. With the world of Oriental thought. But I think I should probably also included in this list of people advocating an organismic theory of the world and Whitehead.

So this is a very remarkable and apparently spontaneous occurrence within the West and well of types of thinking which are parallel to things which we find in Asia. The ones which I've mentioned are relatively well-known. There are those which are less well-known. And there is a kind of tradition. Existing in the West today. It's not very popular tradition. Because in the nature of these things they're not easily popularized because they're not easily expressed. In the times and in the languages of our mass media. But there is a kind of work which I have come across in the last few years which almost more than the work of the biologists that I've mentioned

resembles a Western version of Chinese Taoism. Now, before I say anything about it I want to. Stress in what way this kind of thing resembles Chinese Taoism. I've often drawn attention to a curious distinction between Chinese and typically Western attitudes to human nature. We're reared in the West with a rather fundamental mistrust of our own nature. To use a platonic analogy we think of man as. A sort of right on a horse to natured person who has a rational soul in an animal body. And the animal body is regarded as something vital but stupid. In charge of the rational soul, who's already been seem to be completely independent of those of the animal body. And so the whole problem in the task of human life is to subjugate the animal body to the rational will. And I, again have often drawn attention to the way in which this theory of man has persisted into the whole climate of opinion of modern science. Even though paradoxically enough, the basic philosophy of modern science, especially the behavioral sciences is naturalistic. That is to say it does not admit of there being two quite separate worlds the natural and the supernatural. But one world, at least ideal describable in one language. Simply the world of nature. Although that has been admitted theoretically in practice. The naturalistic scientist is tends to be a person who doesn't trust the natural order at all. But a person who still carries over in a sort of unconscious and habitual way, the old Judeo-Christian mistrust of man's animal nature as a province of the world, preempted, at any rate temporarily, by the devil.

Now therefore, it is somewhat alien to the west, and to Western traditions of thought, to see any sanity. In putting trust in the wisdom of one's own animal nature. Now of course, there were tendencies in this direction that arose in the eighteenth century and strengthened in the nineteenth century mark recall philosophy of nature and later the romantic movement in literature. But these I say, were associated with the work of Rousseau for example with his philosophy of the noble savage the idea that man was by nature free and as a result of the superimpositions of artificial social structures has been found everywhere in chains. And the sudden elements in this romantic philosophy of nature that nowadays we are apt to regard a sentimental. But nevertheless, we are I think beginning to come to a point of view whereby we must recognize. That although human nature is not something which if as it were were not interfered with would be entirely good which is that I think roughly the romantic point of view. But rather to

say something like this .The human nature as we find it is a and into play a balance of good and evil, of positive and negative. And that sanity consists in respecting this balance. See this is not a sentimental point of view. It does not ignore the fact, for example, that we live by destroying other organisms that there is inevitable conflict. In life, in its natural state but that this conflict. Is something which subset a higher kind of harmony and therefore has to be trusted or rather has to be supported accepted and contained. And that sanity consists fundamentally in this.

Now then, on the basis of this sort of attitude to human nature, there has been developed. A kind of movement in the West you would hardly call it a movement in any organized sense which seems to have originated in Germany. Some years ago in Germany there was a woman called Else Gindler. And she happened to have a serious case of tuberculosis. Her doctors told her that at that time many years ago. She died at the age of seventy about two or three years ago. That she was a hopeless case there was nothing further they could do for them that she may as well get ready for the end. She therefore took herself. I think the Black Forest. And. Found herself quite little hot where she could live in the forest alone. And she said. If this disease came by itself it can go by itself and she decided to make an experiment, that she would become as vividly aware [as] she could of all the subtle motions that were going on inside her body all the subtle little feelings that she had and she would respond to them.

And so in the quiet of the forest she became silent. And very very responsive to everything that was going on within her in the kind of inner life of her organism. And by doing this after about a year passed, she found herself recovered from the disease. And this so fascinated her that she explored the promptings of her own nature and explored ways of teaching it to other people. And eventually developed a kind of system of instructing others in this art. But nobody was ever able to think up a kind of label, or name for what this is of course. The Chinese would say this is the art of Taoism this is the art that is called in Chinese wu-wei, or non-interference. With the Dow that is to say with the costs of nature. But you see in describing the way that I was again I went about this it you can see at once that noninterference is a highly. A difficult thing requiring a great deal of intelligence you have to be patient you have to be intelligent you have to be

sensitive in order to respond to these subtle promptings of the organism itself. A number of people who were students of Elsa Gidler's came to the United States. And have, in various differing ways in accordance with their own particular personalities and approaches and style shall we say have talked of this kind of method I think particularly for example of Charlotte Silva who works in New York. Who also was a student of Elsa Gidlow. I've been looking at an article she wrote some time ago in the Bulletin. Of the generous amount expedient. In which she describes this kind of work is so fascinating because. The work of this kind. Escapes all classification which is in itself a mark of some kind of distinction so everything in this well has to be classified. People want to label you they want to say oh you're a Catholic or you're a Republican or you're a Buddhist or you're a beatnik or you're a Zen is or you're a psychoanalyst on whatever it may be because they feel that when they can put a label on you they sort of dismissed you they know where you are and what pigeonhole you're in and you can cause them into trouble. And therefore one can be deeply and creatively troubled by some kind of work. Well you can't quite call it philosophy which is impossible to pin down.

I've been familiar with Charlotte Silvers particular interpretation of else again as idea for some years. And in being asked often to explain it I've been completely dumbfounded to do so in just a short phrase. It isn't physical education, it isn't rhythmic studies, it isn't dance it isn't relaxation. It isn't body culture, or anything of that kind. It's a fascinating experiment in. Simply becoming ever more aware of one's physical organism. And learning to trust it. And learning to become in accord consciously. With what. It wants to do. And that wish all that want is ordinarily unconscious. And therefore, it's something that's very difficult to explain without actually participating in it, without doing it. But still, it's always been one of my particular attempts or efforts to describe the indescribable anybody who works with words poet author and so on is really trying to describe the indescribable this is the whole lot of speech and literature. That's I might introduce this by. A story which shall. Itself I want to tell me about herself and her study with else again. One of the things that Elsa Gindler I tried sometimes to get her students to do. Was to make a drawing of the way in which one feels one's own body. And when Charlotte first went to study with her. She was full of all kinds of funny ideas and when she was asked to

draw how she feels she made a grand drawing of everything about herself that she knew intellectually you see that she had all her bones and muscles and everything was put there in the right position with several people in the classroom and all the drawings were put up along the wall. Charlotte was stunned to see that none of the other drawings looked in the least bit like her own they were all kinds of funny lines and blushes and blobs and indeed one of them was simply a blank piece of paper with a small black spot on it. And she said that else again walked along the drawings making various comments about them and when she came to the one with a black spot she said Oh I see you still have that tension in your left hip. And Charlotte was expecting you see that at the time that I arrived at her she would compliment out on what a really sensitive drawing she had done of our own body. But when she finally approached that drawing, she said nothing passed right on. And that was a great moments that was one of those moments of truth in life moments of conversion when one finds out the difference. Between what you think you feel and how you really feel.

One of the things most strongly emphasized in this work. Is that we're all. Brought up. To try and conform ourselves to fix the patterns of what a human being or to be this happens in very many different ways but one of the ways in which it happens is how we ought to move and hold ourselves physically. We talk about postures, what is the right way to sit the right way to stand. How the right way to use one's hands and so on and so forth and of course it doesn't strike us that all these things are very stylized. And if they don't correspond in any way with what our physical organism actually wants to do. The adoption of these stylized postures is going to cause conflict. Between what we try to be and what we are. And since what we try to be has really no special virtue about. A lot of the postures that we adopt have no particular sense to them at all the sort of social rituals. I want to quote from Charlotte Silver's article in the general semantics bulletin, little story. She says, the other day I visited some friends among the guests there was a couple with their daughter a little girl of eight a thoughtful a very graceful child. While we were talking a little girl played in the garden I had the pleasure of watching how through the window. Then she came up stairs and sat down one leg hanging down the other one on the couch. Mother said. But how did how do you sit take your leg off the couch a gal never should sit like that. Little girl took her leg down on which occasion

housecoat flew high about honeys. The mother. Helen points got down one can see everything. The child blushed and looked down on a self-imposed house cut down but I asked why what is wrong. The mother looked attack quite shocked and said one doesn't do that. By this time the atmosphere in the room was completely uncomfortable the little girl not only had her legs down but have them pressed against each other a shoulders a gone up and she held her arms tight against out of the body. This went on, until she couldn't stand it any longer she suddenly stretched as Elf and yawned heartily. Again, a storm of indignation from her mother by now this all lasted about ten minutes the child had changed completely a gracefulness had turned into awkwardness all her motions were still, her little body was tense, she hardly seemed to be alive anymore. What will happen to this child? She will hold her on a happy pose for a few minutes before she shakes it off the next time my mother will admonished. She will hold it a few minutes longer and so on each time a little longer until at last she will have repressed her naturalness so deeply that she will have forgotten it. The mother will then have reached her go she will have educated had to be socially acceptable as a human being the child will be greatly inhibited, because as the mother will change in this direction she will change in a thousand other directions. End of quote.

And so you see, it isn't simply in. The social conditioning of the child is not simply a matter of. Training children in the fundamental conventions of moral behavior which perhaps are artificial but certainly necessary for some solace. Social cohesion and agreement about the training of children and all kinds of weird symbolic attitudes which I held to be proper and nice and ritualistically decent. Which produces in all of us, a state of chronic psycho-physical strain and discomfort which after a while becomes unconscious we fail to notice it but our it underlies our Also those are not irritations and frustrations which eventually build up into vast and appalling political idiocies. It's very difficult to get people to recover from this, because you see, in trying to come back to themselves, to come back to a unity and harmony with their own organisms they still have the cast of mind the tendency to look to authority of some kind to tell them what they ought to be. And Charlotte Silva has often told me that people who come to work with her. Expect to be told what kind of physical posture, what kind of physical feelings they ought to have. She says they want to know how to

move, how to stand, how to sit. In order to be exercised they're quite astonished at first when they're invited to become more restful to give up the doing so that they can listen better to what their body has to tell them. We need quiet for self experience quiet and awareness we need permissiveness to do all the subtle changes which may be needed. But we ask. We ask that. What can one feel of one's own organism want of happenings within not what one knows of one's body or what one thinks about it all believe somebody else expects one to feel off it but what one actually a sense is no matter what comes to the fall.

But this is difficult of course because. We expect that we are supposed to conform to a pattern. And that there is somebody who knows. What we ideally ought to be, ought to feel. And this despite, this is the curious thing this is the paradox this despite all the emphasis in the western world. On the value of individuality the value of personal uniquenesses and the differences between man and man. Isn't it strange that to fulfill this great ideal, this Democratic, personalistic ideal of the Western world. It seems to be very necessary for us to learn from the east. And from things like the East, to learn from the very great differences which exist between one individual physical organism and another. To trust what Charlotte Silver and Elsa Gidler used to call one's own inner. This is I suppose the most difficult thing. To explain in words because when we just think about it theoretically. All kinds of objections come up to it. And we think that there can only be sanity and only order in society by holding a club over ourselves as if we were naturally organically and physically, little monsters. Really, there is no monstrosity in nature, like the monstrosity of man. We talk about the violent life of the ocean's depth of the way the fishes eat each other and live in perpetual conflict. At least the fishes stay in the ocean and don't come up and attack the birds and the mammals and the people on the dry land. But nobody is safe from an. Radioactive fish in the Pacific. Birds, bewildered by turmoil in the skies. Insects ravaged. And upset in the balances. This is not a condemnation of human intelligence but an appeal to human intelligence. To be both intelligent and sensitive. To be temporarily at least, silent. Before the subtle movements of nature, to study them better. To work with the grain of the world instead of against it.

Man is a Hoax

Now, I'm particularly interested in what Dr. Weaver said about the attitude of the family to children. Because we have an absolutely extraordinary attitude, in our culture and in various other cultures high civilisations to the new member of human society. Instead of saying frankly to children how do you do? Welcome to the human race, we are playing a game and we are playing by the following rules. We want you to...we want to tell you what the rules are so that you will know your way around and when you've understood what rules we're playing by when you get older you may be able to invent better ones. But instead of that, we still retain an attitude to the child that he is on probation, he's not really a human being. He's a candidate for humanity. And therefore to preserve the role of parent or to preserve the role of teacher you have to do what they do in the Arthur Murray School of dancing, which is that they string you out they don't tell you all the story about dancing, because if they tell you you'll learn in a few weeks and go away. And you know it but instead they want to keep you on. And in just this way we have a whole system of preparation of the child for life which always is preparation and never actually gets there in other words we have a system of schooling which starts with grades. And we get this look creature into the thing with a kind of come on kitty, and we get it everyone is preparing for something that's going to happen so you go into the nursery school as preparation for kindergarten you go to kindergartners preparation for first grade and then you see you go up the grades to look at the high school and then comes a time when maybe if we can get you fascinated enough with the system you go to college. And then when you're going to college if you're smart you get into graduate school and stay a perpetual student and go back to be a professor and just go round and round in the system but in the ordinary way they don't encourage quite that they want you after graduate school or after graduation commencement as it's called beginning to get out into the world with a capital W.. And so you know, you've been trained for this and now you've arrived but when you get out into the world at your first sales meeting they've got the same thing going again because they want you to make that quota and if you do make it they give you a higher quota. And come along about forty five years of age maybe your vice president.

And you suddenly it dawns on you that you've arrived. With a sudden sense of having been cheated because it isn't that just the same as the fit life feels

the same as it always felt and you are conditioned to be in desperate need of a future. So the final goal that this culture prepares for us is call retirement. When you will be a senior citizen and you will have the wealth and the leisure to do what you've always wanted but you will at the same time have impotence. Rotten prostate and false teeth and no energy. So all the whole thing, from beginning to end, is a hoax. And furthermore some other aspects of a hoax just for kicks. You are involved, by and large, in a very strange business system, which divides your day into work and play. Work is something that everybody does. And you get paid to do it because nobody could care less about doing it in other words it is so abominable and boring that you can get paid for doing it. And the object of doing this is to make money and the object of making money is to go home and enjoy the money that you've made. With it when you've got it you see you can buy pleasure. And that this is a complete solace in money never to buy pleasure because all pleasures depend upon not putting down a symbol of power money but upon disciplines. In other words, now in Sausalito where I live, we have pier after pier of fine boats. Motor cruisers, sailing boats all sorts of things which nobody ever uses. Because they've been brought on the falling for the ad line that if you buy this thing you will have pleasure you have status you will have something or other but then they suddenly discover that having a boat requires the art of seamanship which is difficult but rewarding therefore nobody has time for it and all they do with the boats is have cocktail parties on the weekend. And in myriads of ways you see you go home you we're the wealthiest people in the world and you would think that having your money and go home you would have an orgy and a great banquet and so on but nobody does they eat a T.V. dinner which is just a warmed over airline food and then they spend the evening looking at an electronic reproduction of life which is divided from you by a glass screen. You can't touch it, you can't smell it then you look at this thing and you don't you have a strange feeling to see that the whole procession of grades that was leading to something in the future to that goody that God just as good it was lying at the end of the line. And it never quite turns up.

And this is because from the beginning, we condition our children to a defective sense of identity. And this I think is the most important feature in the whole thing that. A child grows into our culture and as I repeat this is not only Western culture it's equally true in Japan. But as an area which I

can speak with some firsthand knowledge. We condition the child in a way that sets the child a life problem which is insoluble. And therefore attended by constant frustration and as a result of this problem being insoluble, it is perpetually perspire on to the future. So that one lives one is educated to live in the future and one is not ever educated to live today. Now I'm not saying that you know the philosophy of carpe diem, let us drink today for tomorrow we die and not make any plans. What I am saying is that making plans for the future is of use only to people who are capable of living completely in the present. Because when you make plans for the future and they mature. You are if you can't live in the present you are not able to enjoy the future for which you have planned because you will have a new kind of syndrome a well by happiness consists in promises. And not in direct and immediate realisations so long as you feel that tomorrow it will come to see on a dollar bill, it always has promise to pay. It's a promissory note. And nobody ever can come across. Because the promise is tomorrow and does is the if we said common speech tomorrow never comes. But everything is based on the idea you see that you will get it tomorrow and you can enjoy yourself today so long as tomorrow looks bright. But Confucius once said, A man who understands the Tao in the morning can die contentedly in the evening. That is to say, if you have ever lived one complete moment. You can be ready to die you can say well. That was it that was the good that I've had it. But if you never live that complete moment, death is always the guy who like comes into a bar at two o'clock in the morning and says Time, Gentlemen please. And you say oh oh please one more drink not yet. Because you haven't really have the feeling that you ever had it that you ever got there.

Now then, the main the main factor in this kind of conditioning seems to me. To be as I said the way in which we give children a sense of identity. And in this respect we do something extraordinary odd. We define a person. Consider this for a moment this word person. Harry Emerson Fosdick once wrote a book called How to be a Real Person. And this in translation means how to be a genuine fake. Because the word person means a mask. The Persona, the mask worn by actors in Graeco-Roman drama which was a megaphone mouth mask so that through it Sunnah the sound goes. And so at the beginning of a place script you will see the dramatic personae the persons of the drama that is to say the list of the masks that the actors are

going to wear. But the word has so for them from its original use that to be a person has come to mean your real identity your true sincere honest self the person and we say of someone then he's a real person that means he's genuine. But we have confused, you see, the individual organism with the person with that is to say it's a role and we have defined the role of the person in such a way. That it condemns everybody so defiant to perpetual frustration. Now how is this so? When you are a child, you, your parents, your peers, your teachers, your uncles and aunts, are very anxious to define you. And what they are going to tell you is that you are a free agent. You are responsible that is to say you are an independent First Cause you are an origin of actions and thoughts and feelings and we can praise you or blame you for what you do. And above all we require of you that you love us. You love your parents you love your brothers and sisters as Fred said a child is not allowed to say to let that baby sister go back where it came from because that is not nice all nice children love their brothers and sisters and their parents not of course because we tell you to do so because you would want to do it yourself. You see now what's going on. You are required and commanded to do certain things which will be appreciated only if you do them voluntarily.

Now you see, when your identity is defined by society you cannot resist it. You don't have the knowledge you don't have the wisdom you don't have the resources to understand that something's being put over on you. You cannot but help believe the definition of you as a free agent. But you believe yourself to be a free agent as a result of not being free that is to say of being hopelessly unable to resist society's identification of you. So in the whole sense of our personality there is a contradiction and that is why the sense of ego of being oneself is simultaneously a sense of frustration. The feeling of 'I'-ness, so far as most people are concerned is a feeling of tension between the eyes and behind them. Trigon burrow a remarkable man did some studies about. Two kinds of awareness which we call die-tension and Co-tension in die-tentive is the normal kind of awareness that we have of being a skin encapsulated ego of being separate from the environment and of confronting an external objective world of which we are the independent observer. And this myth he said goes hand in hand with the physical state which is a state of tension between the eyes then he defined tension as another form of awareness which you might call a certain

kind of openness in which you realize. That the external world is just as much you as anything inside your skin. And that you are not something that comes into this world on probation and doesn't really belong this is you see the attitude that we foster in the child that you are something not that comes into the world but comes out of it in the same way as a flower comes out of a plant or a fruit comes out of a tree that you are an expression you as a human being are a symptom of nature. And that you really belong there and that other laws your actual self what is finally and fundamentally you is not. A separate and lonely pops of the world. But the real you is the world itself everything that is expressing itself as this particular organism here and now and of course as you look across the room as all these other organisms in the here and now we are all tits on the same solve by may put it so crudely or if you want to do it it was poetically, rays from the same sun.

Now, now, children very often lost their parents you see as a result of having been given this funny sense of identity. Mommy who would I have been if my father had been someone else? This is a very common child question, because the child gets the message from the parents using the English language, the French language, the German language or whatever, that I am somewhat in my body you gave me my body. But who am I to whom this was given. You can say to her go. Darling you're absolutely gorgeous you're so beautiful and she says How like a man all you think about is bodies I may be beautiful but that's my parents gave me my body but I want to be admired for myself and not for my sassy. And this poor girl is a chauffeur. She's alienated from her body. And she doesn't take any credit, doesn't assume any responsibility for being what she is physically and this is of course as much true of men as of women it is a common cultural attitude we say I have a body we don't say I am a body. We feel very sharp distinction in other words, between our consciousness, which is a kind of focused attention, together with all those actions that we are able to perform voluntarily. On the one hand and on the other hand everything both within us and outside us that seems merely to happen to us.

Consider for a moment breathing. Do you breath, or are you breathed? You can feel it either way. If you become conscious of breathing you get the sense that you're doing it in the same way as thinking or walking but if you forget about it it goes on and you don't have to do it at all that is why

breathing exercises are fundamental in all meditation practices in the Orient because you can understand through breathing and through the experience of breathing that there really is no differentiation between the involuntary experience on the voluntary experience. But when you make set up game rules whereby you identify all that you. Do voluntarily with you and all that happens in voluntarily with the other with what happens to you and then you put a gulf between these things not realizing and this is the secret that is never given away that self and other are inseparable. Just in the same way, that the front in the back of a coin are different but identical is all one can so in exactly the same way the experience of self and the experience of other mutually necessary you wouldn't know what you meant by self unless you knew other you wouldn't know of and this you knew what you meant by self they are therefore polarities like north and south pole of the magnet they're inseparable. But that secret doesn't get out because civilized language and thought. Ignores the fact. That all classes all logical classes and words are after all labels on classes, are so constructed that they are intellectual boxes and every box which has an inside also must have an outside. And we think that insides exist apart from outside and outside the pot from insides we don't realize that although they are opposed they go together. And you see that is the secret of the whole thing that is what the child is not let on to. And so instead the child is defined. As a stranger in the earth. And not as a symptom of it. And as a result of that we have the vast terrifying social problem of alienation of feeling that the world outside human skins is unfeeling, fully-automatic stupidity. Which we have to fight. And dominate, otherwise it will swallow us up and condemn us to the imaginary terrors of everlasting nothingness.

Now I feel in a way with it when we say I wasn't responsible for being born. You know, in one of the great problems of psychotherapy today, is passing the buck. By a kind of superficial Friday and attitude you as a juvenile delinquent are not responsible for what you do because it was your parents who followed you up and so they write articles in the press that instead of prosecuting the children we ought to prosecute the parents so they hold the parents some of the parents I know with mixed up with that was the fault of our parents. And it all goes back to a gag I called Adam and he blamed it on Eve, and she blamed it on the serpent. And God said about the serpent. And I'm not responsible for the serpent. He did it on his own,

because the because the serpent is the Left Hand of God. And what we call God Jehovah Jesus Christ etc That's the right hand but Jesus Christ sits on the right hand of the father nobody ever says it was it's on the left. Because Let not your left hand know what your right hand do it. See my temper got the better of me I didn't really mean it. My lust got the better of me. I am really not responsible for them they were given to me. You see now all this idea that. You see. We were laboring under a definition of the self. Which you think extremely is limited. So that we are for example, of knowledge, thinking and walking and we doing things with our hands and speaking. But we don't acknowledge that we are growing our head and beating our hearts. That is defined as happening to us but it is defined as something that happens to us and when you feel that most of my father's responsibility he had a dirty gleam in his eyes and went after my mother and so on, and he did it. Yes All right.

[audience] There is this point about responsibility, and one way of looking at it is we aren't responsible for what happens in our past. We are responsible for what happens now.

[Alan] Now but you see I feel this is a this is a hoax. You see look let's suppose now that. We will follow the theory of those astronomers who maintain that the universe is not a steady state thing but there was an enormous bang. Billions of years ago and from this bang all the galaxies were thrown out into space. Now, then you look back at this as something. Which happened in the past and which is as it were the cause of the present. But what I would say is that bang is still going on. When you take a lovely bottle of black ink and throw it as hard as you can at the white wall and smash it. Only goes like this you know and in the center it's dense but on the out fringes it has all kinds of interesting color cues and that's all you see one splash. Now in the same way we are at the moment sitting in this room and talking and thinking we are all the little curly cues out on the end of the original cosmic bang. We are it. We are not effects of it because. To think that you are separate from the Big Bang is simply a matter of definition it's a way of talking we separate events from each other in order to measure them that is to say the notion that there are distinct things and distinct events in the physical world is a calculus. It is like pretending that a curve is a series of points. And so in the same way, supposing you have a wiggle.

Now you've got a wiggly line you see and the whole world is wiggly lines clouds mountains people Rivers everything is wiggly lines now how much of a weekly line is a wiggle. You see what is one wiggle and you can see that this is a very arbitrary matter.

So we see the obvious wiggles in the world and we define them as people. Each of you is a wiggle and this wiggle is you! [audience question] That's simply a repetition of the original explosion. Right of class war and of course. This is an expression, entire earth and yes exactly this is the repetition of the original explosion. [audience] It starts before us. Because the definition of yourself as beginning only when shall we put it where did you begin when a partition at conception or when you heard the evil gleam in your father's eyes when did you begin let's go back you began on the first dawn of creation whenever that was that because you did it. See everybody is pretending they didn't. And you can kind of play a game this is what gurus do is an masters and so on they give you a funny look and you say oh I have a problem please teacher I'm this little me and I caught in this thing called life I got mixed up with all these tubes and. And it's uncomfortable and I don't know what to do about it because it's all going to fall apart. And so the teacher says where this freedom on a machine or whether it's a zen teacher who is mixed up in this thing who are you who lost this question. Show me find yourself. You say well I just does me and he says oh come on. You just don't. See it so eventually the person feels very bogged. Because the teacher is calling his bluff. And you are not the Lord God in the Jehovah sense of Christianity who is the cosmic technocrat who knows all the answers to everything but you are the law of God in the Hindu sense was different because the Hindu god doesn't know how he does everything in the sense that he doesn't translate it into words he can't explain it because there's no point in explaining it. You open and close your hand without knowing how you do it and yet you surely do it but you can't put it into words how it happens unless you're a physiologist and then even so it doesn't help you much to open and close your eyes. Better than anybody else. So you do know how to do it but you can't explain it because the thing words are very clumsy way of talking about something which from the standpoint of words in the standpoint of logic is a very very complicated process. So, if you asked Shiva how he dances the cosmos he would say I just do it like you say what I just open and close my eyes and...

So then, you go to says to you isn't Shiva Don't kid me you know that you are not Shiva. But they are just as a thing called Mary Smith or John Doe etc. And everybody says oh you can't admit that because you see if I did it that I would have to be considered responsible and I would be considered crazy and I would feel that I really was one with this whole scheme of things. And that's you see the secret that we don't let the children know. In all well not in all but in many cultures initiation into manhood consists precisely in finding that out. They finally get around to saying to you after all you know we've been pretending all this time that you would just this little boy little girl. But now we're going to let you in on the real story. But not in this culture. That's the problem. In this culture, we do have an initiation into adult life called psychoanalysis and that everybody is ruined by education and then it can't be helped, because they have to know all the conventions and just like you to preserve beef you make it salt and when you're going to cook it you have to suck the salt out of it. So in the same way, to make a child tolerable companion you have to. It's going to. Bill you have to be salted with education then when that mixes up all your natural instincts you have to be psychoanalyzed in order to be straightened out. And root cured of your education cured of your upbringing but the difficulty is you see that the assumptions of psychoanalysis. And of a good deal of psychotherapy in various types and schools do not include the insight that you are basically the works. They have in other words, that simply because historically speaking psychotherapy originated in the nineteenth century. And therefore still carries on the nineteenth century assumptions about the nature of the universe. And all those nineteenth century assumptions about the universe were a put down. They included the myth you see, that the universe is actually blind energy it is essentially stupid. And man's intelligence and man's values and man's consciousness are a fluke in the world.

And so, this myth is that the world. Man, in other words, is not a symptom of the world like an apple tree is a symptom an apple is a symptom of an apple tree that man is a fluke. Kind of a joke of chance. And that to be realistic and hardheaded. Factual In other words a strong man you must realize that you are caught in this trap and face the fact.

So then this...for the West at any rate. This nineteenth century philosophy of man's place in the world and his identity. Has become the most plausible common sense. In other words, people say they are Christians they say they are Jews they say they are the author of his to be done to put is at cetera et cetera but they are not. Because they know in their heart of hearts, whatever they choose to believe that the world. Is as described in the nineteenth century myth because that's become our common sense if people were Christians they'd be screaming in the streets and not screaming streets. Be taking full page ads they'd be sponsoring T.V. programs about the tremendous sense of this Christian that and then not doing anything they find a few Jehovah's witnesses are doing it but they are even they are fairly polite when they come to your front door they show no urgency really. So they don't believe it because the plausible myth of our age is the myth of the fully automatic model of the universe in which man is a fluke and which he doesn't really belong he has a chance operation and when you're dead you're dead and that's all that is to it. That's so plausible, that really almost everyone believes in it without realizing that it is made out of whole cloth that's and nothing but a myth the way of looking at things a way of striking an attitude. But this is the powerful, powerful idea that governs our children, and that gives us our sense of basic identity alienation so that. We live always in expectation of a future, which of course never happens. Well, that's enough from me for the moment.

Humor in Religion

A listener writing to me has made the comment that he felt it in bad taste to make a joke about God as I did in a former talk. And since the God I made the joke about was the God who inhabits a Christian church. Whose house it is, he said he felt that I wouldn't have made the same kind of joke about a Buddhist shrine. I suppose the listener assumed I was a Buddhist. I'm interested in Buddhism and I like it very much, but I'm not a Buddhist I don't give myself a label. But it's always struck me that a person who doesn't know how to make a joke about God. Or about his own religion. Is somehow strange to his own religion. I like a Buddhist story very much it's about. A kind of Buddhism. In Japan called Shin Buddhism, and the peculiarly. You might say wonderful, examples of this particular way of life are called miokonen, which means marvelous fine people.

The story goes that one of these Miokonen was traveling one night and then a place he found the lodging was a temple. And he went inside, and it was a rather bare, drafty place until he got up around the altar and there he found the various cushions on which the priests sit and he made himself a comfortable bed out of them and slept right in front of the altar. And in the morning the temple priest came in and saw this raggedy looking beggar sleeping in the holy sanctuary and he said Ma, what if from tree one river it's what sacrilege you common but I'm coming in here and sleeping in front of the altar. And the Miokonen looked up and said wow he said. You must be a stranger here, you can't be one of the family. And I remember another story this time it's a Catholic story. There was a church in Italy. And an Italian mama had taken her kids and she wanted to pray and washee was praying the kids were tearing up and down the aisles having a wonderful time and the reason New England spinster visiting and seeing the sights of the guide book in our hand, and she saw all these children making an irreverent know is and she touched the Italian mother on the shoulder while she was paid said Excuse me but contra take care of those children of yours they're making very unnecessary disturbance. It's how the woman said but it's the father's house, can't they play here.

I wonder why it is that we, especially we of the Anglo-Saxon subculture, have to be so terribly gloomy about religion and deny all of human to it. I remember when I was a boy in school. It was one of those British public schools one of the very great sins that one could commit was to smile or laugh at a church service. One had to keep on the straightest of straight faces. Even though everybody knew we made all. Sorts of terrible jokes about the Reverent clergy and the things that went on Nevertheless while we were there while we were in the presence of the public the must be no loft at all for fear of the most dire punishments. I don't think it's in bad taste to be jocular about divine matters about holy things. Indeed, one of the most vigorous spokesmen of traditional Christianity G.K. Chesterton used to say that very often when he wrote the word cosmic in an article, the printer would print comic. And he said this is after all, not so unintelligent. For there is a greater connection between cosmic and comic than the mere similarity of the words. He said on another occasion, it is one thing to be astonished at a gorgon or a griffin. A creature who doesn't exist, but it is much more profound to be astonished at a hippopotamus a creature who

does exist and looks as if he doesn't. He had the sense in other words, that the good lord had the most tremendous sense of humor. Perhaps you may know that poem that he wrote, where he's describing some sort of strange wonderful fish, where he says dark the sea was but I saw him one great head with goggle eyes like a diabolic cherub flying in those fallen skies. I have seen a fool ha fashioned borrow from the heavens a tongue so to curse them, or at leisure. But I try to not as dung for I saw that Finney goblin hidden in the abyss on drugs and I knew there can be laughter on the secret face of God. Blow the trumpets crown the sages bring the age by reason fed, he that siteth in the heavens, he shall laugh the prophet said.

Of course actually the quotation that he takes from the prophet at the end is a little bit out of context. Because if I remember it correctly, and I'm only speaking from memory, he that sitting to the heavens for a laugh that he even the scorn. And that's not real humor, as Chesterton intended, the idea of real human. Because I think real humor, or the profoundest order of human is to be able to laugh at oneself. Humor is the awareness isn't it that. You yourself in would lay. Very incongruous with what you appear to be outwardly. Another remark that Chesterton made is it that is always funny to see somebody fall down. Especially a dignified person, fall down. It's always funny to see for example a man running off his hat when it's been blown away by the wind and he says this is funny because it's reminiscent of the fall of man. That the pretentious and pompous person, going along the street you know, how these people can move as if they were a procession all by themselves a sudden it comes to grief. And the humanity and fallibility and find it to do the creature suddenly intrudes. The same sort of amusement of course occurs when a dignified person breaks room in public. And that's why we see humor in such a famous limerick. As I sat next to the Duchess at tea with everyone that offered to see how rumblings abdominal was simpler phenomenal and everyone thought it was me. The contrast the incongruity between the dignified person of the Duchess and the rumblings abdominal. And so on a much performed a level. It seems to me that it's always a mark of the highest sort of wisdom that we find among human beings for a person to be aware of what I've sometimes called his own irreducible element of rascality. And therefore, he's never able as it was and they down the law to other people without something. In the way of a little twinkle in his eye. Or great deal of humor so-called, is simply

malicious, where we make fun of other people at their expense and me point out that incongruities. And this humor lacks insight, because it doesn't see that you, yourself have the same kind of contradiction.

You notice very often the can really subtle form of humor with Jewish people. I remember in particular a rabbi I think will Stein of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York whose...has a marvelously subtle sense of what you might call self-irony. And the whole of his charm as a man consists he doesn't overdo it but it's just the flavor of this slight humor about himself, his realization of his own finitude without being guiltily ashamed of it and I think this is the important thing after all. So much of the work of every psychotherapist is to get people to acknowledge. And admit the disowned aspects of themselves. After all, if you are brought up, not only to behave correctly outwardly, but to imagine that you can behave correctly inwardly. In other words, to imagine that you can be without a way would even though or even just wandering thoughts and ideas and emotions and that you must keep your own mind swept clean of these funny oddities. And then you struggle and struggle all your life long to disown, be afraid all of these purely a spontaneous and strange creatures that arise in yourself like goblins from the abyss on drugs. Then of course you are sick and you have to go to a psychiatry and his main task of course is to get you to acknowledge and accept and be responsible for these unwelcome and alien aspects of oneself. In other words, what the psychotherapists teach us more than anything is that that is it is plainly and downright absurd to be guilty, to feel guilty, because one is simply human. And has this kind of wayward spontaneity of one's inner life.

And thus, you might say it is the sign of an integrated psychically whole person that he has humor with respect to the side of himself. That he always is aware of that he never is what he's supposed to present himself as in public. And it seems to me that this is an absolutely necessary gift in anybody who holds the sort of responsible office where he has the life and death of other human beings in his hands. Whether he's a president of a great concern university or a corporation or whether he's a judge or whether he's a psychiatrist, a physician he has to have this understanding about himself and it's very nice to be able to get up at a public place and bombinate and lay down the law in a solemn way as to how everybody else

ought to behave. You always notice that people who do this really in the long run completely ineffectual and make asses of themselves. Whereas the more persuasive type of human being has along with whatever he may say a twinkle in his eyes, because he has the sense of his own limitations and he knows very well he's conscious of the fact, in other words, that his inward being and his outward row are complimentary. A coincidentia oppositorum, a coincidence of opposites rather than simply the same thing on both sides. That's what for example, makes a man like Rabelais so great he was quite a devout and proper sort of clergyman and his ordinary life and yet he wrote these fantastic tales about Gargantua and Pantarole. On the other hand, will find all sorts of people whose writings and lives were overweeningly holy and were actually rascals, and they never really acknowledged it, they were always torn between a certain guilt. And so are I would say that that human the recognition of it of a sudden incongruity in things is one of the very highest qualifications of a Wholy Man holy in the real sense of being whole.

And now of the question arises you see, if this quality of humor is a characteristic of the highest kind of human beings that we know, why not... couldn't it be a characteristic of God? Now please you understand, if I talk about God in this way, this isn't saying that I think that factually, scientifically, you all metaphysically there is such a thing as a personal god. This is a sort of aside to make the point clear. I do feel that there is perhaps an order of the world. That might in some ways correspond to rather than being equivalent to the notion of God. But in talking about God in a more personal way one is using what is to my mind a mythological way of speaking. And if you use it as such you can say in this mythological or poetic manner of talking things that are important. Myths can sometimes express philosophical ideas that more exact language can never get across mythological language is infinitely suggestive.

And therefore, if one talks about God and the devil. And uses these for the personal god and personal devil speaking in a mythological way it's often very suggestive philosophically and that's the kind of spirit in which I'm talking about. So the question arises, why couldn't wouldn't the idea of God be extraordinarily defective and extraordinarily unpoetic without the gift of humor, and not the kind of humor which is laughing at others but that of

laughing at himself, with a capital H. It's so strange that people who believe in God very often expect the children of God to behave much better than God himself. When you consider the kind of conduct that is expected of a saint in most religions. In most theistic religions it's infinitely superior conduct to that which is expected of God. God is allowed to judge and damn people in all directions if they displease his divine will, and the saint is always characterized as an infinitely forgiving person. The saint may have humor. But very rarely does it seem that God does. What would the humor of God be? This I think would take us to a very profound matter. That, if humor is the recognition of a sudden incongruity in things, what would be the incongruity that is cosmic, that is absolutely fundamental?

Well, first of all, it does seem doesn't it, that one of the things that is fundamental in all life is the polarity of what we call opposites. Namely, for example, that you can't have life without death. You can't have something without its being limited both in space and in time. The higher you go, the further you can fall. That the more you succeed, the more you need to succeed. The more you have, the more anxiety you have to keep what you have and so on there's a certain Isn't there a kind of contradiction. That every yes seems to imply no. And naturally, this is at the root of anxiety. When we realise that to be, to be alive means that we are going to die to be implies not to be. To become implies not to become, there's something fundamentally frustrating about that. As if life was saying to us, heads I win tails you lose or you... I've got a game you can't beat. And I say that arouses anxiety in us. Because it gives us the feeling that we have to choose between two things, neither of which is quite the choice that we want to make. If we choose life we get death. And so on.

Now, a quite a long time ago in one of these talks, I used an illustration of anxiety which I got from Gregory Bateson. And that was the electric bell. An electric bell is a mechanical anxiety because it vibrates, it wobbles, it trembles. You know how it works. It's an electromagnetic, and alongside the electromagnet lies a strip of metal on a spring with a ball on the end, and that's called an armature. And when the current is switched on, the magnet attracts the armature. But the armature moves and is also a switch, and it disconnects the current. So immediately the armature pulls it. The magnet releases it, and it springs back, but that switches the current on

again, and so the armature springs back and forth and rings the bell. So in other words, this mechanical anxiety is that every yes means no. To switch on implies to switch off, to switch off to switch on. This is like life implying death and good implying evil, and so on. And so it trembles, and this is the motion of anxiety. A kind of oscillating trembling is also the motion of sobbing, of weeping. But the wobbling, the trembling, remains, shall we say negative, something like anxiety, something like weeping, just so long as we are trying to beat the game. So long, for example, as we are trying to have life without death, to have pleasure without pain, and to have virtue without the element of irreducible rascality. When, however, this is seen through, when we see that this coincidence of opposites is the very nature of life, the nature of the vibration changes, and instead of anxiety it becomes laughter. And laughter is a release. Perhaps you know a remark that one of the zen masters made that when a person has struggles through the whole discipline of Buddhism and finally sees the point, he says nothing is left for you at this moment but to have a good laugh. Because you see again, the incongruity. You were striving, struggling, for something we had all along. I mean, don't we laugh at ourselves when we're looking everywhere for our spectacles and discover that we're wearing them? Or, digging through all the drawers and closets for one's necktie when it's already on. It's the incongruity of the state of affairs as they are, from the state of affairs as we imagine them to be.

So, one might say, there is this incongruity, this rocking ambivalence, at the very root of the world, and thus, to introduce this perception into religion doesn't seem to me to be in any way irreverence. It might be irreverence if it were done maliciously. If it were done to laugh at it. But this kind of humor seems to be laughing with it. I mean the story I told about the prayers of the sort of beatnik character were answers instantly, whereas those of the devout believer were not, and when the devout believer protested, God said, 'Man, you bug me.' I mean just suppose you were God. And you had to listen day in and day out, to the way people spoke to you imagining that you are that kind of fellow that they do imagine you are. Imagining that you could only be approached with fear and trembling. And with the most. Strange gestures of piety and standoffishness. I would beg to suggest that even on negligence and on this you would find it exceedingly tiresome I would want to introduce a sudden light touch into the

proceedings. It's so strange that a great deal of the religious attitudes of east and west alike are based on caught ceremonials of ancient kings. You know, everybody had to lie prostrate on the floor, mustn't look in the eyes of majesty and how to speak especially polite language and make all sorts of bows and curtsies as I'm retired from the room backwards. Why did they have to do that? Why did they arrange it that way? The answer is simply that those ancient tyrants would turn out to fight a rebellion and did everything possible to keep people. In on a hundred B.C. and. it was because they were weak not strong that they had to have this sanctimonious kind of flattery. So if God for those who believe in God is really God If God is strong and not weak. That kind of mummery is hardly necessary.

Ghosts

There's an old Cornish litany that runs from girl isn't ghost isn't long legged beast is and things that go bump in the night. Good Lord deliver us. And I like to connect it. With another saying. Which I heard once from a professor of mathematics, Professor Davis at Northwestern. When he said, 'It's amazing how many things there are that aren't so.' I've been looking again recently at a book, which is one of the most important contributions to modern philosophy. Wittgenstein's Tractato Logico Philosophicalus. And despite its complicated sounding title and the intricacies of some of the reasoning in it. It's basically an extraordinarily simple and extremely cogent piece of reasoning. To think about it that fascinated me so much. And some others is the astonishing similarity of Wittgenstein's point of view to that of Buddhism in general. And Zen in particular. And this was also noticed by Paul when Paul who's a Professor of Philosophy at the University of California at Santa Barbara, who once wrote an article on the subject. But let me quote a passage from the end of the book.

The solution of the problem of life is seen in the vanishing of this problem is not this the reason why men to whom after long doubting the sense of law. I became clear I could not then say where in the sense consisted. There is indeed the inexpressible this shows itself it is the mystical. The right method of philosophy would be this. To say nothing except what can be said. I.E. the propositions of natural science I.E. something that has nothing to do with philosophy. And then always, when someone else wished to say

something metaphysical, to demonstrate to him that he had given no meaning to certain signs in his propositions. This method would be unsatisfying to the other. He would not have the feeling that we were teaching him philosophy. But it would be the only strictly correct method. My propositions are elucidatory in this way. He who understands me finally recognizes them as senseless when he has climbed out through them on them over them. He must so to speak, throw away the ladder after he has climbed up on it. He must cement these propositions then he sees the world rightly. Where off one cannot speak there are one must be silent. I suppose that last sentence is one of the most often quoted passages in the whole literature of modern philosophy rather reminiscent of Lao Tzu, saying Those who speak do not know. Those who know do not speak. But as one looks over certain illustrations and images in the passage the student of oriental philosophy finds them extraordinarily familiar. The idea of throwing away the ladder after you have climbed up on that directed power levels the ancient Buddhist simile of the Buddha's doctrine being a rock. To cross a river. To cross from the shore of Samsara to the shore of Nirvana from life lived in other words as a vicious circle to the life of liberation. It goes on to say after you've crossed the river you don't pick up the raft and carry it with you you leave it behind.

And so in the same way, Zen teachers have often made the remark. That all the doctrines that the Buddha taught were nothing in a way that obstacles. The doctrine is sometimes likened to giving a child a yellow leaf to stop it crying for go. And so in the same way, Wittgenstein suggests that the whole task of philosophy is really to get rid of itself I mean in rather the same way the task of a doctor is to put himself out of business because he never succeeded because people keep getting sick. But if he was one hundred percent successful he'd lose all his patients because they wouldn't be ill in him all. And so in the same way, a philosopher of this kind is very rarely out of business. Because there are still always people with what we might call intellectual sicknesses bothered by fantastic and nonexistent problems. And so too we can see another parallel, where he says it's the right method of philosophy would be this: to say nothing except what can be said I.E. the propositions of natural science I.E. something that has nothing to do with philosophy it's just the same thing when the old master, when asked what was what is the fundamental principle of Buddhism and one of them

answered three pounds of flax. What is that got to do with philosophy what is that got to do with things of the spirit but you see what it is it's a perfectly ordinary everyday remark.

[There was] another was another story rather like this. There was an old master called Gozo. And one of his students came to him one day and said how am I getting on in my study of Zen Oh he said you're all right but you have a trivial fault but what's that you work together too much then well said the student if one is studying Zen isn't it the most natural thing in the world to be talking about it. And the Master replied, But when it's like an ordinary everyday conversation, it's somewhat better. Now this may appear at first sight to be a kind of philistinism. In other words, the most spiritual discourse that one can have is Good-morning how do you do. Nice day, isn't it? Does that not reduce all the great speculations of the human intellect the great quests of human intelligence to mere prosaic everyday matters. Well it depends. You know extrusion was often have a deceptive resemblance between each other. Very often parallels have been drawn between the wisest of men and idiots. Or between great sages and children. Or between saints and drunkards. For in rather the same way, the highest in the lowest notes of the musical scale are alike inaudible. And yet extremely different so in a somewhat similar way the person who's been through the whole thing the whole quest of wisdom the whole study of philosopher. Ends up deceptively like a stupid man who never heard a philosophy in his life you know the Zen saying: When I knew nothing of Buddhism, mountains were mountains and waters were waters. The when I had started it a great deal mountains were no longer mountains waters were no longer waters but when I had fairly understood the whole thing and arrived at the abode of peace mountains were once again mountains and waters once again waters. Something rather similar happens here because you see what Wittgenstein is really saying, Is that there is no problem of life. In the sense in which we ordinarily use that phrase. And that seems an almost a stunning affront to our confidence life not after problem we see it is nothing but problems we regard ourselves in a morning noon and night struggle to solve the great problem of existence and for some people this problem is. Why does the universe exist? Rather people the problem is how my going to get enough to eat. And therefore, when you take it at one extreme or the other why does the universe exist or harm I going to get enough to eat who

can say that life is not a problem and yet here is this audacious suggestion, that what we are bothering about is a ghost. It's something that isn't really there.

But you know, when we look at the history of science. We find to what an extraordinary sense. Science has solved problems by disarming them. I mean such things for example people have spent years and years and years hours and hours of thought trying to invent a mechanical contraption that would be in perpetual motion. Think of the trouble they would save themselves if they realized it can't be done. Or they've tried to find a construction for try setting an angle with a straightedge and compass and it can't be done and now it's been proved that it can't be done and how much trouble would have been saved. Or think again of trying to square the circle. Or, imagine for example, people thinking for centuries that the planets revolved about the earth because they were encased in crystalline spheres. The funny thing is they knew they were encased in crystalline spheres why you could see right through them. And yet that the whole problem of how the spheres were moved out of as a premium of the layout most fear that gave rotation to all the others is simply disappeared the spheres are presumed now not to be there at all and it's much easier to think of the solar system without the spheres. In the same way, people jolly well knew that the planets revolved about the earth and in circles. Perfect circles and it was a considerable shock when Kepler proved that the orbit of Mars was an ellipse.

So too, we knew we were perfectly sure of essential that light propagated itself through a mysterious continuum called the ether. And to our astonishment we found out that there isn't any ether. In so many ways, just ordinary physical science is using is an act of understanding the world more clearly by ceasing to ask misleading questions. In exactly the same sort of thing happens to in psychotherapy. One of the characteristics of neurotic behavior. You know is it's repetitive. The neurotic personality keeps going through unsuccessful life patterns again and again and again and nothing seems to be able to stop it. Now this kind of behavior is exactly what a Buddhist would mean by Samsara. The round of the rat race, of birth and death that is to say of life as we ordinarily live it. Because it is a round, it is a vicious circle. For the reason that we keep trying to solve problems that

are not simply overwhelmingly difficult. The problems that are not problems at all. They only look like problems. So when we tackle you see, impossible questions. I mean for a simple example, if you really think it means something to ask why is a mouse when it spins and then try and find out it will never make any sense to the cows come home. In the same way, Buddhist imagery liken this to looking for the horns of a hare. All the child of a barren woman. Or the beard of a unit. And thus, things go round and round and never come out, when, the question being asked is the is an absurd question is a nonsense question. And therefore what brings cure healing say to a neurotic personality is the insight that the problem that he was trying to solve was no real problem at all.

Now, take for example. Some of the many ghosts which haunt our minds. We say for example that we all have an instinct to survive. And a lot of people thus treat the problem of life is how am I to survive? And one might almost be a little cautious about relieving people of this problem lest they should lose the impetus to go on doing their work. But then also, impetus to go on doing your work is another ghost we think we have driven you see we think that what we do has these mysterious things behind it like for example people say. We always choose, make our decisions, on the basis of a pleasure principle. We always choose in accordance with what we prefer. And of course when our choice is limited to alternatives all of which are rather unpleasant, we choose the lesser evil. Now what is actually say we always choose what we prefer is simply another way of saying we always choose what we choose. For there is no way of showing what it is that we prefer except in the fact that we choose it. So it's very important simply to keep your eye on what is being done and to describe that and if you describe it clearly enough and well enough you will probably find the ghost of instinct disappeared. Thus you see, when we talk about an instinct for survival, what is the saying? What is the evidence for the fact that there is an instinct for survival? There is no evidence except that in fact be. It will survive. Until they don't. And this is rather odd because what happens to the instinct for survival when people don't survive well Freud thought he solved this problem by inventing a death wish a death instinct but that too is something as phony as the survival instinct and the whole problem is much more simply described if we get rid of both of these ghosts.

So, in this way, we find that when we try to explain some kind of behavior some kind of activity, by supposing, that there is a motivating force a sort of Incarnate spook behind the whole thing what has really happened is that we haven't described what's going on sufficiently clearly. Now this comes out in another way, when we try to describe anything at all, and think that we are describing something that as it were exists all by itself like the Cheshire Cat in Alice in Wonderland, whose face just hung all by itself in mid-air. I mean supposing we have we draw the Cheshire Cat and here he is with his big grin. And we try to describe what goes on here what is this figure. Well, we get at first sidetracked we are fascinated by the figure our attention is riveted on it and we think that that is what we are talking about all by itself just up. That. And we start to talk about it's outline that it's black. And that the cat has little we can if on the top of its head that it has whiskers and a big grin and so on and so forth. But I ask you let's account for the fact that it's there and it isn't hanging in the middle of empty space how does it happen that this black outline is there where is it? And then we have to say, well, it is on a piece of paper. And the piece of paper is so Tash to the framework that it stays upright and could be drawn on in the sufficiently firm and furthermore it is of such a texture that the ink doesn't just roll off when you put it that. And, but you see what's beginning to happen, is that I'm beginning to describe not simply the figure, but the ground of the figure the environment of the figure. I should also go on to say that the figure got there. Through the application of a brush with ink on it and how did the brush get that well you might say I put it that way. Yes but let's describe that more carefully. What do you mean, I put it? What does this 'I' word refer to? Well I is a human organism. And it does things. With him and Wedeman what is this it does things. Describe that more carefully and what are you going to describe. You're going to describe the organism and you. With all its complex structures. But as you describe the structures as you describe that organism accurately you are going to describe another action. You would describe the whole thing in terms of process you won't find as it were some thing doing the process as I've often said we are so bugged by the notion of stuff you see stuff acting stuff doing things but all that is you see is that. The world strikes us as being material until we examine it closely. In other words and distant nebula in the heavens looks like a solid star, until you turn a giant telescope on it and you make out the clear pattern of a spiral nebula. Or, to the naked eye, a lump of wood looks like a solid

and impenetrable mass of continuous matter. But when you start turning powerful microscopes on it and the instruments of nuclear physics, you begin to find out that this apparently solid lump of wood. Is a worrying mass of electrical charges going on in relatively enormous spaces. In other words, the concept of stuff is a sensation that we get when we haven't examined things sufficiently closely, or when our instruments are not fine enough to penetrate what we're observing. When the instruments are fine enough. What we get instead is pattern, and pattern is simply a form of behavior of activity. Consider this in another way. Let's go back to the Hume. An organism. And asked the question well what about it shape how is it that a human organism is contained all the organs are kept in by the skin. Well we will describe of course the structure of skin and how it is that it holds together but then we'll soon find out that we're also talking about the surrounding area which impinges upon the human skin with a pressure of about fifteen pounds per square inch so that if it weren't that would explode. Now so the question arises you know what is keeping the organism in shape and we find out that it is not only what is going on inside the skin that keeps it in shape but also what's going on outside the skin. And. When we go on to describe this still mark half we discover. That it isn't quite correct to say that it is the air that is doing this or that it is the organism that is doing this. We begin to describe instead what Dewey and Bentley, in the very fascinating book *Knowing and the Known* call a transaction. And that is to say. A by our. Count by unless somebody is also selling. You can't. Know anything. Unless the something we know. You can't eat unless there's something to be eaten. And this fact. You see is constantly overlooked. That any thing in the world whether it's in animate or animate whatever it may be, is that by virtue of being in a transactional relationship. Not with something else but everything else. In other words, a human being, of course, has ever so many relationships that are very complicated. And because, a person say we call a doctor is not only related to his actual work of doctoring but he may be also a father related to a family he's a citizen related to a community in other ways and as the doctor and so on and so forth and so we begin to imagine him as it were apart from his relationships as a sort of constant going through all these different relationships and therefore in some way different from them all. But this you see creates a ghost. It creates a being independent of all the different relationships in which he finds himself when as strictly speaking, he is

inseparable from those relationships and we can't eliminate them we can only describe fully as the entire whole complex so that in other words. Every organism could be called the behavior of the field or environment in which it is found. Now this doesn't mean, on the one hand, that the organism is something pushed around by the environment. And is completely passive and inert and that everything that it does is simply a response to external stimulus.

Because in a way, the organism is part of its environment after all it is an object a process in nature in the cosmos just as much as everything in its environment. There is really no way of separating the two and saying that one acts upon the other that the organism as it were shoves around the environment or that the environment shoves around the organism instead of speaking as it were in this terminology of doers and done to. Our attackers and victims. We simplify things considerably. Just by confining ourselves to a description of what is happening. And as we do this we get a peculiarly clarified picture of the world, without all sorts of ghosts and it is in this way that we also begin to be able to have some preliminary intuition or sensation of the meaning of the fact that life is not a problem. In other words, not a contest between ourselves and our environment. This conception of life turns out to be basically phony.

Gateless Gate

When I originally planned [this] series of talks, I had not intended to include what to me is one of the most remarkable books in the world. And the reason I hadn't originally intended to include it in the series, is that, to the average person who is not acquainted with these matters it's a book of extraordinary difficulty, despite the fact that from another point of view, it's a very simple book. But in any rate, I thought I'd have a shot at it. This book is called in its Chinese title Wu Min Guan. And literally translated that means no-gate barrier. Or you might call it the gateless gate, or the gate which is no gate. The book is representative of an extremely important school of Buddhism known as a Zen in Japanese and as Chan in Chinese. And this particular school of Buddhism has been one of the most potent influences. In the history of Far Eastern culture, in the shaping of its arts and such a wide range of Arts, going from painting and calligraphy at one

extreme to the art of Jujutsu at the other. Including in between, landscape architecture ordinary house architecture ceramics archery, fencing, all kinds of things as well as daily life itself. And because of them has been of such great influence in forming the cultures of the Far East is one of the most important types of oriental philosophy for us to understand.

But when one comes to the literature of Zen, the beginner is faced with a very strange problem. And the problem is that the great majority of this literature consists of anecdotes store is which are technically called Mondo or question and answer. And these story is are somewhat like jokes. Because a joke strikes you as funny only if you get the punchline see the point and laugh at once. If somebody has to draw a diagram and explain the joke to you and tell you just why it's funny, well, it falls flat. And it's the same with these stories. There is a meaning to them, but this meaning is not a symbolic meaning as I will try and explain in a little while you don't really have to be in the know about a kind of subtle and obscure system of symbols in order to be able to interpret them. The strange thing about these stories is that the point which they convey is so obvious, that it's difficult to see. And the problem about explaining a book of this kind is that the more I might succeed in giving you what would seem to you like a convincing and satisfactory explanation, the more I should be fooling you why would that be well for exactly the same reason. As if I were explaining jokes. If I explain a joke and draw a diagram of it I cheat you out of the laugh. You will never have a belly laugh over it, you will at most have a rather polite throaty laugh but if I do not explain the point of a joke to you, even if you do not see the point immediately it is told some time later while you're ruminating over it the point may suddenly occurred to you and then you may get the benefit of laughter. However the point of these then stories is not so much to make you laugh. But to create a state of mind which in some respects is rather similar to laughter in that it is a state of profound feeling it's not just a state of understanding words. And that profound feeling is called in the technical language of zen Buddhism, Satori. And Satori is more literally, a sudden awakening. I think when I was talking about the Diamond Sutra. I tried to give some explanation of what is meant in Buddhism by awakening. I'm not going to try and give a further definition of what it means, except by agency of the stories themselves and some comments about them. But awakening, is the goal of all Buddhist endeavor.

It is a kind of psychotherapy a kind of transformation of the consciousness of the everyday person which is held to be a sleep, into a state of awakening, in which you might say he is so clearly conscious of reality. That he is never fooled anymore by the illusions of life.

Before I turn to the actual story is contained in our book *The no-gate barrier*, I think I should say something by way of introduction about Zen itself because then it is really an extraordinary phenomena in the history of philosophy and religion. The reason why Zen is so peculiar is that it has to begin with no doctrines that can be stated in words nothing that it requires anybody to believe. It has no system of formulated philosophy. In fact, it doesn't really have anything to say at all. What is remarkable about zen is that it endeavors to convey its message. The realisation which constitutes awakening in Buddhism, without the intermediary of words and ideas. There are four statements which sum up the character of Zen Buddhism and they are as follows. A direct transmission of awakening outside the Scriptures. No dependence on words and letters. Direct pointing. And finally, seeing into one's own nature and becoming a Buddha, which is to say, an awakened one. I particularly want to concentrate on what is meant for the moment by direct pointing, because this is the technique in which Zen excels. Zen feels that all that human beings are seeking all that they really fundamentally desire. Whether it be complete contentment of the heart, understanding why this universe exists and what our place in it is all this understanding is not something obscure and far off, but something completely obvious. And lying open for us to anybody who cares to look at it in this immediate moment which we are living now it does as if to say. The whole secret of life everything that you could possibly desire is yours at this moment. And if you cannot lay hold on it now you will never be able to. The difficulty is that it's very hard to convince people of this by talking about it because all talk, all systems of ideas, are in relation to reality itself somewhat like a menu in relation to a dinner. And those who try to get comfort to get wisdom out of books or by believing in various systems of ideas and philosophies. Such people are really devouring the menu instead of eating the dinner.

Now how then is one to divert people's attention from the main you to the dinner itself. There's only one way and that is to point directly at the dinner

to stop talking about it to stop writing about it and to point out it directly. And this is what zen does and most of these stories from the no gate barrier Wu Min Guan, the examples of direct pointing. According to legend the Zen school of Buddhism was introduced into China in about the five hundred twenty seven A.D.. By a sage. From India whose name was Bodhi Dharma. And Bodhidharma is always represented in the art of the Far East as a fierce gentleman with a bushy beard and staring bright eyes. In Japan, at the present time children's toys are made to represent body Dharma their little fellows rather like the American schmoo. Same sort of shape, and their weighted inside you know they're legless figures and they're weighted inside so that you can't knock them over they're always come up right again. And always, there is the fierce stare in the eyes of the bushy beard on the chin and of course there is some reference to body dharmas secret to the teaching which he brought, to the message of Zen in the fact that you can't not was little fella over you can push it in this way you could push him that, but he always bobs up again. The first story I'm going to read from the Wu Min Guan, which incidentally was compiled by a teacher of the Zen school who lived in China between eleven hundred eighty three and twelve sixty. The first story I'm going to read you is the story of the encounter between Bodhi Dharma and his first disciple. Whose name was Aka. Bodhidharma was sitting facing the wall. His future successor a car stands in the snow. And presents his severed arm to Bodhidharma I should explain in parenthesis that. Bodhidharma had very much discouraged from becoming his disciple and this is always the way with Oriental philosophical and spiritual teachers they don't look for disciples. And the reason why. Bodhi Dharma wasn't looking for disciples was his own fundamental feeling that he had nothing to teach the truth of Buddhism was so completely obvious that anyone could see it if he looked and to talk about it and try and teach it was as they say in Zen, only to put legs on a snake. You know, a snake walks very well without legs and if you stuck some on it would only embarrass him. And so he had said repeatedly I have nothing to teach go away. But a guy was so convinced that Bodhidharma had some secret which he could convey to him that at last as a token of sincerity he cut off one of his arms while standing outside the teacher's heart in the freezing snow and presented it to the teacher crying. My mind is not pacified. Master, pacify my mind. Bodhi Dharma says, If you bring me that mind, I will pacify it for you. I said. When I search for my mind, I cannot hold it. Bodhi Dharma

said then your mind is pacified already. And it is said that at this moment a car had a sudden insight into the whole mystery of life, the problem of peace of mind and the essential meaning of Buddhism itself. To each one of these stories, the editor of the book has added a comment and a poem, and I'm going to read the comment which he's put here. 'That broken toothed Hindu Bodhidharma came thousands of miles over the sea from India to China as if he had something wonderful. He is like raising waves without wind. After he remained years in China he had only one disciple and that one lot. Does Armin was deformed alas ever since he has had brainless disciples.' And the poem. Why did Bodhi Dharma come to China. For years monks have discussed this. All the troubles that have followed since came from that teacher and disciple. It's a characteristic convention of zen literature that the masters of the school poke fun at one another. Because insofar as they seem to be masters they all realize that calling themselves masters is kind of a joke because a mass there is after all one who has something to teach and in Zen, there is nothing to teach. The more one teaches them all one tries to explain it the more obscure it becomes just like the more one explains the joke or less funny it becomes. Going back to the story about bodhiDharma and Aka, Aka is expressing a very ordinary, simple human problem. He says, I have no peace of mind what does he mean by mind. We might say so we might say ego or self. I feel that I am happy I need peace.

And so BodhiDharma says very naturally, bring up this soul, this mind of yours and I'll pass if I had. But Aka says you know when I try to find myself. I can't. I look and look. But then I realize that I'm looking for the one who is looking and I can never lay hold on it. But body Dharma said there your mind is pacified already. I feel very diffident, really, about making any comment was story of that kind, but just in the nature of a little bit of a hint. We are all very convinced indeed that we exist as a kind of self or ego. And our selfishness is one of our major problems. It would, wouldn't it, be rather fascinating, to find that when we look for ourselves we are not really there. As if where we expected to find ourselves in the center of all our experience we found only a hole, an empty space. And then the problem of myself, my happiness my peace of mind. Would have disappeared. There is no one whom one has to pacify whom one has to make happy. You're not actually there. But of course one can't discover that

just by hearing about it you have to look and see that's why one of the fundamental questions in oriental philosophy is the simple question Who are you? Look and try to find out who it is that is trying to find out who it is that is trying to find out. This is after all. A parable of what everybody is doing who is engaged in what we in the west call self-seeking. And this is really a stupid as somebody sitting down in a chair and bashing him gnashing away trying to bite his own teeth. Well then here's another story from the no gate area. There was once a teacher called Tozan. And one day when he was weighing some flax, a student came to him and said, What is Buddha? This question can mean, What is reality? Or what is it to be awakened? Tozan answered, This flax weighs three pounds. Period. Then I read your comment. Old tows arms then there's like a clam. The minute the shell opens you see the hole inside. However I want to ask youm Do you see the real Tozan? And then the poem. Three pounds of flax in front of your nose close enough and the mind is still closer. Whoever talks about affirmation and negation lives in the right and wrong region.

Now you must not suppose that there is some symbolism in saying this flax weighs three pounds. Or why I know some commentators have tried to explain that in Buddhism there are three precious jewels the Buddha himself the dharma or his doctrine and the Sangha, or his ordained followers. But the three pounds of flax don't refer to the three jewels turns on answered. This flax weighs three pounds, just as you might answer a very simple question about where are you going to say when I'm going in town to buy groceries. Or, what kind of a day was it yesterday? Where you live only to say it was raining a good deal of the time. And this flax weighs three pounds there's an answer just like that but it seems doesn't that a strange answer to give to a question like What is reality or what is it to be fully awakened? Well, Zen teachers say that they derived this tradition of answering questions in that direct simple way from the Buddha himself, because our book contains a story. That this was the way in which the border passed on. The secret of his own teaching to his principal disciple whose name was Mahaghashaba.

And this is the story: When the Buddha was in the greed Rockwood the mountain he turned a flower in his fingers and held it before his lessons. Everyone was silent. Only Mahaghashaba smiled that this revelation

although he tried to control the lines of his face. The Buddha said. I have the eye of the true teaching. The heart of Nirvana, of awakening, the true aspect of the formless. The ineffable stride of the doctrine. It is not expressed by words, but especially transmitted beyond teaching. This teaching I now give to my how to shop. And then, the very amusing commentary of Wuman, Golden-faced Buddha, thought he could cheat anyone. He made the good listeners as bad and so dog meat under the sign of mutton. And he himself thought it was wonderful whatever the audience had laughed together. How could he have transmitted the teaching? And again if market because shot my shop I had not smiled How could he have transmitted the teaching. If he says that realisation can be transmitted he is like a city slicker that cheats the country dub. And if he says it cannot be transmitted Why does he approve of Mahaghashaba.

And then the poem: At the turning of a flower his disguise was exposed no one in heaven and can surpass my hookah shoppers wrinkled face. There were all those disciples gathered around the Buddha expecting from him the usual daily words of wisdom and instead of that he said nothing. He just picked up a flower and held it in his hand. And this is the same sort of answer. That tones on gave when he was asked what is reality he just said. This lacks weighs three pounds. An ordinary statement just as holding up a flower is an ordinary action. When Zen teaches began to answer questions about reality in this way, they had their imitators. Those who thought that they had got hold of something, that [it] was you know a sort of new cultish fad in the way of religion and they went around imitating these kind of antics in order to seem wise and to collect followers but this is what happened to a person and try that sort of thing is this. Dorie called Gutei. Gutei raised his finger whenever he was asked a question about zen. A boy attendant began to imitate him in this way. When anyone asked the boy what his master had preached about, the boy would raise his finger. Gutei heard about the boy's Mr. He seized him. And asked him the question. What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism the boy raised his finger and at once Gutei cut it off. The boy cried out, and ran away. But Gutei called out and stopped him. When the boy turned his head to good a. Gutei raised up his own finger. In that instant, the boy was enlightened. When Gutei was about to pass from as well he gathered his monks around him. I

attained my fingers and he said from my teacher ten real and in my whole life I could not exhaust it. And he passed away.

So the secret of the thing is not just in being able to do some strange antics in answer to questions, and the fellow who didn't really understand but imitated his understanding got into very serious trouble. But despite of his get into trouble, he realized the thing in the end. Here is a story in which perhaps the point of this great a thing begins to come a little clearer. And it's called The Story of tipping over the pitcher. Heakoto send him out to open a new ministry. He told his pupils that whoever answered a question most ably would be appointed. Placing a water pitcher on the ground he asked. Who can say what this is without calling its name? The chief monk said no one can call it a wooden shoe. But Isan, the cooking monk tipped over the pitcher with his foot and went out. Jaco just smiled and said the chief monk loses. And Isan became the master of the new ministry. Woman comments. Eason was brave enough but he could not escape Iago Joe's trick. After all, he gave up a light job and took a heavy one why can't you see he took off his comfortable hat and placed himself in iron stocks. If I talk all the time, and never listen to what others have to say I shall lose touch with my fellow man. In the same way, if I think all the time which is in a way talking to myself inwardly I shall lose touch with the reality with which words are about, which they're intended to symbolize. It's the fundamental inside of zen that by an excess of thinking men have lost touch with the real world in which they live. The solution to this problem is to be silent in one's mind and to look again at the real world not thinking but seeing it directly this can't be talked about. If I want you to listen to music any advice to do so will drown out the music the directness way is to play music itself. In other words, he had seen that the reality of the picture was not the word or the idea 'picture', but was something non-verbal. And by this action demonstrated that this was his understanding you cannot put what it is into words. And this indeed is a central point of zen and of Buddhist understanding in general. That reality is beyond words. And that one must not confuse the world of things as we think about them and talk about them and name them, with the world as it actually is.

The first story I read was a case in point. Because in the world of ideas and words and conceptions and inherited social notions every one of us is

perfectly convinced that he is a self, an ego. But when we step out of that world of conventional ideas into the clear daylight of reality and with wide open eyes look for ourselves, what do we find?

On GK Chesterton

I want you to have in mind an enormously fat man wearing a black cloak and a rather large, wide-brimmed hat, with pince-nez secured to his nose, and prevented from destruction by a large, black, long ribbon fastened around his neck, who speaks—as fat men do—with a certain luxurious voice rather like Charles Laughton, only with a slightly grieved tone in everything he says. What I would call a humorously grieved tone. And this is G. K. Chesterton: a person whom—I discover—has had an enormous influence on my life. Because when I was a late adolescent—and when I was, for a while, a priest in the episcopal church—I read this man’s works very carefully and I have, by osmosis, imbibed an enormous amount of wisdom from him. The funny thing is: not so much in terms of specific ideas as in basic attitude to life. Because this is a man who, above all virtues, had—I think—what is one of the very greatest virtues, which we don’t usually find catalogued in lists of virtues: he had a sense of wonder.

He knew a truth that was once enunciated by a kind of guru-type who was a friend of mine many years ago, who said that Gnosis—which means... I suppose you’d best call it ‘transcendental knowledge’—Gnosis is to be surprised at everything. Because, you see, if you carry out technology to its final fulfillment, you have technological means of supplying you with every need or wish that you could imagine. So that you have—instead of just the plain little telephone with its dial on it—you have a somewhat more elaborate machine on which you can dial for anything you need at any time and it’ll be supplied instantly. Imagine yourself in that omnipotent position!

And what you will wish for in that final, ultimate push-button world will be a button labeled Surprise! You won’t know what’s going to come when you dial that one. And Chesterton’s fundamental attitude as a poet, as a theologian, was that even God needs a surprise and, of course, for that very reason endowed angels and men with the mystery of free will: so that they would do things that would be surprising and that could not be foretold.

This is why Calvinists are so dreary: that they believe that everything is predestined. And that's why, of course, the Episcopal church is always more interesting than the Presbyterian church, in that they're not Calvinists. There's something always rather depressing about Calvinists, although there are many interesting things about them that I won't go into.

But Chesterton's idea was that the universe is so arranged that it is, basically, the Lord's own way of surprising himself. Because that's what you would do if you were God, if you really think it through. A lot of people never think this through. They think about... I remember a story about a conversation at a dinner party where all—it was in England—and all the people were discussing what they thought was going to happen after death. Whether they would simply be extinguished, or whether they'd be reincarnated, or whatever kind of thing. And present at the dinner there was a very respectable country squire who was on the vestry of the local church. Very pious. And finally the hostess said to him, Sir Roger, you haven't said anything in the conversation this evening! What do you think is going to happen to you when you die? He said, I'm perfectly sure that I shall go to heaven and enjoy everlasting bliss, but I wish you wouldn't raise such a depressing subject.

So, you see, people just don't think it through. It's very fascinating to ask people, deeply, about their theological ideas: what they really do think God is, and what heaven would be like. And not only what it would be like as based on the symbolism of the Bible, but what sort of a heaven they would really want to go to. I mean, do you want to be stuck with the rest of your family forever? The saying: God gives us our relations, but let us thank him we can choose our friends. At what age would you like your resurrected body to be? There are all sorts of fascinating questions of this kind which bring out the great, marvelous problem of what we would really like to happen. And when we follow that through, and through, and through, and through, we must admit in the end that we don't want a situation in which everything is completely controlled. In other words, if everything is rationalized, if everything is perfectly logical and clear, and it all works, and there's no possibility of anybody making a mistake, and we know exactly what's going to happen forever and ever and ever, we'd be bored to death. Nobody wants that kind of heaven. So what kind of heaven would you like?

Supposing, for example, you had the privilege—the power—to dream any dream you wanted every night and have it real vivid. And, of course, you would be able to dream any amount of clock-time in one night that you desired. You would be able to, say, have a hundred years of experience in one night. And when you think that through, what dreams would you dream? It's almost like the question: if you were going to have half an hour's interview with God, and you had the privilege of asking one question, what question would you ask? And you've got a little while to think that one over, see, before you go in for the interview. So, then, the same thing is: what would you dream?

You would dream, of course—at first, I suppose—all possible fulfillments of wishes. Whatever your wishes were, whatever your desires were, you would fulfill them all. And when you've done that for about a month of nights—of a hundred years long, each night of dreams—you would say, Well, let's vary things a bit. Let's let things get out of control. Let's have an adventure. And then, you know, you would rescue a princess from a dragon or something of that kind. And then you would arrange it so that you would forget that you were dreaming, and so the thing would seem as real as real could be. And you would dare yourself like kids dare themselves to do all sorts of dangerous exploits. And finally, you would dare yourself to experience awful situations because you knew it would be wonderful when you woke up; because the contrast would be so fascinating. And finally, in the course of your dreaming, you would dream a dream in which you were sitting in Campbell Hall at Christ's Church in Sausalito listening to me give a lecture—with all your personal lives, and your problems, and whatever it is that's going on, you see? Because that would be the nature of surprise.

Now, in this—when you fully realize that to be surprised at everything is high wisdom you get a new point of view towards the world which gives you almost what could be called a child's vision of life. When Jesus said that unless you be converted and become as a child you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is the thing that Chesterton understood in a very profound way because, to a child, the world is entirely new and, therefore, all of it is extraordinary. And I hope most of you can remember how you saw things when you were about two years old: as the whole world being quite weird. And when you get used to things... you see a tree

and you say, Oh, well, that's a tree. We're used to trees, we know what trees are. BUt if you can go back to your childhood and remember how it was when you first looked at a tree and you saw the Earth itself reaching up into the sky, extending itself in many branches and waving all these little flags at heaven. Or when you looked at the sun, as a child, and you stared at the sun: it was marvelous. And the sun turned blue, and there was a feeling about everything of being essentially magical.

So there is a most extraordinary passage which occurs in one of the rarer books of Chesterton, called *The Coloured Lands*, where he makes this extraordinary remark:

It is one thing to describe an interview with a gorgon or a griffin, a creature who does not exist. It is another thing to discover that the rhinoceros does exist, and then take pleasure in the fact that he looks as if he doesn't.

And this is the key to this man's wisdom: that he could see all kinds of everyday things and events as if they were completely improbable and magical, and that he could describe the world as an extremely improbable object. This great globe of rock floating in space around a vast fire, covered with green hair that ordinary people call grass, and containing all the extraordinarily odd objects on it. And when he thought about this he realized two things that are not ordinarily realized by religious people. And the two things are this.

He realized that the world created by God is a form of nonsense and that one of the most important features of the divine mind is humor. In one of his essays he says, So often, when I've written the word 'cosmic,' the printer makes a misprint and prints it 'comic.' But he said there's a certain unconscious wisdom in that. The cosmic is the comic. Dante wrote the *Divine Comedy*, an account of Earth, heaven, purgatory, and hell. The *divine comedy*. And one finds, you see, in ordinary people's religious attitudes there is a lack of both these things; of nonsense and of humor.

When I was a boy I was brought up in the church of England. I went to school at The King's School, Canterbury. And, of course, we attended innumerable services in that great cathedral. And one of the cardinal sins which one could commit was to laugh in church. And that is, of course,

because—the same reason judges don't like laughter in court: that laughter is threatening to tyrants. And if you can see God in the image of a tyrant, a monarch, who rules by violence—whatever kind of violence it may be; military violence, moral violence, any kind of violence—all tyrants are afraid. And they sit in courtrooms with their backs to the wall, surrounded by either side by their guards. And everybody who comes in, of course, has to fall flat on their faces because in that position it's more difficult to attack. And so, when a marine sergeant on parade salutes the flag he has a very serious expression in his eyes. That's not a time for laughter.

And therefore, we have associated the word 'solemn'—as when we celebrate, in the catholic church, solemn high mass—solemn... solemn means 'serious.' And one of the great things—one of the fundamental insights that is underlying all Chesterton's work—is that the attitude of heaven is not serious. There's a famous passage in his book *Orthodoxy* where he says:

Things like stones are subject to gravity. They are heavy, they are grave, they are serious. But in all things spiritual there is lightness and, therefore, a kind of frivolity. The angels fly because they take themselves lightly. And if that must be true of the angels, how much more true of the Lord of the angels?

I have said in my funny way that there are four fundamental philosophical questions that human beings have argued about as far back as we can remember. The first question is: Who started it? The second question is: Are we going to make it? The third question is: Where are we going to put it? And the fourth question is: Who's going to clean up? But all those things suggest a fifth question, which is: Is it serious? Like when someone's sick and says to the doctor, Is it serious? Are you serious? But he would say that's quite the wrong question to ask. Not are you serious, because that would mean are you grave, are you heavy, are you ponderous, are you solemn? And in all these senses he would equate that with a kind of lack of spirituality. And it's much better to ask people not are you serious but are you sincere? In other words, are you with it, as we say in more current American slang. So, from his view the world is fundamentally not serious;

it is sincere. And beyond that—to go on to the higher mystery of his insight—the world is basically nonsense. Now, what do we mean by that?

In the Book of Job—which is the most profound book in the Bible so far as I'm concerned—there is raised the problem of the sufferings experienced by those who are just and righteous. And Chesterton has written a great deal on the Book of Job, and without quoting him directly I'm going to summarize what I've learned from him about this book because this is really very important about this whole theme.

The prelude to the Book of Job is in heaven and a conversation ensues between God and one of the angels called Satan, otherwise known as Samael. The word '-el' on the end of a name of an angel—like Gabriel, Rafael, Uriel, and so on—means 'divine being,' 'angel,' 'attendant of the court of heaven.' And the role of Satan in the Old Testament is different from the role of Satan in Christianity. The role of Satan in the Old Testament is: he's the district attorney of heaven; he's the prosecutor. And, as you will see in a court today, it is arranged that the prosecution is always on the left of the judge and the defense is on the right. So at the left hand of God—a situation which is not mentioned in the Creed—there is, of course, the prosecutor. At the right hand of God—for he sitteth at the right hand of the Father—is our only mediator and advocate, Jesus Christ, because he's the council for the defense. And he happens to be the boss' son; puts him in a rather strong position. Because, in the course of time, when you read reports of cases in court and you get very familiar with court procedures, you always start having sympathy with the accused. And, therefore, antipathy towards the prosecution because the prosecution's always putting people down, who are saying nasty things about people. And the defense is always trying to say nice things about people. So, therefore, there's popular enthusiasm for the defense and popular displeasure for the prosecution. And it was for this reason that the particular angel called Samael, or Satan, was in due course of time turned into the devil; the enemy of all things good. Whereas, actually, the devil in the Book of Job is a loyal servant of the court of heaven. It's just his job to do the prosecution. So he proposes that God try Job. He said, You think you've got a virtuous follower in Job, but he's only virtuous so long as he's prosperous. You see what happens when you visit him with suffering, and then see if he's loyal to you. So God does

exactly that and he visits Job with all these plagues. And then the three friends of Job sit around and they try to rationalize why all this is happening. They say, in effect, you must have committed some sort of secret sin, otherwise you wouldn't be suffering.

This is the reasoning of the Book of Deuteronomy: that if you obey the law of God you will prosper. And the Hebrews were eternally puzzled as to why this didn't work out. So the Book of Job highlights this question. And all the advisors of Job—the three men who have this discussion with him while he's covered with sores, and sitting around in some wretched pad with all his property lost and his family in trouble, and so on. And he cannot see any sense in their arguments. And finally, God appears at the end; in the 28—what is it?—28th chapter. And he comes in a whirlwind. And he refutes the advice of all these three friends. Who is this, he says, that darkeneth council with words without knowledge? Now, stand you up like a man and answer like a man! Were you there when I laid the foundations of the Earth? When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy? And then he goes on to ask Job a series of questions which include such questions as, Why do I send rain on the desert where no man is? Can you catch the leviathan with a hook? Can you bind the influences of the Pleiades and make them work for you? Or Can you loosen the astrological influences of this constellation of Orion? Can you do all this? And what is it all about?

So a series of questions are delivered to Job, none of which have any answer. And the effect of these questions on Job is to solve his problem. And ordinary interpreters of the Book of Job always say that this isn't really the answer. They say the Book of Job raises the question and doesn't answer the question—it does answer the question! It answers the question by asking the questions, all of which seem to reflect that, in some curious way, the universe doesn't make sense. Why do you send rain on the desert where no man is?

Now, what about that? See, our trouble is that, where we really get into difficulty in life is that we expect everything to make sense. And then we get disappointed. We expect, for example, that time is going to solve our problems, that there's going to come a day in the future when we will be

finally satisfied. And so things make sense—we say of something it is sensible, it is satisfactory, it is good, because we feel it has a future, it's going to get somewhere, and we're going to arrive. Our whole education is programmed with the idea that there is a good time coming, when we are going to arrive, we're going to be there. When you're a child, you see, you're not here yet. You're treated as a merely probationary human being. And they get you involved in this system where you go up step by step through the various grades. When you get out of college you go up step by step through the various grades of business, or your profession, or whatever it is. Always with the thought that the thing is ahead of you. See? It's going to make sense. And perhaps the universe doesn't work that way at all. Maybe, instead of that, this world is like music, where the goal of music is certainly not in the future. You don't play a symphony in order to reach the end of the symphony. Because then the best orchestra would be the one that played the fastest. You don't dance in order to arrive at a particular place on the floor. So Chesterton's view of the world is an essentially musical view, a dancing view of the world, in which the object of the creation is not some far-off divine event which is the goal, but the object of the creation is the kind of musicality of it, the very nonsense of it as it unfolds.

And so, when you talk sense your words refer to something else. In other words, if I talk about tables and chairs, these sounds that I'm making—'tables,' 'chairs'—refer to something in the physical world. The sound 'table' is not the table, but it refers to this [Alan knocks on a nearby table]. But then, when we ask What does the world mean? What does the table mean? The word, the noise, 'table' means this: [Alan thumps on the table again]. Now, does this have a meaning? What is the meaning of life? If we ask the question What is the meaning of life? we are treating life as if it were a set of words, a set of symbols. But it isn't. The real great insight is that these things don't have any meaning.

Now, in ordinary way of talking in the West we would say that's terrible! Something that has no meaning is awful! A meaningless life, you see? We say that about the most dreadful kind of life. But Chesterton is trying to say that the meaningless universe, the nonsense universe, is just great just because it doesn't mean anything. It is because God himself is dancing. He's playing. He has a poem of God as a child and he's playing with a

windmill, and the fans of the windmill are the four great winds of heaven. And the balls with which he's playing are the sun and moon. And the whole idea, therefore, then, is that existence itself is a magical play, and it's therefore nonsense in the sense—the special sense of nonsense—that it is something going on which does not refer to anything except itself. When we say 'nonsense' we are saying it for the delight of the words and not for anything that they mean.

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves

Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:

All mimsy were the borogoves,

And the mome raths outgrabe.

Or better, from Edward Lear, who said of himself—he really drew the portrait of Chesterton:

His body is perfectly spherical,

He weareth a runcible hat.

And so:

There was an old man of Spithead,

Who opened the window, and said,—

“Fil-jomble, fil-jumble, fil-rumble-come-tumble!”

That doubtful old man of Spithead.

Or:

Plumpskin, buffskin, pelican, gee!

We think no bird so happy as we.

Plumpskin, buffskin, pelican jill!

We think so then and we thought so still.

You see? Now, he says that—in this kind of marvelous playing with the voice, and with words—you have something nearer to the nature of reality than you do with statements that make formal sense. Even though this man, Chesterton, was a great believer in reason. And, you know, in the Father Brown stories there is an occasion when Father Brown spies the criminal masquerading as a priest because the man says, Well, we cannot find out God with our reason. Or All the things of divine are beyond reason and we must learn to suspend reason. And at that moment Father Brown knows this man is not a good catholic and not really a priest at all. Because St. Thomas, you see, bases everything in saying there is a consistency between reason and faith. And Chesterton believed in that very strongly. But that didn't prevent him from seeing the deeper mystery that there is a kind of super-reason in unreason. But not just pure unreason, but in something that we recognize as nonsense in the sense that Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll wrote nonsense.

Now, this is an enormously important thing to understand. What is the difference, shall we say, between inspired nonsense and mere bosh? And this is what he's trying to point out. There is a kind of nonsense which we could call 'magical nonsense,' and there's a kind of nonsense, on the other hand, which we should call just 'trivial rubbish.' So it is the nonsense—divine nonsense has this extraordinary humor with it, which he tries to evoke in saying that it is a great thing to look at a rhinoceros or a hippopotamus, creatures who do exist and look as if they don't. A poem in which he brings this out is called The Fish.

Dark the sea was: but I saw him,

One great head with goggle eyes,

Like a diabolic cherub

Flying in those fallen skies.

I have heard the hoarse deniers,
I have known the wordy wars;
I have seen a man, by shouting,
Seek to orphan all the stars.
I have seen a fool half-fashioned
Borrow from the heavens a tongue,
So to curse them more at leisure—
—And I trod him not as dung.
For I saw that finny goblin
Hidden in the abyss untrod;
And I knew there can be laughter
On the secret face of God.
Blow the trumpets, crown the sages,
Bring the age by reason fed!
(He that sitteth in the heavens,
'He shall laugh'—the prophet said.)

So he sees in a goldfish—you know, those kind of Disney goldfishes which have all sorts of tails and fins and complications, with their big goggle eyes—what on Earth are they doing? You ever thought about that, you know? What is this, going on? I mean, does it have a purpose? Goldfish, you know, they eat and they absorb things in, and make more goldfish, and they go on making goldfish, and more goldfish, and we don't

even eat them! Maybe something does that we, finally, eat. But fundamentally, what's the point of a goldfish?

A goldfish is a solemn thing which keeps on going 'round, (you know?)

And it keeps on going 'round and 'round and 'round and 'round and 'round,

Lives beneath the water but is very seldom drowned,

Which is because it keeps on going 'round and 'round and 'round!

Isn't going anywhere at all! It's just going as children like to go Bwee-bdwee-bwee-bdoo-bwee-bdwee-bdoo-boo-bee-bwup! Or fill jumble, fill jumble, fill rumble-come-tumble, that doubtful old man of Spithead. That's what's happening. And so (in very profound theological ideas) it is said, you see, that when we finally go to heaven and we join the choirs of the angels—what are the choirs of angels doing? Well, they're sitting around in heaven—or actually, dancing—singing Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia! You know? When you sing on Easter Jesus Christ is risen today, Alleluia! what is this Alleluia? Well, I must assure you, it doesn't mean anything. It is a sound of delight, but of no other meaning. It is an expression like whoopee! You know? When somebody's riding a surfboard and they're going down, heeeeeeoowww! It's just like that, you see? Well, what's the point of that?

The point of it is itself! It has no point beyond itself. It's there. It's arrived. It's in a complete present, it is here and now. And that's what it's all about. We say to swing it. Get with it. And that is, of course, what all those angels are doing. The beatific vision—that means, the word beatus in Latin, we translate it 'blessed,' but that's a rather pious word. It really means 'happy,' 'joyous.' Beatus And so all those angels—as Dante describes it in the Paradiso, when he first hears the song of the angels—he says it sounded as if it were the laughter of the universe. And what? No laughter in church? Well, we're supposed to be a small replica of the beatific vision, and of the angels gathered around heaven, represented by the altar—you know, the throne of God. Why associate all this with solemnity?

You see, Sunday is a very interesting institution. It's a kind of modification of the Jewish idea that, after the six days of creation when God was working, he took a day off. Holy day. That was, as it were, the culmination of the six days of work. In Christianity, of course, the Sunday is the first day of the week and not the seventh day, the Sabbath. But the same idea is involved: that once in every six pulses there is a seventh pulse which is a little space of time to take off. Now, six days of your life—say you're working, and you're being responsible, and you're earning a living, and you're being serious. If you do that all the time you're going to go quite mad. You're going to be like a bridge—a steel bridge—which is so rigid that it has no swing in it and, therefore, it will fall apart in a storm. For in order to be sane, every human being must allow himself a little time in life to be insane, to let go, to stop trying to control everything, to stop trying to be God and just go Bwee-bdwee-bwee-bdoo-bwee-bdwee in whatever way you want, see? So when you go to church on Sunday, that's what you're supposed to do! You're supposed to take off from all this thing of laying it on. We've made the mistake, when we go to church on Sunday—present company excepted—but most preachers lay it on! They say, This is what you ought to do! That's what you ought to do! You haven't been conducting this right! And so on, and so on, and nobody gets a vacation. Nobody gets a holy day, holiday, a Sabbath, time off.

So when you go, the whole idea of church is that this is the place where we can get back to the fundamental sanity of nonsense, and sing Alleluia with the angels around the center of the universe. Which is, actually, manifesting these stars, these galaxies. For what? It's a firework display. It's a celebration. You say, Today there will be at 11 o'clock on Sunday, or whatever other time it is, a celebration of the holy communion. Do you celebrate? Or do you comport yourselves as if you were attending a funeral?

I used to be a chaplain in a university and I used to say, There will be a celebration of the holy communion at such-and-such a time on Sunday and, incidentally, if you come here out of a sense of duty we don't want you. Better be lying in bed or going swimming, or something. Because what this is is: we are going to have celestial whoopee! And we're going to enjoy it! That's what you're supposed to do instead of coming in and saying Ungh!

You know, you're going to go to this thing and you're going to feel how awful you are, how undutiful you've been, how absolutely terrible you've been. And however can you expect to be anything more than terrible if you don't really enjoy your religion? That's what's going to give you the strength and the power to be something other than terrible. But if you just go in and make your religion an occasion of saying, Oh, we've been terrible and we're awful sick, and we need help, and here's the holy communion which is your medicine, and I hope it tastes nasty, you know? That's awful. It doesn't get to the center of the thing, you see, which is: Chesterton put it in another poem where he said—it's called *The Song of the Children*—and it says of Jesus that he taught to the adults:

He taught them laws and watchwords,

To preach and struggle and pray;

But he taught us deep in the hayfield

The games that the angels play.

Had he stayed here for ever,

Their world would be wise as ours—

And the king be cutting capers,

And the priest be picking flowers.

Because that's the sense of the thing, fundamentally. That everything that's going on is a sort of jazz. A ba-doo-ja-daa, ba-hoo-da-daa, je-doo-be-dah, de-bup-ah, de-dup-ah, de-dup-ah, and everything in the world—the flowers, the trees, the mountains—all going ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo. And we have piped you and you have not danced. We have mourned you and you have not wept. You won't join the game because you human beings think you're so special, and so serious, and you've got to make sense of it all. There isn't any sense to it! Just join in, come on! Make

ba-joo-dee-dah, ba-joo-dee-dah, ba-joo-dee-dah with the whole thing. And finally, you'll be singing Alleluia with the angels.

Fundamentals of Buddhism

I'm continuing this program with talks on some of the fundamental ideas of oriental philosophy. But before going on, I want to refer back to something that I said in the last programme in which I was talking about Hinduism which may possibly have been misunderstood. At the end of the programme, I was referring to certain trends in modern Hinduism which I described as being of a somewhat namby-pamby nature. Perhaps that wasn't quite the right phrase because that suggests weakness what I really wanted to suggest was bloodlessness lack of earthiness, or excessive spirituality. And I think this arises in certain schools of thought. From a wrong interpretation. Of the great commentator Shankara. Shankara and Ramanewja, probably the two of the greatest medieval Indian commentators on the will punish obs. And. The traditional scriptures. And the way some people interpret this is somewhat as follows. That. There is but one reality which is Brahman. Which is without form. Without any quality that the mind can imagine following the usual method of description by negation. And that this, being so, it excludes there being any reality whatsoever to the seeming multiplicity of the physical world. And other words the physical world that we perceive with our senses is in reality simply not of there. And there is even no cause within reality for it seeming to be that and this is rather like the Christian Science doctrine of mortal mind, producing the era of suffering and physical existence. That it has no reality at all, and our seeing of it. Its seeming to be real again has no basis within the divine reality which is the sole thing that exists now this is an interpretation of Shankara which I believe to be fundamentally wrong. I don't believe that Shankara can correctly be interpreted as saying that the world of sensory experience which this to my mind a wrong interpretation of his school identifies with Maya. I don't believe that this is the way he ought to be understood.

Maya, I can think of passages in Shankar where my yard is given a much more positive sense where the world is not to be considered. Identical with Brahman in the sense that it's not really there and Brahman is the only

reality which exists. But rather, that the world is Maya is illusory only in the sense that we do not see it to be one with Brahman just as it is. The seeing of its one this with Brahman does not involve its disappearance and if it does then we've got not a non-dualistic doctrine a tall we've got an extremely dualistic doctrine. Because after all if there is the seeing of an illusion. Supposing you say what you see I. The illusion isn't really there but you can't deny the fact that you see it. And then if that seeing off it has no basis in reality if that in turn is an illusion and the illusion that one sees an illusion is an illusion then you've got a principle that is fundamentally distinct from the Supreme Reality, and in a way stands against it is not explained by it is not grounded in it and therefore this is a highly dualistic form of thought. And as a result all fundamental dualism is lead to. Consequences in feeling and in conduct which are world beating. And this is seems to me why there are trends in modern Hinduism to be excessively spiritual, to regard all sense knowledge as basically evil, in the sense of being fundamentally. And I mean fundamentally unreal.

And this in other words is what I want to educate about these trends in modern Hinduism which I do not feel are representative at all of either Shankaar's doctrine or the doctrine of the punishments upon which the whole tradition of Hinduism is based. Now then today I want to go on to the subject of Buddhism. Buddhism originates in India, somewhere between six and five hundred B.C.. There is always some conjecture about the exact dating of individuals at this time. But it was during this period that there lived a man called Gautama. And Guatama was the son of a king or perhaps tribal chief. Who lived very close to modern Nepal in the north of India. And Buddha is a title given to this man wasn't his proper name just as Christ is not as it were the son name of Jesus as when we say Jesus Christ we should correctly say Jesus the Christ Jesus the anointed one and in the same way one should say not Gautama Buddha but Gautama the but her for blood means an awakened one. A man who woke up. Who In other words, you must understand this term within the whole Hindu tradition a man who is no longer spellbound by Maya, by the seeming separateness of all the things in this world. That's one of the forms of my yard. And so it would have is not a unique historical character. That can be and it is supposed that there have been, innumerable Buddhas.

But, the idea of it is related to the Hindu idea of an avatar. Which means an incarnation of the Godhead in human form. But I don't think of it as an incarnation of the Godhead. Because, they, although not rejecting the idea of a god or gods, relegate all gods to the world of my yard to the world of relative reality. And in this sense, it is felt in some way to be superior even to the gods let's put it in this way perhaps I'm a. You have seen what is a sort of fundamental illustration of the principles of Buddhism a diagram or map like thing called the wheel of life. And into death and versions of the wheel of life you will notice that the wheel is divided into six realms. And these six realms include human beings, gods or perhaps angels would be a better term for Devas. Spirits of Wrath called asuras, personifications of the destructive forces of nature. Animals. Then what are called naraka, or Purgatories. Preta, or tormented frustrated spirits with tiny mouths and immense that is having in other words immense appetite but very little means of satisfying it and then again humans. And the basic idea of Buddhism is that awakening Buddhahood can be attained only from the human state. Deliverance from the vicious circle which the wheel represents. Life considered as a vicious cycle. The gods are too powerful and too happy to concern themselves to be delivered. At the opposite extreme the people in the knockers the tormented souls in purgatory as it were are too miserable at the animals too damn they are sure those too angry the predators too frustrated. You can take this wheel as a matter of fact not as referring to any actual worlds other than ours of ghosts. All gods and Purgatories. But you can take these six realms as representing states of the human mind. And the human state as representing even mindedness what is called in Sanskrit the picture I can imitate. Now when it is said then that one can become a Buddha only from a human state it means you see that it brought us down about the gods as being released from the wheel. In a very popular but as I'm of costs as in popular Hinduism. The idea of the wheel is taken rather literally it is in other words believed. That the individual passes from life to life. And is rather funny if that although Buddhism actually denies the existence of an individual soul as an enduring reality Nevertheless in Buddhist countries it is popularly believed that some sort of equivalent of the soul passes from life to life and that if your present life is miserable it is a result of foolish actions in the former life but if in this life you act wisely your birth in the next life is to be more fortunate and you may get up of cost to the heaven world of the world of the gods.

But human birth is the thing that is always regarded as most fortunate. Because you can be tied to the wheel not only by chains of iron, and that is to say by acting wrongly You can also be bound by chains of gold. That is by acting wisely so as to inherit good fruit. Now, of course very sophisticated Buddhists not only in modern times but in engine Times did not take this idea of reincarnation literally. They looked upon it in quite a different way. And just as they regarded the six worlds as states of the human mind so they regarded reincarnation as something happening in this life. Those of you who've read T.S. Eliot's Four Quartets will remember the passage perhaps where he says. That those who have just left the platform of the station on a railway train are not those who will arrive at any destination. Those who in other words, walked in at the door of the Roman are now sitting down in chairs are not the same people as those who stepped in at the dog. We are in other words, constantly changing. Just as we know physiologically speaking, that our bodies are, in all their molecular structure completely changed every seven years or so so that we are as it were not enduring entities but rather something like a university where the faculty in the students and the very buildings themselves may change completely within a span of years and yet somehow the university or something by way of a pattern, goes on.

And so in this sense, freedom from reincarnation would be by very sophisticated Buddhists interpreted as freedom from the illusion that the person who came in at the door is the same one now sitting in the chair. And that in its turn signifies freedom from an emotional habit the habit of grasping at one's own life. At seeking for continuity. And you see the idea of continuity in Buddhist philosophy is that we desire continuity in order to perpetuate our past. In our past in other words, we have accumulated various things experiences material goods knowledge but use power, so on. The desire for continuity is the desire for the perpetuation of a past self or string of selves with which we identify ourselves. And, Buddhist insight involves the recognition that the past is perpetually vanishing. There really is no past to continue. And therefore to cling to it to identify oneself with it is to perpetuate an illusion resulting in incessant frustration resulting indeed in that very vicious circle which the symbol of the wheel represents.

Now Guatama made it very easy to summarize his teaching. He was really quite an addict in what we call name on ix in putting things in simple form so that they could easily be remembered. And he summed up the whole of his doctrine and what is called The Fourth noble truths. And although it becomes sometimes awfully boring to read fundamental. Text on but isn't much you just go over these things again and again I think it's only boring if one goes over them in a very formal way that these texts adopt really it's a very skilful outline of the nature of but as I'm and it's based on an old medical formula in ancient India, as in almost all ancient cultures. Every activity was ceremonial lives and when a physician came to pay his call he gave his diagnosis in a ceremonial way he made for pronouncements. The first pronouncement was the name of the disease. The second, the cause of the disease. The third, the curability of the deed to the disease. Can it be cured yes or no? And if it can be cured the fourth pronouncement is the giving of the prescription. And that's exactly the form of go to most summary of his doctrine. He said in other words the first principle is that mankind and indeed all forms of life suffer from a disease which is called in Sanskrit Dukha. And the most general translation of that word is suffering. To come in suffering in all its forms. Moral physical spiritual. But Western interpreters of Buddhism have sometimes represented him as saying that life is suffering period. In other words of enunciating a highly pessimistic and world hating doctrine that to be alive is to suffer and that in other words the amount of joy of positive pleasure in life. It is after all so negligible that the game is not worth the candle. Now, if one study is the method of teaching of sages in ancient India, you have to realize that one of their fundamental pedagogical gambits. Is. To arrive at their point of view they wish to inculcate. By is exact method, when we walk you know we put down maybe first the left foot then we shift to the right foot then the left foot then the right foot and in this way we go along neither to the left not of the right but straight ahead. And you find to that in thought. That the human mind tends to go from position to position but it always when it settles on any fixed position we can always point out that that position is an extreme. For example, in scholastic philosophy in the Middle Ages whence and Thomas Aquinas fastened on the idea that God is fundamentally of being, a Buddhist philosophy would point out that he had settled upon an extreme that has an opposite nonbeing. And that therefore his position needs to be corrected by the opposite position somebody else will get up and say No no

God is not being God is nonbeing. And from this facing of opposites with each other, we arrive at what Buddhism is sometimes called the middle way doesn't mean the compromise position. The middle way is the doctrine of relativity. Of showing that all positions or experiences which we can formulate, must always be perceived on known. By contrast with opposites.

So in other words, Buddhist doctrine that life is fundamentally do cause of suffering. Is an antithesis. Directed towards those people who believe that the object of life is to attain sukha, or sweetness, pleasure. He is saying in other words. You cannot experience pleasure except in reference to non pleasure. And therefore the more you pursue pleasure the more non pleasure will arise to frustrate you. The more you pursue permanence the more you will feel the empowerment of things. And so it is for after all when we are bent on enjoying ourselves we become at that very moment curiously aware of how rapidly time is slipping by when on the other hand we are not enjoying ourselves we become curiously aware of how time is dragging. So then Dukha, arising from an exaggerated pursuit of sukha, its opposite, becomes the basic characteristic of life. And he goes on to say in his second principle that the cause of this. Is Krishna or grasping sometimes translated desire and indeed I believe the word Trishna does underlie Etymologically the English word thirst. But Trishna is not quite desire for example one's appetite when your haven't eaten for some time and you get hungry this is not Trishna. It's a perfectly natural occurrence. Trishna is based in turn on. Which means unwisdom. Which is the way the Tibetan scholars around here Alex women like to translate it. It's good translation and wisdom of. A simple lack of insight, lack of consciousness, lack of well a special sense of ignorance not the ordinary sense of ignorance of not being informed but ignoring us. Action based on ignoring something. And ignorance is not realizing the relativity of experience is not realizing the inseparability of pleasure and pain existence and non existence life and death up and down good and bad. So that as a result of such ignorance, or unwisdom, people try to separate these opposites from each other. To corral, to gain the good ones and to exclude and I have laid the bad ones. And as a result of that because these opposites are exist mutually. They go around in circles and that mutual existence of these opposites is a really seems to me the basic meaning of the doctrine of karma which is involved in Buddhism the doctrine of conditioned action. Which put a miser in the phrase this

arises that becomes. In other words, without this on the one hand this on the one hand always implies that on the other good on the one hand implies bad on the other and so on example. And so, if a person a person becomes involved in karma involved in conditioned action leading to a vicious circle if he is ignored of the into dependence of all states of experience.

So then the third truth the cure of this do cause. Suffering is the truth about Nirvana. Nirvana is most grossly mistranslated word in all foreign languages it's probably. Because we early scholars of Buddhism translated as annihilation and nowadays Nirvana means the state of being doped up to most people popularly used as being. In ecstasy in a kind of dreamy bliss. And your vomit doesn't mean not at all it's a state of being very, very wide awake. State of being completely aware. But the etymology of the word is disputed. There are several etymologies that you can offer and so I just choose the one I like. And that stew blowout. As when, having tried to hold one's breath you discover that you can't hold it you lose your breath by holding it therefore you expire you D. spy rate. And so you he have a sigh of relief. And so only advantage is the side of relief the expiration or despiration. In other words, the giving up of the attempt to clutch at life. To hold it in a fixed form to resist change to separate the good side of things from the bad side and I hate the bad side it is the giving up of that fundamentally contradictory self contradictory kind of conduct.

And so then in the fourth truth there is, set up the Noble Eightfold Path. But as prescription for to cause. And the Noble Eightfold Path is really in three divisions one of which concerns itself with understanding might almost say intellectual understanding of the doctrine. That one is concerned with conduct. And the third part of it is concerned with the state of consciousness or meditation. Now, to summarize them briefly one of the first stages of the path as a right view. Or I prefer to translate the word samyak, not so much as right. But as perfect in the Greek sense as telos or complete. And, thus, to have a complete view, is a view which does not take sides, which takes the middle path. Which in other words, does not go off to extremes. And so, on the part of the eightfold path that is concerned with conduct of Buddhism is often represented as having a very exalted ethical system and this is true in a way it does. But also one must recognize the difference between Buddhism and Christianity as any rate as Christianity is

ordinarily taught is that these ethical ideas are not commandments. They are really, forms of expedient conduct. The Buddha counseled his followers to take upon themselves sudden obligations they have not killing not stealing, and not exploiting the senses of not getting drunk or intoxicated with poisons, not lying. Because, not because these were against the will of God or against the fundamental laws of the universe but the. As they are inexpedient forms of conduct for a person who wants to wake up call if you get thought only doped up you're not liable to be very wide awake.

And then finally, the end of the path the last stages of it are concerned with one state of consciousness. With the being...the with the process of what is sometimes called meditation. Or of bringing one's mind to its maximum awareness through clear recollection. And then finally the attainment of what is called somebody which means integrated consciousness consciousness no longer under the influence of avidya. No longer bamboozled and fooled by the apparent separateness of things which are really inseparably interlinked. And thus samadhi could be called Integrated a unified consciousness in which it is seen that the subject of the now is inseparable from the object the known that man is inseparable from the totality of life and so on and so forth so that somebody at the end of the eightfold path might be described as being the entry to all realization the making real of the state of nirvana, which constitutes in time being a Buddha.

Daylight Savings Time and God

The last Sunday in September is the day when we go through the amusing ritual of putting our clocks back, and to revert what some people might call God's time. I say amusing. Because the practice of altering our clocks for saving daylight has always 'jiggled my funny bone just a little.' It seems a kind of way of fooling ourselves into getting up an hour earlier. Why don't we just get up an hour earlier and let it go at that? Well I suppose in practice the idea of putting the clocks back has something to be said for it in the way of saving a reprinting of all the airline and railroad time tables. But it's very illustrative of ways in which human beings fool themselves. And it offers what I feel to be a very instructive parallel to a lot of argument that is going on these days about going back to the old time religion.

I've speculated a good deal about this, and I'm not at all sure why, in certain circles, there is so much talk going on about God. And there is a kind of flavor in this revival of the idea of God which I don't like, it's sort of sinister. People want to write into all sorts of documents that this country is under God. And in this idea of God of course there speaks the projection upon the cosmos of the benevolent despot, the great patriarch. Because of course, it's very convenient for people who want to play the part of benevolent despots and authoritative patriarchs to feel that they have some backing.

It is as I suppose. You feel a greater sense of authorization if you get up an hour earlier by doing so at the usual time through altering the clock. But the practice of changing the clock illustrative of another phase of this whole recrudescence of the idea of God. The patriarchal God. Because in going through all the various reasons which in the past twenty five or thirty years theologians have been advancing for reasons why God should be believed in, this kind of God should be believed in, I come across only one really dominant argument. That is to say, I've never found anybody yet in writing in modern times who has advanced what seemed to be any new simply logical reasons or metaphysical reasons for the belief in God. Most of these are simply repetitions of things that have been said hundreds of years ago.

Most of the reasons that are now advanced have to do with what an advantage it would be to human life and human society to believe in God. In other words, we have problems with juvenile delinquency. What a pity, if outside the Roman Catholic Church we cannot scare these children into good behavior by frightening them with ideas of hell and judgment. Or appeal to that sentiment by saying for example, look what your sins have cost to Jesus Christ, you put another nail in the cross. But it's a strange thing isn't it that sin has been running around in the world for an awful long time and people did desperate depraved and horrible things. When the old time religion was in full swing. And one of the reasons why it nowadays we think the world is going to the dogs. Is that everything happens not only on a much larger scale, that everything happens within the sight of everybody that is to say there's so much news, there's so much communication. And you just slug someone in a back alley in San Francisco one night and it's all over the headlines in the morning. And therefore, the presence of evil is

perhaps drawn to our attention more than it ever was before. But people very frequently say that the belief in God is necessary for preserving the dignity of man. In other words, if a man, say in the conception of the nature which is held by people we might call mechanists, if man is simply a piece of machinery. Of very complicated machinery which emerged as a result of the blind. Changes and processes of nature then he is qualitatively no more than a cow. Or any other domestic animal. He's just more complicated that's all. And therefore the argument goes, if human beings are only a mechanical cattle, and cattle are only very complicated chemical mechanisms, just as we exploit cattle, breed them impersonally, kill them when we want to eat them, and generally push them around. So also, if man is just this kind of thing there's no reason why we shouldn't just push him around there's no reason why we shouldn't gas millions of Jews if we find them inconvenient, and so on.

In other words, that the basis of the argument is, if man does not have some sort of guarantee beyond himself for his dignity, for the rights of his personality, then all chaos can break loose. And the Human being can be simply degraded, as indeed he has been degraded in modern times. But it seems to me a very very false and perhaps dangerous argument to say that the foundation for this dignity must be a belief in God. Because the believer in God will say no you must not humiliate human beings in this way. You must not despise human dignity, because man is a child of God. Every individual human being is the object of the love of God, has a special destiny planned for him by God, and therefore for this reason and on this authority, you must not treat human beings as if they were just machines are just animals.

This is similar to the argument frequently produced by Roman Catholics in commending the superiority of their form of Christianity to the various forms of Protestantism. They always say, well, what you believe as a Protestant is simply a matter of opinion, and it's your own private judgment whereas a Catholic suspends his private judgment and believes because he also believes that he is bound to believe, it is an act of obedience. And this is an equally silly argument. Because it simply conceals the fact that to believe that you are bound to believe in something that you believe it's a matter of personal opinion and private judgment. It's an act of private

judgment to accept the authority of the church. And in the same way, if we say the guarantee for the dignity of human personality is the existence of God, I'm going to ask then what is the guarantee for the existence of God? I suppose this is a know sort of sophisticated form of the child's question, if God made the world, who made God? But it really is rather a good question because you can answer nobody made God. God isn't made, and then the child can come back if he's smart enough well why couldn't you say the same thing about the world.

And so in the same way, when we say only God can be the guarantee only belief in God can be the guarantee for the proper treatment of human beings then we must ask again what is the guarantee for belief in God. And it's simply, in other words, a way in which we can kid ourselves into a certain forms of conduct by laying down a premise just as we kid ourselves into getting up early about changing the clocks. And while as I said, changing the clocks may be actually a practical idea because of the time tables and all the reprinting of stuff, it's very important to know what you're doing when you're doing it it's very important to know that you're just changing your standard of measurement and that you made the standard of measurement that the clock is your invention. And so in the same way, it should be important to realize that when people start talking about the need for belief in God again, this is just a gambit in the art of ruling. A gambit in the art of preserving law and order. Only, it seems to me in this case to be not so useful and in many ways to confuse the issue profoundly. Because it gets us into the strange state of mind which you find so often in discussing the problems of human conduct and thought, that people want to base their actions and their ideas upon some sort of authority. And it's strange this, for a Christian, because it said of Jesus that He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes. And to have authority is a very different thing from following authority. The scribes, you know, were the sort of people who never said anything unless they could quote somebody else as having said it before some great and Rabbi of the past to whom time had given the kind of distance of divinity.

And in the same way, when we nowadays in our academic world get what is called an authoritative text, you may be sure that the author Orotate of text is absolutely jammed with footnotes nobody dared say anything without

documenting it. But, in a deeper sense than that, people want to feel that certain forms of conduct, certain ways of life, are not things upon which they can safely embark unless they are in some way authorized. That is to say, unless they feel that this is in accord with the will of God, or if they don't believe in God In that sense they want to feel that it's in accordance with what is natural with what is in accordance with the laws of nature, or else it's perhaps with what is in accord with the opinions of a very celebrated person or with some other forceful and successful group of people. There's always this curious desire to found what one does and thinks on authority. To get, as it were some basis outside one's own judgement and one's own will for doing what you're going to do. And then of course, when it what you do is challenge either by other people or by life itself you can say well I, really I wasn't responsible I acted on authority, but without authority.

And so we can see how in this sense we kid ourselves by invoking and inventing reasons for what perhaps deeply we are going through what we want to do and we're going to do anyhow reasons which somehow seem to pass the buck, to shelve the responsibility on a higher shelf. At the same time, you might think that an argument of this kind would Come on naturally from a person who is simply an atheist. Who believes that the universe is a drifting process that is absolutely without any sort of authority behind it. And that man finds himself in this process and has to make the best of it that he can make. And this is the difficulty which I think today, very very many thoughtful people find themselves in. The notion of God, as presented by tradition whether Hebrew or Christian is utterly distasteful. But mechanistic atheism is equally distasteful. Because as a matter of fact both of them rest upon the same premises. The atheists, mechanistic universe, of course, not all atheists would be mechanists but very often they are. But that universe is based on the same premises as the universe of the theist. Atheist and theist seem so often to be heads and tails of the same coin, acknowledging the same premises because both of them naturally look upon the universe as an artifact, a machine as an artifact only in the case of the atheist or what we might call the moon mystic naturalist the architect has disappeared and there is just left the machine. It's all part of this thing which I've mentioned occasionally our attitude of regarding the world as a collection of objects.

And we of course have justification for this in so far as looking at the world as object has been such a successful way of dealing with it we don't pray to the wind anymore. We don't speak to the rain or to the sun as if they were people we look upon them as objects, that is to say, just as not people. And of course as time goes on we know more and more objectively and scientifically about ourselves in our own minds we can regard ourselves as objects. And so indeed, we do get the depersonalization of man which the people who call for a return to belief in God or at least some of them are afraid of and we get this feeling of the Universe being hollow, empty, a rattling shell. An altogether impoverished affair, with no more any life in it it's all just hurrying atoms, as Whitehead said. Now, it's always seemed to me that the difficulty or one of the main difficulties with the Hebrew Christian idea of God is that it's much too specific. In fact, it's strange isn't it that many apologists for Orthodox Judaism or Catholicism or some sort of neoorthodox Protestantism, rather pride themselves on the specific character of their god and make fun of say Christian Scientists or new thought followers or liberal Protestants who have a very vague idea of God and they say oh these people are so we're really and so vague and so sort of the implication is that timid and haven't got the guts. Whereas we have a good strong definite belief. And they laugh about it and make jokes and have a great time, not realizing that it's precisely this specific idea of God as something not just unimaginable but having a nature which has been revealed, say through the character of Christ, or through the Scriptures or through the church, which is intelligible to man even if man can't know everything about it. But the difficulty you see with all these specific accounts of God is that on the very terms of a Jewish or Christian attitude to life then I don't address. They pretend to knowledge which nobody has the right to pretend to. They form a specific image in the mind of what God is. And that specific image in the mind is far more idolatrous than a specific image sitting on an altar, because it is more persuasive. And therefore, it seems to me at the same time, that while we cannot lose while I cannot utterly reject every meaning that the word god has ever had. I at the same time feel still. That I want to be able to have at least a symbol. Which will embrace the concept of the totality. Or worlds. By that, I don't mean simply an additive concept, world plus world plus world, just the total collection. Because I don't think this world is a collection it's only a collection of things if in the first instance you have split it up into things in order to think

about it. But if you think of the what a physicist might call the total field of phenomena, there's something that we can think about because we can't get our minds round it we can analyze it and measure it and so on and so forth but all we have is various projected systems of measures which we use in just the same way that we use the measure of time to chart the movements of life.

But time isn't up there. There isn't a kind of cosmic clock with calibrations on it. We invented it. But at the same time, the, I think of almost anybody of any sensitivity at all finds it hard to regard the total realm of physical nature as something which he can sort of shrug off and say well radioactive gas and machinery. Because it always makes us wonder there are various ways of wondering one way of wondering is to ask well, what explains it all? And that creates that kind of question in the mind which we call wonder. But that's not the only ground to wonder, Supposing I say well, perhaps to ask for an explanation of it all is the wrong question. That's only after all translating the history of what has happened into words. This is what we mean by an explanation. And explanations never fully explain because there's always more explanation that can be done more words that can be said, more events behind the events of history and so on and on forever and ever and ever.

What is also at the root of wonder is something perhaps more aesthetic is simply the admiration. The astonishment. That a world exists at all. And the realization that a great deal of it in fact, almost all of it, is something which influences us, rather than something which we influence. Now of course, if that is then something of which the world as an expression which we will just call X. Or, if we say energy like a physicist might say energy is a kind of devitalized word Strangely enough it means something mechanical like electricity. But we don't know what it is. And part of our difficulty is that wherever we look, with our eyes, with our instruments, we find only the surfaces of things and the surfaces it within surfaces so that there's only one place where we as it were have a very intimate acquaintance with what existence is, and that is in us.

But it's a strange thing that at the very point where we have the most intimate acquaintance with existence it is the least susceptible to objective

study, because it is too close it's the very middle of us. And it is there, in the unknown. and ultimately it unfathomable springs, of our life our action and our thought. That we are linked with. Whatever this X is, of which all the world is a manifestation. I don't want to say man... Manifestation is a curious word, because it sometimes suggests that. What is manifested. It's very different from that which is manifested. In other words, that while on the outside in the manifestation we see all the multiple and glorious variety of this world. What's on the inside must be somehow one instead of many, and therefore sort of an interesting live shapeless, something like wasn't it C.S. Lewis said tapioca pudding. Or Jell-O. or something like that. No, I only say manifested in the sense that there is a way, and we experience this way when we experience our own existence. In which the world is not accessible to our examination and our control in a very intimate deep way. And I would say it's there you see that our ingenuity stops. Not it doesn't stop at a dead halt it's slows down gradually as it penetrates deeper and deeper. And it's at this point that we could exclaim God, more perhaps as an exclamation of wonder than an affirmation of a theological proposition.

And I feel that it's profoundly important, not just to put out of mind the illimitable mystery from which we spring and from which we act. As something that just can be neglected. Because then indeed we do become what the theologians writely fear. We become inebriated with pride, we become cocky we become people who think that they can push the whole universe around and arrange everything just so and then we get into these enormous difficulties, like the Sorcerer's Apprentice who got hold of the magic, and didn't know how to keep it under control because he didn't have respect. He didn't proceed with a certain caution. And so, if anything it seems to me that the future of the idea of God will involve less definition and much more vagueness. And in this wakeness of clear delineation will lie this strength and the difficulty to exploit it by people who just want to rule human beings.

Constitution of Nature

As I think it over it seems to me that the high civilisations of the world have produced exactly three different views of the constitution of nature, of the physical universe. And to enumerate them I would call them respectively,

nature as a construct, nature as a drama, and nature as an organism. The first two, nature of the construct, has until very recently been characteristic of the Western world. The view of nature as a drama has been largely characteristic of India. And finally of nature, as an organism, has been characteristic of the Far East. I'd like to compare these three views and point out the certain of their advantages, disadvantages, and the ways in which they complement each other. And I think that was part of the interest of this is that our thinking more and more I've been fascinated by this, that are thinking about the world is strongly influenced by analogies. By, sometimes analogies that are almost hidden, so far back in the history of the thought of any given civilization or culture. That they have taken as something more than analogies, they are taken out almost you could say as logical patterns. And they are basic to our grammar, to our common sense, and to our attitudes, in ways that often go unsuspected.

Why don't we start with the Western view of the world as a construct? By this I mean, the the the physical world has historically in the west been looked upon as a created or manufactured article. The work of a creator external to the world, and this view has continued in many ways even after the rise of deism in the eighteenth century and the general tendency of the scientist to dispense with the hypothesis of the Creator, the idea still remains that the world is a construct analogous to a machine, and indeed obeying laws all plans in the same way as a machine obeys a blueprint. Even though the law giver and the planner himself seems to have disappeared. The basic metaphor though, underlying this is not so much the machine. As the work of clay the pot or the sculpture, of the modeled figure. For as you know it is said in the book of Genesis that the lord God created Adam out of the dust of the ground and breathed the breath of life into his nostrils.

And so our language, our poetry is full of all of allusions to the fact that we are really after all clay. Imperial Caesar dead, and turned to clay. Might stop a hole to keep the window away. And because of this figure, it is as I have often said come to mental to our common sense. But the world is formed matter. The forming the shape of the pot, the matter being the clay. And thus, we think of life as being basically. Something done to a medium the medium is stuff, a kind of ominous and inert self in out and unintelligent

goo, which requires an external agency to give it form and intelligence and life. And naturally because we have thought this way for so long it's a terribly difficult idea to abandon to get out of I had the notion. That, in the same way that tables are made of wood and houses of stone.

So we tend to think that trees made of wood and mountains of stone and people are flesh and all of it eventually reducing itself to the primordial goo that the universal Clay the primal matter, the formless original water over which the Spirit of God is said to have moved in the beginning of all time. Now, beyond the idea of the world as a work of pottery lies the most sophisticated idea of the world as a mechanism. In this western view of the world as a construct. As soon as men began to understand mechanical principles, it became extraordinarily convenient to make analogies between various types of machinery, and things to be found in the world. And it is really upon this analogy, that the great achievements of Western technology have hitherto been based. And, it's really very difficult to think that we could have devised our technology and that our practical sciences could have made such progress. Without the idea of the analogy between the world and a constructed machine. You see, one of the most fundamental things about a machine is that it is an assemblage of parts. And, the successful measurement and description of nature depends upon the calculus, upon reducing it to parts. You know the word calculus originally meant pebbles, and pebbles were one of the oldest methods of calculating. Counting pebbles. In a funny, kind of association of words, calculus is also calculating, in the sense of having a calculating attitude. Scheming. And scheming is associated with turning things to calculate. It is a sort of killing the world, reducing it from the living to the dead, from the organism to the machine. But nevertheless, it has had the most marvelous consequences so far as we are concerned and the cultures which thought of nature by analogy with drama and by analogy with the organism did not produce the technology that we in the West produced. Let me just for a moment, contrast the attitudes. The Indian attitude of the world as a drama. In Hindu thought, the world is not thought of as being made or constructed by God, but as being actually God himself playing a game. The idea of one single divine actor who is playing all the parts of all the creatures in the world imagining himself to be them. To see me as it were, myriads of masks behind which there is simply one where of the mask.

In a forthcoming book, the second volume of the masks of God is not published yet but I've seen a copy of Joseph Campbell. Contrasts the way in which the myth of the one who became to the one that became many, has gone into quite different directions beginning in ancient Sumeria, which constitutes as it were a sort of cultural watershed. It has flowed eastwards in one way and westwards and another to the east the idea that the one the Godhead in other words split itself. And dismembered itself into many parts quite voluntarily, and thus became the world as a play. To the west, the theme of the one who became many is different because, as he points out in the book of Genesis it is not the divine who becomes male and female it is the creature. In the Upanishads say the breed had the long ago punishment of the divine self. Is. Described as have a saying in the beginning of time let me become two and he splits into male and female and thus generates the world but in the book of end of Genesis it is not the Godhead who splits it is man the creature who is split into Adam and then into Eve.

But thus in the Eastern world we have the dramatic view, in India in particular. And although it's interesting to note that in say in the writings of the great philosopher Shankara and others the or very often encounter the analogy of the potter, or of pots as representing the world the roles are reversed. The it is the clay is used as the symbol, for the divine reality. Just as pots are all made of clay or as jewels or all made of gold. So, all things in the world are of one divine substance which is of the nature of the Godhead, or Brahman. Is interesting, the different use of the simile. And so, from the standpoint of the dramatic view of the universe, all the divisions and distinctions of the world are looked upon as being a kind of as if. They are in play, they are not quite serious. And this contrasts very sharply with what has been the characteristic Western view the distinctions in the world are the most important things about it. That they are deeply serious. The distinction for good and evil is an eternal distinction as is the distinction between the creator and the creature. The world in this view is not a drama. It is played not by actors, but by what we call real individuals even real persons although funnily enough as I suppose you know the word person is originally persona. The megaphone mask worn by actors in classical Greek drama.

Then thirdly, there is the organic view characteristic of China. In this there is no real thought of there being a divine creator or a divine actor behind the world. But rather the world is thought of as being self-moving and self-creating. The word for nature in Chinese means what is of itself so. When, in the West, a child asks its mother. Who made me? And she replies darling God made you and the child asked But who made god. She has to say nobody made God. And that is a great puzzle to the child who thinks of the world as a construct. And, it may be explained to the child if you like, that god makes himself, he exists off him self because he is existence. To put it in more theological language, he has the attribute called Say it. From the Latin OS A by himself.

Perhaps, some kind of off on telly but would ask the question well if that's true of God Why couldn't it be true of the world in the first place? Why did you have to make that additional step in the first place? If he did so he would be thinking more or less in the Chinese way. Which does not think of the world either as an artifact of some make all as a mosque or appearance warm by some sort of deeper reality. He doesn't, in other words, have a two level view of nature, as an appearance underneath which there is something else to explain it. He sees it all rather as self evident. As being something which regulates itself. And indeed alters itself. There is a sudden sense you see in which the Chinese view is fundamentally Or you could almost call it anarchical. Or if you don't like that word, you could call it democratic. A world which is self-governing. Not even through a president. But self-governing in every way a great and colossal an it because which moves itself in the same way as you and I move our fingers. Without directing them in the sense that we know exactly what we are doing and how we move them. We don't.

Now, I've said that the Western view is probably what made it possible for us to develop our highly advanced technology. By thinking about the world as a construct. We could think about the laws or principles, or plans, or regularities upon which it was based. We could think for example, of the calculus, of number, as the basic characteristic of the law upon which nature is based. By doing that, we caught on to the idea of thinking of all things as reducible to atoms to parts, to bits. And then by thinking of bits, we found

that we could measure the world very accurately, describe its regularities very accurately. And that gave us an astonishing degree of control over it.

But this is a point of view which is successful to a certain degree. It goes well up to a certain level after which it begins to develop complications. One thing, you could say, it has complications which of psychological on the one hand and practical and technical on another. From a psychological point of view, it's complication is that when it becomes common sensical to us to look at the world as a mechanism, we begin as humans, as people capable of feeling and love, to feel the external world rather alien to us. Yes, it's a machine. It's a great big automatic mechanical arrangement. Which, in essence, is simply stupid energy. We thereupon feel that it has nothing in common with ourselves, and perhaps even though we try to give the same sort of account of ourselves, and try to reduce our brains and emotions to some kind of neurological computer mechanism, that makes us in a way hate ourselves. Because soon as we start thinking of ourselves as automata, we begin ethically and psychologically treating ourselves as automata. We lose respect for ourselves and thereupon feel that what is central to us the feeling center of the person is trapped in a cosmos that is a mechanical night to match foreign and strange. We can see ourselves as a kind of ghastly accident. And I don't wonder that this engender has certain kinds of suicidal tendencies in our culture. So much for the psychological point of view. From the technical point of view, the analogy of nature with mechanism develops its own disadvantages after a certain point. That is to say, the disadvantage of trying to manage the physical universe as if it were indeed a an assemblage of separate parts or separable parts. The first sort of person to notice this mistake would be the extreme subject law medical specialist. Who knows for example. All about hearts or about stomachs but they're little about brains or lungs. And who treats one or going at a time and becomes unaware of the imbalances inflicted upon other organs by what he's done to the organ in which he specializes. Also in the same way, the specialist always tends to see the units of nature and to be unaware of that connection is all relationships, which are after all inseparable relationships with all the other parts.

There is you might say also, another technical disadvantage again which develops them in the course of time to this particular mechanical analogy.

And that is, that when you begin to rely more and more upon minute and careful description of the world. For dealing with it, and that of course involves the reduction of the world to describable units. The world then becomes terribly complicated, and it becomes increasingly difficult to keep track of all the minute units that you've described. Hence the difficulty of specialists in the various sciences communicating with each other and the difficulty of the scientific specialist in communicating with the layman. The whole thing becomes much too complicated to manage. And this then means that. The more we know, the greater our skill in managing the world as a mechanical construct, the more difficult it becomes to control because it becomes increasingly complex. We talk endlessly about the increasing complexity of political, social and economic affairs which makes the problems of the world increasingly unintelligible to even the average well-educated citizen.

Now, it has been suggested that the Western view, nature as a construct, has in some ways done its job. And that from here on we need to explore to a greater degree, other views, perhaps the organic view of the Chinese where in we get a became really a harmony of points of view with our own sciences biology, ecology, and so forth. As if somehow this view had been tucked away in a store cupboard, waiting for us to be available at just the time when we needed it. The problem here is an entirely new one, because we're so used to thinking of our problems of controlling and understanding the world in terms of the methods of mechanical science.

Not so long ago, I was talking to Lyn White, who used to be president of Mills College, and he was saying that our academic world, values only three kinds of intelligence whereas it is said there are many more that at least seven I don't remember what all the seven were but he said that the kinds of intelligence that we value our first of all mnemonic. Which is the ability to remember. Computational intelligence, the ability to figure. And verbal intelligence the ability to read write and talk. But he said there is also social intelligence. And that is also kinesthetic intelligence. A kind of intelligence, kinesthetic, in which we learn as children to walk to run and throw and catch balls and to do all kinds of acts dreamily complex and very subtle actions without being able to describe, or counts what we are doing. Perhaps, in handling far more complex matters, and catching balls, or

skiing, or riding bicycles we may have unknown resources of kinesthetic intelligence for dealing with some of the problems that now face us. Here is the germ of an idea, which Chinese culture and Far Eastern culture in general suggest to us. Perhaps they themselves have only dimly begun to explore these things, but I think that it's in that direction that the future of practical philosophy and government of the world may lie.

Buddhist Mysticism

Just this month a new book has been published by Dr D.T. Suzuki called *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist*. I'm not intending to devote this program to in review of this book as such but I call attention to it. Incidentally, it's published by Harper's in New York for three dollars and fifty cents. But I rather want to call attention to a particular theme, with which the book deals with will seem of a peculiar type of Japanese mysticism I suppose you'd call it, associated primarily with the title put design which is caution Shinju. Should issue are to know it by another name God of our land but isn't is one of the most popular forms of Buddhism in the Far East.

Spreading over China Japan found Tibet, originally had some following in India. But has undergone a very marked and special type of development in Japan. And what makes it so popular is that in contrast, or apparent contrast I should say with other forms of Buddhism, it stands as a kind of easy way, as distinct from a difficult way. In Japanese technical terms the two types of Buddhism are respectively called Jiriki and Tariki. Now Ji means one's own are self and means other and Riki means power and so the schools of Buddhism which call themselves Gili. Are ways of Deliverance which one follows by one's own will one's own power one's own strength. Whereas on the other hand the, type of Buddhism called tariki, is where you rely on the power of another and this other is usually speaking. If I may put it in somewhat mythological terms. A great supra-mundane Buddha. Known as M E Tara in Japanese as Amidha. And the story goes that in incalculable ages in the most distant past this great Buddha made a vow. That he would not enter into the state of complete Buddhahood. Until. Any human being upon the face of the earth who pronounced his name in phase would after his death be reborn in the Western paradise of which we target presides.

And find Larry in. Far greater ease of spiritual development of awakening of the coming of border than is to be found on the face of this difficult earth.

And all this of course to rise from the ancient India Indian idea that the present the park of the world's unfoldment is the darkest of dark ages, called the Kali Yuga. And in the Kali Yuga, or the Mapol is scholars it is peculiar only difficult. To advance towards any kind of spiritual development because it's an age of decadence the end of which will witness the total destruction of the world prior to its remaining manifestation and some future time. And therefore, the story goes on to say that this great Buddha, did, in course of time, attain to complete put up with. Signifying fact that his vow is fulfilled and that any. One who simply repeats the formula Namita higher in Sanskrit or in Japanese now. Which is roughly translatable in English as the name of Amitabha Buddha. Or Namu who is used in the formula is used in Sanskrit or Japanese somewhat as the French say Nandan Nandan are they just same name. Meaning hail I suppose in English we have no real equivalent of it.

And the idea is that anybody who repeats the name of the Buddha Amitabha in perfect faith. Will without any other effort, any other kind of spiritual endeavor on his own part. However evil however it prayed he may be. He will be reborn after death in this spiritual state in which the task of becoming a Buddha is rendered so easy as to be as we should say in perfect cinch. And of course all commentators on Buddhism say Well this of course is how religions degenerate. They become popular, pie-in-the-sky selling organizations. Where absolutely nothing is required of the faithful except an occasional contribution and the easier you make it in contrast to the other sects which make it more difficult for more people of luck to your following out of the contributions will be and it all ends up with the pressure we all well all you have to do is make the thing revalue don't even have to think about it and incalculable supernatural merits all start up on your behalf.

But it's very dangerous to jump to conclusions of the sky about this type of. Religious or spiritual manifestation, because in practice the Shin school of Buddhism has had some of the most remarkable adherents. And produces a

type of personality which is known in Japan as a Miokonen. Literally translated Miokonen means a wonderful and fine man. That's just a literal translation which doesn't at all convey the sense of this kind of personality of them are common. But the Miokonen A man likes in run him self cool found in the shins school of brothers and in Japan is a man who has in a way, understood the profounder meaning of the doctrine of the school. And perhaps before I talk about the personal characteristics of the Miokonen. I should try and indicate. What may underlie what may be the deeper meaning, of this seemingly, decadent highly popular and easy form of Buddhism.

Perhaps the best way to do this is by means of the critique, which this particular school uses against those who follow the other way will follow the way of Jiriki or self power. The followers of the sions coom would say, that a person who attempts to make spiritual progress by his own efforts is betting against the worst possible obstacle to any progress at all. And that is that in thinking that he can do it himself he is like a person trying to lift himself up by his own bootstraps Or to put it in another way, he suffers from the pride of imagining that his own will, his own energy is sufficient to change himself. After all, if he needs changing at all, it is precisely the character in the motivation of his own will and his own energy that needs changing. And how is this change going to be achieved by that very will win so stands in need of change. To put it in the more usual language of the school of thought, they say that the average human being is so weighted down by karma. That is if we put it into more modern terminology we would say, he is so fundamentally conditioned by his upbringing, by his social environment, by the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil, there's really nothing he couldn't do to make himself any better and everything that he does do is simply a manifestation of the same conditioning masquerading like a wolf in sheep's clothing. Therefore, if the human being cannot transform himself. If used to be transformed at all, he must rely on some power greater than his own.

Now of course, this other power may be represented, figuratively speaking, like we represent God in the Christian tradition as a spiritual entity off force or intelligence quite out of them and apart from man or it may be represented on the other hand as other than us in just the same way look at

the functioning of our own bodies the beating of the heart of the operation of the lungs goes on quite independently of the conscious will and his other in that sense although in another sense those unconscious and automatic or spontaneous functioning of our organism could be understood as Ma fundamentally and truly ourselves than the things that go on in our other superficial consciousness and if you interpret it in that latter way, the idea of how to keep our reliance on the power of another is really a reliance on something deeper in yourself than yourself is consciousness, and that I think is the sense in which the profound the followers of the school of Buddhistic thought to understand doctrine. So the Miokone, As I said literally the wonderful fine fellow, is the kind of personality which this doctrine in Genesis Now what is he he's the kind of person, who has realized through and through the fallibility of his own humanity is the kind of person who knows himself far away who has a rather wry and humorous view of his own own, shall we say his own high motivations and ideals. He knows himself thoroughly for the rascal that he is and doesn't pretend to be anything.

And this. If that were all the word to it is a very likable former fellow from my point of view. I always feel uncomfortable with people who don't have this realization of their own inherent rascality the people at pretensions to holiness and righteousness, who are so deceived as not to know that in their heart of hearts they are after all rapacious and selfish human beings. But the Miokonen makes no bones about this. He knows that's what he is and he knows that by the exercise of his own will and his own intention and his own conscious effort, he can't be anything else. And so there is in him a kind of fundamental honesty and sincerity from the start.

And, what he goes on to be beyond this is something a little different. Because a Miokonen is called a marvelous fine fellow, because somehow or other he does seem to transcend the ordinary kind of human rascality to become. A truly unselfish. A truly human being loving others, understanding others, sympathizing with others, a wonderful compassionate man. Because he has been unable to love himself, to accept himself in the profoundest possible way. For if you translate it into more modern and less symbolic language this idea. That by the mere repetition of a formula, by the mere act of faith in the power, a transcendent Divine Being, one is able

to be saved or made a Buddha or perfected just as you are by an act of magic which lifts you up and transfers you to another realm.

If you were to translate that as I said, into a more contemporary way of talking. It would be to say something like this. That the intent of the symbology is to say that the condition of growing, psychologically and spiritually, is to let yourself and alone, and not to fight against what you are. The more you try to make yourself great. To make yourself unselfish, to make yourself loving, you are simply tying yourself psychically into a knot, a kind of paralyzed state, which makes it impossible for you to be anything except as we might say all balled up. But if on the other hand, you let go of yourself and do not try to change yourself, you relieve yourself from this inattention, you as it were, unblock the conduits of psychic energy within yourself by not straining on and are therefore enabled to grow naturally like a tree or a plant. And this is exactly the attitude of the Miokonon.

I think that one of the most fascinating of these characters as one who as a matter of fact did not actually belong to the Shin school of Buddhism. Although he as in many ways entire. The same spirit because of room there is not so much difference between this profound understanding of the Shin school and other types of Buddhism such as Zen. Zen is ordinarily understood to represent the extreme of the jiriki way, of fighting along by one's own strength. But the intent of the jiriki emphasis of Zen, the self-powered, the willful, driving sense is something like this. To exert one's will to the utmost in order to realize its futility to make the most desperate attempts to change one's motivation and once conditioning in order to discover that in the last analysis it can't be done and it is this and that it is merely the futile struggle to lift yourself up by your own bootstraps.

And so, as a result of this, the jiriki form but as I'm producing very often the same type of personality as the Tariki. And one of the most marvelous examples of the Spirit is a monk or I'd rather call him a hermit and poet by the name of Riokan, who lived between seventeen fifty eight and eight hundred thirty one. A man who is extraordinary in all the annals of sainthood and sanctity. For the reason that everybody loved him I don't think he had any enemies at all, and this is really a very remarkable achievement. After all, it's so easy to be so holy that you are a challenge to

the world, and everybody feels uncomfortable in your presence feels an accused by your sanctity and given a bad conscience and result the result of that you get loathed, you make all sorts of enemies and finally you get crucified.

But it's really a very remarkable achievement indeed to be all that and lovable and top. To be without enemies, the friend of everybody, and yet. Involving absolutely no compromise with one's integrity and honesty. Such a man was Riokan, really marvelous. And many, many stories are told about him and I think these anecdotes about him describe his personality more delightful than anything I could say by way of a character analysis or comment in that fashion. First of all it was to be understood that the Miokonen, or the type of person like real can is one who has truly become again as a child. He's not seen a whole he's not in second childhood in that sense but a person who is really full of a genuine wonderful life. Who has some accepted himself some let go of him self is so you're not pretending to be anything gives himself, no airs and graces that he can relax and be perfectly natural and so the story is told. That one day in Riokan was going along baking is food and he met friend invited him to spend the night at his home. Well, in the room where he stayed it was a picture of a tiger egging on the wall. And real can look for a long time in the picture and was so intrigued by it that after a while he came to feel that he himself was a tiger and he fell to the floor and all running around on all fours he growled at the tiger in the picture he said and the Tiger seemed to look at him and answer him you know can again shout. And the Tiger seemed to answer and appeared to be going to approach him. And Riokan getting a great deal of fun out of this game repeated it many times. But just then a maid of the house. Appeared. And was quite astonished when she saw the priest on the spot. For a moment she didn't understand what had happened and was very frightened and then she recognised him oh Rio comes up so it is you who frighten me so much what are you doing there. Startled by I have voice real can't stop his game of imitation and shamefacedly spoke to her on his knees. Did you see what I was doing he asked you did oh that annoys me very much about good mate please keep it a secret otherwise I would not to do will know what to do for people will think I'm crazy.

And then there's another story which tells of. A certain party who came to the little hermitage where he lived in the mountains. Bringing a letter from one of his friends. And just at that moment real count was absorbed. And trying to juggle his big bowl on the top of the pole. When the messenger called out and delivered his letter real can stop his juggling for a brief interval glanced over the letter and wrote his answer. The Baron made his departure. And Riokan resumed his play his bone time after time slipped down to the floor but again and again and set it up on top of the pole many hundred times that he struggled to accomplish this feat. And after some time the messenger returned Riokan was so engrossed in his play that he felt annoyed at this interruption and did not pay any attention to his visitor. While the boy waited for some time and finally called out in a large voice real grandson I look here what does this answer mean my master is angry with me and has ordered me to ask you to take back the letter you wrote before and give me your real answer please do. Riokan had pity on the intruder and opened the letter he had written only a short time before and what was his surprise when he read. The bone turns round round. He broke into laughter, Oh dear me excuse me I made a mistake exclaimed. He then wrote another letter. But as his mind was filled with thoughts of the bowl and into play the answer didn't come easily. The great delight of real was playing with children in the village when he went down to make his food. And one fine autumn day when he was going quietly through the village he was suddenly disturbed by the sound of a voice. Apparently coming from a persistent tree. And turning his eyes to the place where the sound came from he's discovered a boy clinging in great fright to the top most branches and crying for help. Oh wait a moment my boy he said I'll help you down and then I'll pick some of the fruit for him. Riokan brought the boy safely to the ground and then began to pick the coveted fruit. He plucked one percent when Mom was about to hand it to the child when he decided that it would do well to taste it first, in order to give away the very best the first persimmon was therefore thrust into his own mouth. How sweet he exclaimed he picked another and again stuffed it into his mouth. Good and again and again Simmons found their way into his mouth accompanied by the exclamation. Sweet our sweet. Meanwhile, the boy was waiting with open mouth at the foot of the tree, growing more desperate every moment. Riokan, last in rapture over the percent had entirely forgotten. Only when the boy shouted out in. Riokan to him selfe. Oh dear me he said Pardon me

do forgive me I shall pick the best for you now the very best of all and as many as you like. Saying this Riokan dropped persimmons to the boy one by one all red and very sweet.

And then there was once someone told him that if you picked up money on the road it made you feel very happy. So, one day as he was traveling back to his home it if you thought he would try it and see what it was like. Accordingly, took some of the kindness which he had begged from the villagers and let them drop to the ground he didn't pick them up one by one but though he did this many times, he didn't experience any particular feeling of driveway I can't understand it he said They tell me that it is pleasant. Surely they wouldn't deceive me. He tried it again and again but always without and it was out. In the process of dropping and picking up his money he gradually lost all you had in the grass kind of a long time he had to search for the money, but he found it at last, and then when the crowd joy he exclaimed. Ah understand now to find money is certainly a delight. And once, when he was invited to stay in the home of some friends, they had to go out. And they asked him to watch the house and he got kind of sleepy. Cap was going to sleep on. Suddenly heard a funny noise, he thought it was a cat but there was the cannot sleep on his lap What was that Sam. You still need to the paper screen which separated the verandah from his run and peeped through it with childish curiosity. And there in his room, he saw a shabbily dressed man searching in a chest of drawers and taking clothes out of it. All he's a sneak thief thought really count. Of course Riokan didn't want a thief to take clothes from his friend's house. So he made up his mind to frighten the robber and drive him away. And therefore crash into the room and stand behind the thief. And the robber, utterly ignorant of this, went out of the WRONG with a packet of clothes and hastened into another room to look for Mott and Riokan follow stealth any stepping always about ten feet behind him and when the robber turned to the left he also quickly went to the left and if the thief turned of the right real can do the same always just behind him another slight turn brought the robber almost in Riokan's direction but the priest was so quick that the thief didn't see him. It seemed a real count as if you were playing a game plan and, so absorbed had he become in the game, and before he knew it the thief had slipped away with a stolen package increased suddenly came to himself and realized what a serious mistake you made.

But his concern was not so much over the last thing his heart was full of pity for the feet. As he thought of his shabby clothes sad face. Late in the evening when the family returned they are full of dismay and they saw what happened but you can't just. Sat in silence and smile as usual. And among his written effects was found as curious little document. It just said, favorite things, cotton cap, how paper than money ball and marbles. Necessities: bamboo hat, gloves, stick, well. Things for travel some clothes and oil cake a bowl in the back don't forget to read this before stuff. Otherwise you will suffer from want.

He liked to smoke too. He was very fond of tobacco. And he always had a shabby old skin tobacco pouch which he kept his tobacco in very often it was empty and he would go out on the streets with his tobacco pouch tied at the end of a long stream down his back. People knew at once what he meant when they saw the power dangling behind him he would hasten to finish the tobacco. Among other things Riokan very famous as it can be great for years and writing was great it promised. And it was a bar to who used to go to be a. Very much wanted a specimen of his writing to hang on a crack in one of the hanging scroll as was not real congress wouldn't get that. Well one day. In the middle of shaving his head in the bar stopped and left him and said Now I want to go on finish saving unless you give me the piece of writing I want so immediately real can write it for him. And then the barber finish shaving him the mother couldn't read and some days later when somebody who could read came into his shop said Why this inscription is incomplete there's a well missing so next time we'll count came by. The Bible said but you didn't write the full inscription or no I know he said I didn't write the full inscription because you didn't shave all of my hand the missing work you'll find I've written the same inscription to put the missing word in twice at the home of an old widow who always gives me extra bean curd when I needed. Such, by anecdotes, is the temper of a man who is profoundly at home in the world. And difficult to think about, difficult to talk about. Because, to praise such a character is to tempt one, to imitate him. And one can only imitate him by not doing so at all, but by being just completely oneself.

Gateless Gate

When I originally planned [this] series of talks, I had not intended to include what to me is one of the most remarkable books in the world. And the reason I hadn't originally intended to include it in the series, is that, to the average person who is not acquainted with these matters it's a book of extraordinary difficulty, despite the fact that from another point of view, it's a very simple book. But in any rate, I thought I'd have a shot at it. This book is called in its Chinese title Wu Min Guan. And literally translated that means no-gate barrier. Or you might call it the gateless gate, or the gate which is no gate. The book is representative of an extremely important school of Buddhism known as a Zen in Japanese and as Chan in Chinese. And this particular school of Buddhism has been one of the most potent influences. In the history of Far Eastern culture, in the shaping of its arts and such a wide range of Arts, going from painting and calligraphy at one extreme to the art of Jujutsu at the other. Including in between, landscape architecture ordinary house architecture ceramics archery, fencing, all kinds of things as well as daily life itself. And because of them has been of such great influence in forming the cultures of the Far East is one of the most important types of oriental philosophy for us to understand.

But when one comes to the literature of Zen, the beginner is faced with a very strange problem. And the problem is that the great majority of this literature consists of anecdotes some of which are technically called Mondo or question and answer. And these stories are somewhat like jokes. Because a joke strikes you as funny only if you get the punchline see the point and laugh at once. If somebody has to draw a diagram and explain the joke to you and tell you just why it's funny, well, it falls flat. And it's the same with these stories. There is a meaning to them, but this meaning is not a symbolic meaning as I will try and explain in a little while you don't really have to be in the know about a kind of subtle and obscure system of symbols in order to be able to interpret them. The strange thing about these stories is that the point which they convey is so obvious, that it's difficult to see. And the problem about explaining a book of this kind is that the more I might succeed in giving you what would seem to you like a convincing and satisfactory explanation, the more I should be fooling you why would that be well for exactly the same reason. As if I were explaining jokes. If I explain a joke and draw a diagram of it I cheat you out of the laugh. You will never have a belly laugh over it, you will at most have a rather polite

throaty laugh but if I do not explain the point of a joke to you, even if you do not see the point immediately it is told some time later while you're ruminating over it the point may suddenly occurred to you and then you may get the benefit of laughter. However the point of these then stories is not so much to make you laugh. But to create a state of mind which in some respects is rather similar to laughter in that it is a state of profound feeling it's not just a state of understanding words. And that profound feeling is called in the technical language of zen Buddhism, Satori. And Satori is more literally, a sudden awakening. I think when I was talking about the Diamond Sutra. I tried to give some explanation of what is meant in Buddhism by awakening. I'm not going to try and give a further definition of what it means, except by agency of the stories themselves and some comments about them. But awakening, is the goal of all Buddhist endeavor. It is a kind of psychotherapy a kind of transformation of the consciousness of the everyday person which is held to be a sleep, into a state of awakening, in which you might say he is so clearly conscious of reality. That he is never fooled anymore by the illusions of life.

Before I turn to the actual story is contained in our book *The no-gate barrier*, I think I should say something by way of introduction about Zen itself because then it is really an extraordinary phenomena in the history of philosophy and religion. The reason why Zen is so peculiar is that it has to begin with no doctrines that can be stated in words nothing that it requires anybody to believe. It has no system of formulated philosophy. In fact, it doesn't really have anything to say at all. What is remarkable about zen is that it endeavors to convey its message. The realisation which constitutes awakening in Buddhism, without the intermediary of words and ideas. There are four statements which sum up the character of Zen Buddhism and they are as follows. A direct transmission of awakening outside the Scriptures. No dependence on words and letters. Direct pointing. And finally, seeing into one's own nature and becoming a Buddha, which is to say, an awakened one. I particularly want to concentrate on what is meant for the moment by direct pointing, because this is the technique in which Zen excels. Zen feels that all that human beings are seeking all that they really fundamentally desire. Whether it be complete contentment of the heart, understanding why this universe exists and what our place in it is all this understanding is not something obscure and far off, but something

completely obvious. And lying open for us to anybody who cares to look at it in this immediate moment which we are living now it does as if to say. The whole secret of life everything that you could possibly desire is yours at this moment. And if you cannot lay hold on it now you will never be able to. The difficulty is that it's very hard to convince people of this by talking about it because all talk, all systems of ideas, are in relation to reality itself somewhat like a menu in relation to a dinner. And those who try to get comfort to get wisdom out of books or by believing in various systems of ideas and philosophies. Such people are really devouring the menu instead of eating the dinner.

Now how then is one to divert people's attention from the main you to the dinner itself. There's only one way and that is to point directly at the dinner to stop talking about it to stop writing about it and to point out it directly. And this is what zen does and most of these stories from the no gate barrier Wu Min Guan, the examples of direct pointing. According to legend the Zen school of Buddhism was introduced into China in about the five hundred twenty seven A.D.. By a sage. From India whose name was Bodhi Dharma. And Bodhidharma is always represented in the art of the Far East as a fierce gentleman with a bushy beard and staring bright eyes. In Japan, at the present time children's toys are made to represent body Dharma their little fellows rather like the American schmoo. Same sort of shape, and their weighted inside you know they're legless figures and they're weighted inside so that you can't knock them over they're always come up right again. And always, there is the fierce stare in the eyes of the bushy beard on the chin and of course there is some reference to body dharmas secret to the teaching which he brought, to the message of Zen in the fact that you can't not was little fella over you can push it in this way you could push him that, but he always bobs up again. The first story I'm going to read from the Wu Min Guan, which incidentally was compiled by a teacher of the Zen school who lived in China between eleven hundred eighty three and twelve sixty. The first story I'm going to read you is the story of the encounter between Bodhi Dharma and his first disciple. Whose name was Aka. Bodhidharma was sitting facing the wall. His future successor a car stands in the snow. And presents his severed arm to Bodhidharma I should explain in parenthesis that. Bodhidharma had very much discouraged from becoming his disciple and this is always the way with Oriental philosophical and

spiritual teachers they don't look for disciples. And the reason why. Bodhi Dharma wasn't looking for disciples was his own fundamental feeling that he had nothing to teach the truth of Buddhism was so completely obvious that anyone could see it if he looked and to talk about it and try and teach it was as they say in Zen, only to put legs on a snake. You know, a snake walks very well without legs and if you stuck some on it would only embarrass him. And so he had said repeatedly I have nothing to teach go away. But a guy was so convinced that Bodhidharma had some secret which he could convey to him that at last as a token of sincerity he cut off one of his arms while standing outside the teacher's heart in the freezing snow and presented it to the teacher crying. My mind is not pacified. Master, pacify my mind. Bodhi Dharma says, If you bring me that mind, I will pacify it for you. I said. When I search for my mind, I cannot hold it. Bodhi Dharma said then your mind is pacified already. And it is said that at this moment a car had a sudden insight into the whole mystery of life, the problem of peace of mind and the essential meaning of Buddhism itself. To each one of these stories, the editor of the book has added a comment and a poem, and I'm going to read the comment which he's put here. 'That broken toothed Hindu Bodhidharma came thousands of miles over the sea from India to China as if he had something wonderful. He is like raising waves without wind. After he remained years in China he had only one disciple and that one lot. Does Armin was deformed alas ever since he has had brainless disciples.' And the poem. Why did Bodhi Dharma come to China. For years monks have discussed this. All the troubles that have followed since came from that teacher and disciple. It's a characteristic convention of zen literature that the masters of the school poke fun at one another. Because insofar as they seem to be masters they all realize that calling themselves masters is kind of a joke because a mass there is after all one who has something to teach and in Zen, there is nothing to teach. The more one teaches them all one tries to explain it the more obscure it becomes just like the more one explains the joke or less funny it becomes. Going back to the story about bodhiDharma and Aka, Aka is expressing a very ordinary, simple human problem. He says, I have no peace of mind what does he mean by mind. We might say so we might say ego or self. I feel that I am happy I need peace.

And so BodhiDharma says very naturally, bring up this soul, this mind of yours and I'll pass if I had. But Aka says you know when I try to find myself. I can't. I look and look. But then I realize that I'm looking for the one who is looking and I can never lay hold on it. But body Dharma said there your mind is pacified already. I feel very diffident, really, about making any comment was story of that kind, but just in the nature of a little bit of a hint. We are all very convinced indeed that we exist as a kind of self or ego. And our selfishness is one of our major problems. It would, wouldn't it, be rather fascinating, to find that when we look for ourselves we are not really there. As if where we expected to find ourselves in the center of all our experience we found only a hole, an empty space. And then the problem of myself, my happiness my peace of mind. Would have disappeared. There is no one whom one has to pacify whom one has to make happy. You're not actually there. But of course one can't discover that just by hearing about it you have to look and see that's why one of the fundamental questions in oriental philosophy is the simple question Who are you? Look and try to find out who it is that is trying to find out who it is that is trying to find out. This is after all. A parable of what everybody is doing who is engaged in what we in the west call self-seeking. And this is really a stupid as somebody sitting down in a chair and bashing him gnashing away trying to bite his own teeth. Well then here's another story from the no gate area. There was once a teacher called Tozan. And one day when he was weighing some flax, a student came to him and said, What is Buddha? This question can mean, What is reality? Or what is it to be awakened? Tozan answered, This flax weighs three pounds. Period. Then I read your comment. Old tows arms then there's like a clam. The minute the shell opens you see the hole inside. However I want to ask youm Do you see the real Tozan? And then the poem. Three pounds of flax in front of your nose close enough and the mind is still closer. Whoever talks about affirmation and negation lives in the right and wrong region.

Now you must not suppose that there is some symbolism in saying this flax weighs three pounds. Or why I know some commentators have tried to explain that in Buddhism there are three precious jewels the Buddha himself the dharma or his doctrine and the Sangha, or his ordained followers. But the three pounds of flax don't refer to the three jewels turns on answered. This flax weighs three pounds, just as you might answer a

very simple question about where are you going to say when I'm going in town to buy groceries. Or, what kind of a day was it yesterday? Where you live only to say it was raining a good deal of the time. And this flax weighs three pounds there's an answer just like that but it seems doesn't that a strange answer to give to a question like What is reality or what is it to be fully awakened? Well, Zen teachers say that they derived this tradition of answering questions in that direct simple way from the Buddha himself, because our book contains a story. That this was the way in which the border passed on. The secret of his own teaching to his principal disciple whose name was Mahaghashaba.

And this is the story: When the Buddha was in the greed Rockwood the mountain he turned a flower in his fingers and held it before his lessons. Everyone was silent. Only Mahaghashaba smiled that this revelation although he tried to control the lines of his face. The Buddha said. I have the eye of the true teaching. The heart of Nirvana, of awakening, the true aspect of the formless. The ineffable stride of the doctrine. It is not expressed by words, but especially transmitted beyond teaching. This teaching I now give to my how to shop. And then, the very amusing commentary of Wuman, Golden-faced Buddha, thought he could cheat anyone. He made the good listeners as bad and so dog meat under the sign of mutton. And he himself thought it was wonderful whatever the audience had laughed together. How could he have transmitted the teaching? And again if market because shot my shop I had not smiled How could he have transmitted the teaching. If he says that realisation can be transmitted he is like a city slicker that cheats the country dub. And if he says it cannot be transmitted Why does he approve of Mahaghashaba.

And then the poem: At the turning of a flower his disguise was exposed no one in heaven and can surpass my hookah shoppers wrinkled face. There were all those disciples gathered around the Buddha expecting from him the usual daily words of wisdom and instead of that he said nothing. He just picked up a flower and held it in his hand. And this is the same sort of answer. That tones on gave when he was asked what is reality he just said. This lacks weighs three pounds. An ordinary statement just as holding up a flower is an ordinary action. When Zen teaches began to answer questions about reality in this way, they had their imitators. Those who thought that

they had got hold of something, that [it] was you know a sort of new cultish fad in the way of religion and they went around imitating these kind of antics in order to seem wise and to collect followers but this is what happened to a person and try that sort of thing is this. Dorie called Gutei. Gutei raised his finger whenever he was asked a question about zen. A boy attendant began to imitate him in this way. When anyone asked the boy what his master had preached about, the boy would raise his finger. Gutei heard about the boy's Mr. He seized him. And asked him the question. What is the fundamental principle of Buddhism the boy raised his finger and at once Gutei cut it off. The boy cried out, and ran away. But Gutei called out and stopped him. When the boy turned his head to good a. Gutei raised up his own finger. In that instant, the boy was enlightened. When Gutei was about to pass from as well he gathered his monks around him. I attained my fingers and he said from my teacher ten real and in my whole life I could not exhaust it. And he passed away.

So the secret of the thing is not just in being able to do some strange antics in answer to questions, and the fellow who didn't really understand but imitated his understanding got into very serious trouble. But despite of his get into trouble, he realized the thing in the end. Here is a story in which perhaps the point of this great a thing begins to come a little clearer. And it's called The Story of tipping over the pitcher. Heakoto send him out to open a new ministry. He told his pupils that whoever answered a question most ably would be appointed. Placing a water pitcher on the ground he asked. Who can say what this is without calling its name? The chief monk said no one can call it a wooden shoe. But Isan, the cooking monk tipped over the pitcher with his foot and went out. Jaco just smiled and said the chief monk loses. And Isan became the master of the new ministry. Woman comments. Eason was brave enough but he could not escape Iago Joe's trick. After all, he gave up a light job and took a heavy one why can't you see he took off his comfortable hat and placed himself in iron stocks. If I talk all the time, and never listen to what others have to say I shall lose touch with my fellow man. In the same way, if I think all the time which is in a way talking to myself inwardly I shall lose touch with the reality with which words are about, which they're intended to symbolize. It's the fundamental inside of zen that by an excess of thinking men have lost touch with the real world in which they live. The solution to this problem is to be

silent in one's mind and to look again at the real world not thinking but seeing it directly this can't be talked about. If I want you to listen to music any advice to do so will drown out the music the directness way is to play music itself. In other words, he had seen that the reality of the picture was not the word or the idea 'picture', but was something non-verbal. And by this action demonstrated that this was his understanding you cannot put what it is into words. And this indeed is a central point of zen and of Buddhist understanding in general. That reality is beyond words. And that one must not confuse the world of things as we think about them and talk about them and name them, with the world as it actually is.

The first story I read was a case in point. Because in the world of ideas and words and conceptions and inherited social notions every one of us is perfectly convinced that he is a self, an ego. But when we step out of that world of conventional ideas into the clear daylight of reality and with wide open eyes look for ourselves, what do we find?

On GK Chesterton

I want you to have in mind an enormously fat man wearing a black cloak and a rather large, wide-brimmed hat, with pince-nez secured to his nose, and prevented from destruction by a large, black, long ribbon fastened around his neck, who speaks—as fat men do—with a certain luxurious voice rather like Charles Laughton, only with a slightly grieved tone in everything he says. What I would call a humorously grieved tone. And this is G. K. Chesterton: a person whom—I discover—has had an enormous influence on my life. Because when I was a late adolescent—and when I was, for a while, a priest in the episcopal church—I read this man's works very carefully and I have, by osmosis, imbibed an enormous amount of wisdom from him. The funny thing is: not so much in terms of specific ideas as in basic attitude to life. Because this is a man who, above all virtues, had—I think—what is one of the very greatest virtues, which we don't usually find catalogued in lists of virtues: he had a sense of wonder.

He knew a truth that was once enunciated by a kind of guru-type who was a friend of mine many years ago, who said that Gnosis—which means... I suppose you'd best call it 'transcendental knowledge'—Gnosis is to be

surprised at everything. Because, you see, if you carry out technology to its final fulfillment, you have technological means of supplying you with every need or wish that you could imagine. So that you have—instead of just the plain little telephone with its dial on it—you have a somewhat more elaborate machine on which you can dial for anything you need at any time and it'll be supplied instantly. Imagine yourself in that omnipotent position!

And what you will wish for in that final, ultimate push-button world will be a button labeled Surprise! You won't know what's going to come when you dial that one. And Chesterton's fundamental attitude as a poet, as a theologian, was that even God needs a surprise and, of course, for that very reason endowed angels and men with the mystery of free will: so that they would do things that would be surprising and that could not be foretold.

This is why Calvinists are so dreary: that they believe that everything is predestined. And that's why, of course, the Episcopal church is always more interesting than the Presbyterian church, in that they're not Calvinists. There's something always rather depressing about Calvinists, although there are many interesting things about them that I won't go into.

But Chesterton's idea was that the universe is so arranged that it is, basically, the Lord's own way of surprising himself. Because that's what you would do if you were God, if you really think it through. A lot of people never think this through. They think about... I remember a story about a conversation at a dinner party where all—it was in England—and all the people were discussing what they thought was going to happen after death. Whether they would simply be extinguished, or whether they'd be reincarnated, or whatever kind of thing. And present at the dinner there was a very respectable country squire who was on the vestry of the local church. Very pious. And finally the hostess said to him, Sir Roger, you haven't said anything in the conversation this evening! What do you think is going to happen to you when you die? He said, I'm perfectly sure that I shall go to heaven and enjoy everlasting bliss, but I wish you wouldn't raise such a depressing subject.

So, you see, people just don't think it through. It's very fascinating to ask people, deeply, about their theological ideas: what they really do think God is, and what heaven would be like. And not only what it would be like as

based on the symbolism of the Bible, but what sort of a heaven they would really want to go to. I mean, do you want to be stuck with the rest of your family forever? The saying: God gives us our relations, but let us thank him we can choose our friends. At what age would you like your resurrected body to be? There are all sorts of fascinating questions of this kind which bring out the great, marvelous problem of what we would really like to happen. And when we follow that through, and through, and through, and through, we must admit in the end that we don't want a situation in which everything is completely controlled. In other words, if everything is rationalized, if everything is perfectly logical and clear, and it all works, and there's no possibility of anybody making a mistake, and we know exactly what's going to happen forever and ever and ever, we'd be bored to death. Nobody wants that kind of heaven. So what kind of heaven would you like?

Supposing, for example, you had the privilege—the power—to dream any dream you wanted every night and have it real vivid. And, of course, you would be able to dream any amount of clock-time in one night that you desired. You would be able to, say, have a hundred years of experience in one night. And when you think that through, what dreams would you dream? It's almost like the question: if you were going to have half an hour's interview with God, and you had the privilege of asking one question, what question would you ask? And you've got a little while to think that one over, see, before you go in for the interview. So, then, the same thing is: what would you dream?

You would dream, of course—at first, I suppose—all possible fulfillments of wishes. Whatever your wishes were, whatever your desires were, you would fulfill them all. And when you've done that for about a month of nights—of a hundred years long, each night of dreams—you would say, Well, let's vary things a bit. Let's let things get out of control. Let's have an adventure. And then, you know, you would rescue a princess from a dragon or something of that kind. And then you would arrange it so that you would forget that you were dreaming, and so the thing would seem as real as real could be. And you would dare yourself like kids dare themselves to do all sorts of dangerous exploits. And finally, you would dare yourself to experience awful situations because you knew it would be wonderful when you woke up; because the contrast would be so fascinating. And finally, in

the course of your dreaming, you would dream a dream in which you were sitting in Campbell Hall at Christ's Church in Sausalito listening to me give a lecture—with all your personal lives, and your problems, and whatever it is that's going on, you see? Because that would be the nature of surprise.

Now, in this—when you fully realize that to be surprised at everything is high wisdom you get a new point of view towards the world which gives you almost what could be called a child's vision of life. When Jesus said that unless you be converted and become as a child you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. This is the thing that Chesterton understood in a very profound way because, to a child, the world is entirely new and, therefore, all of it is extraordinary. And I hope most of you can remember how you saw things when you were about two years old: as the whole world being quite weird. And when you get used to things... you see a tree and you say, Oh, well, that's a tree. We're used to trees, we know what trees are. BUt if you can go back to your childhood and remember how it was when you first looked at a tree and you saw the Earth itself reaching up into the sky, extending itself in many branches and waving all these little flags at heaven. Or when you looked at the sun, as a child, and you stared at the sun: it was marvelous. And the sun turned blue, and there was a feeling about everything of being essentially magical.

So there is a most extraordinary passage which occurs in one of the rarer books of Chesterton, called *The Coloured Lands*, where he makes this extraordinary remark:

It is one thing to describe an interview with a gorgon or a griffin, a creature who does not exist. It is another thing to discover that the rhinoceros does exist, and then take pleasure in the fact that he looks as if he doesn't.

And this is the key to this man's wisdom: that he could see all kinds of everyday things and events as if they were completely improbable and magical, and that he could describe the world as an extremely improbable object. This great globe of rock floating in space around a vast fire, covered with green hair that ordinary people call grass, and containing all the extraordinarily odd objects on it. And when he thought about this he realized two things that are not ordinarily realized by religious people. And the two things are this.

He realized that the world created by God is a form of nonsense and that one of the most important features of the divine mind is humor. In one of his essays he says, So often, when I've written the word 'cosmic,' the printer makes a misprint and prints it 'comic.' But he said there's a certain unconscious wisdom in that. The cosmic is the comic. Dante wrote the Divine Comedy, an account of Earth, heaven, purgatory, and hell. The divine comedy. And one finds, you see, in ordinary people's religious attitudes there is a lack of both these things; of nonsense and of humor.

When I was a boy I was brought up in the church of England. I went to school at The King's School, Canterbury. And, of course, we attended innumerable services in that great cathedral. And one of the cardinal sins which one could commit was to laugh in church. And that is, of course, because—the same reason judges don't like laughter in court: that laughter is threatening to tyrants. And if you can see God in the image of a tyrant, a monarch, who rules by violence—whatever kind of violence it may be; military violence, moral violence, any kind of violence—all tyrants are afraid. And they sit in courtrooms with their backs to the wall, surrounded by either side by their guards. And everybody who comes in, of course, has to fall flat on their faces because in that position it's more difficult to attack. And so, when a marine sergeant on parade salutes the flag he has a very serious expression in his eyes. That's not a time for laughter.

And therefore, we have associated the word 'solemn'—as when we celebrate, in the catholic church, solemn high mass—solemn... solemn means 'serious.' And one of the great things—one of the fundamental insights that is underlying all Chesterton's work—is that the attitude of heaven is not serious. There's a famous passage in his book Orthodoxy where he says:

Things like stones are subject to gravity. They are heavy, they are grave, they are serious. But in all things spiritual there is lightness and, therefore, a kind of frivolity. The angels fly because they take themselves lightly. And if that must be true of the angels, how much more true of the Lord of the angels?

I have said in my funny way that there are four fundamental philosophical questions that human beings have argued about as far back as we can

remember. The first question is: Who started it? The second question is: Are we going to make it? The third question is: Where are we going to put it? And the fourth question is: Who's going to clean up? But all those things suggest a fifth question, which is: Is it serious? Like when someone's sick and says to the doctor, Is it serious? Are you serious? But he would say that's quite the wrong question to ask. Not are you serious, because that would mean are you grave, are you heavy, are you ponderous, are you solemn? And in all these senses he would equate that with a kind of lack of spirituality. And it's much better to ask people not are you serious but are you sincere? In other words, are you with it, as we say in more current American slang. So, from his view the world is fundamentally not serious; it is sincere. And beyond that—to go on to the higher mystery of his insight—the world is basically nonsense. Now, what do we mean by that?

In the Book of Job—which is the most profound book in the Bible so far as I'm concerned—there is raised the problem of the sufferings experienced by those who are just and righteous. And Chesterton has written a great deal on the Book of Job, and without quoting him directly I'm going to summarize what I've learned from him about this book because this is really very important about this whole theme.

The prelude to the Book of Job is in heaven and a conversation ensues between God and one of the angels called Satan, otherwise known as Samael. The word '-el' on the end of a name of an angel—like Gabriel, Rafael, Uriel, and so on—means 'divine being,' 'angel,' 'attendant of the court of heaven.' And the role of Satan in the Old Testament is different from the role of Satan in Christianity. The role of Satan in the Old Testament is: he's the district attorney of heaven; he's the prosecutor. And, as you will see in a court today, it is arranged that the prosecution is always on the left of the judge and the defense is on the right. So at the left hand of God—a situation which is not mentioned in the Creed—there is, of course, the prosecutor. At the right hand of God—for he sitteth at the right hand of the Father—is our only mediator and advocate, Jesus Christ, because he's the council for the defense. And he happens to be the boss' son; puts him in a rather strong position. Because, in the course of time, when you read reports of cases in court and you get very familiar with court procedures, you always start having sympathy with the accused. And, therefore,

antipathy towards the prosecution because the prosecution's always putting people down, who are saying nasty things about people. And the defense is always trying to say nice things about people. So, therefore, there's popular enthusiasm for the defense and popular displeasure for the prosecution. And it was for this reason that the particular angel called Samael, or Satan, was in due course of time turned into the devil; the enemy of all things good. Whereas, actually, the devil in the Book of Job is a loyal servant of the court of heaven. It's just his job to do the prosecution. So he proposes that God try Job. He said, You think you've got a virtuous follower in Job, but he's only virtuous so long as he's prosperous. You see what happens when you visit him with suffering, and then see if he's loyal to you. So God does exactly that and he visits Job with all these plagues. And then the three friends of Job sit around and they try to rationalize why all this is happening. They say, in effect, you must have committed some sort of secret sin, otherwise you wouldn't be suffering.

This is the reasoning of the Book of Deuteronomy: that if you obey the law of God you will prosper. And the Hebrews were eternally puzzled as to why this didn't work out. So the Book of Job highlights this question. And all the advisors of Job—the three men who have this discussion with him while he's covered with sores, and sitting around in some wretched pad with all his property lost and his family in trouble, and so on. And he cannot see any sense in their arguments. And finally, God appears at the end; in the 28—what is it?—28th chapter. And he comes in a whirlwind. And he refutes the advice of all these three friends. Who is this, he says, that darkeneth council with words without knowledge? Now, stand you up like a man and answer like a man! Were you there when I laid the foundations of the Earth? When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy? And then he goes on to ask Job a series of questions which include such questions as, Why do I send rain on the desert where no man is? Can you catch the leviathan with a hook? Can you bind the influences of the Pleiades and make them work for you? Or Can you loosen the astrological influences of this constellation of Orion? Can you do all this? And what is it all about?

So a series of questions are delivered to Job, none of which have any answer. And the effect of these questions on Job is to solve his problem.

And ordinary interpreters of the Book of Job always say that this isn't really the answer. They say the Book of Job raises the question and doesn't answer the question—it does answer the question! It answers the question by asking the questions, all of which seem to reflect that, in some curious way, the universe doesn't make sense. Why do you send rain on the desert where no man is?

Now, what about that? See, our trouble is that, where we really get into difficulty in life is that we expect everything to make sense. And then we get disappointed. We expect, for example, that time is going to solve our problems, that there's going to come a day in the future when we will be finally satisfied. And so things make sense—we say of something it is sensible, it is satisfactory, it is good, because we feel it has a future, it's going to get somewhere, and we're going to arrive. Our whole education is programmed with the idea that there is a good time coming, when we are going to arrive, we're going to be there. When you're a child, you see, you're not here yet. You're treated as a merely probationary human being. And they get you involved in this system where you go up step by step through the various grades. When you get out of college you go up step by step through the various grades of business, or your profession, or whatever it is. Always with the thought that the thing is ahead of you. See? It's going to make sense. And perhaps the universe doesn't work that way at all. Maybe, instead of that, this world is like music, where the goal of music is certainly not in the future. You don't play a symphony in order to reach the end of the symphony. Because then the best orchestra would be the one that played the fastest. You don't dance in order to arrive at a particular place on the floor. So Chesterton's view of the world is an essentially musical view, a dancing view of the world, in which the object of the creation is not some far-off divine event which is the goal, but the object of the creation is the kind of musicality of it, the very nonsense of it as it unfolds.

And so, when you talk sense your words refer to something else. In other words, if I talk about tables and chairs, these sounds that I'm making—'tables,' 'chairs'—refer to something in the physical world. The sound 'table' is not the table, but it refers to this [Alan knocks on a nearby table]. But then, when we ask What does the world mean? What does the table mean? The word, the noise, 'table' means this: [Alan thumps on the table

again]. Now, does this have a meaning? What is the meaning of life? If we ask the question What is the meaning of life? we are treating life as if it were a set of words, a set of symbols. But it isn't. The real great insight is that these things don't have any meaning.

Now, in ordinary way of talking in the West we would say that's terrible! Something that has no meaning is awful! A meaningless life, you see? We say that about the most dreadful kind of life. But Chesterton is trying to say that the meaningless universe, the nonsense universe, is just great just because it doesn't mean anything. It is because God himself is dancing. He's playing. He has a poem of God as a child and he's playing with a windmill, and the fans of the windmill are the four great winds of heaven. And the balls with which he's playing are the sun and moon. And the whole idea, therefore, then, is that existence itself is a magical play, and it's therefore nonsense in the sense—the special sense of nonsense—that it is something going on which does not refer to anything except itself. When we say 'nonsense' we are saying it for the delight of the words and not for anything that they mean.

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves

Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:

All mimsy were the borogoves,

And the mome raths outgrabe.

Or better, from Edward Lear, who said of himself—he really drew the portrait of Chesterton:

His body is perfectly spherical,

He weareth a runcible hat.

And so:

There was an old man of Spithead,

Who opened the window, and said,—

“Fil-jomble, fil-jumble, fil-rumble-come-tumble!”

That doubtful old man of Spithead.

Or:

Plumpskin, buffskin, pelican, gee!

We think no bird so happy as we.

Plumpskin, buffskin, pelican jill!

We think so then and we thought so still.

You see? Now, he says that—in this kind of marvelous playing with the voice, and with words—you have something nearer to the nature of reality than you do with statements that make formal sense. Even though this man, Chesterton, was a great believer in reason. And, you know, in the Father Brown stories there is an occasion when Father Brown spies the criminal masquerading as a priest because the man says, Well, we cannot find out God with our reason. Or All the things of divine are beyond reason and we must learn to suspend reason. And at that moment Father Brown knows this man is not a good catholic and not really a priest at all. Because St. Thomas, you see, bases everything in saying there is a consistency between reason and faith. And Chesterton believed in that very strongly. But that didn't prevent him from seeing the deeper mystery that there is a kind of super-reason in unreason. But not just pure unreason, but in something that we recognize as nonsense in the sense that Edward Lear and Lewis Carroll wrote nonsense.

Now, this is an enormously important thing to understand. What is the difference, shall we say, between inspired nonsense and mere bosh? And this is what he's trying to point out. There is a kind of nonsense which we could call 'magical nonsense,' and there's a kind of nonsense, on the other hand, which we should call just 'trivial rubbish.' So it is the nonsense—divine nonsense has this extraordinary humor with it, which he tries to evoke in saying that it is a great thing to look at a rhinoceros or a

hippopotamus, creatures who do exist and look as if they don't. A poem in which he brings this out is called *The Fish*.

Dark the sea was: but I saw him,
One great head with goggle eyes,
Like a diabolic cherub
Flying in those fallen skies.
I have heard the hoarse deniers,
I have known the wordy wars;
I have seen a man, by shouting,
Seek to orphan all the stars.
I have seen a fool half-fashioned
Borrow from the heavens a tongue,
So to curse them more at leisure—
—And I trod him not as dung.
For I saw that finny goblin
Hidden in the abyss untrod;
And I knew there can be laughter
On the secret face of God.
Blow the trumpets, crown the sages,
Bring the age by reason fed!
(He that sitteth in the heavens,

‘He shall laugh’—the prophet said.)

So he sees in a goldfish—you know, those kind of Disney goldfishes which have all sorts of tails and fins and complications, with their big goggle eyes—what on Earth are they doing? You ever thought about that, you know? What is this, going on? I mean, does it have a purpose? Goldfish, you know, they eat and they absorb things in, and make more goldfish, and they go on making goldfish, and more goldfish, and we don’t even eat them! Maybe something does that we, finally, eat. But fundamentally, what’s the point of a goldfish?

A goldfish is a solemn thing which keeps on going ’round, (you know?)

And it keeps on going ’round and ’round and ’round and ’round and ’round,

Lives beneath the water but is very seldom drowned,

Which is because it keeps on going ’round and ’round and ’round!

Isn’t going anywhere at all! It’s just going as children like to go Bwee-bdwee-bwee-bdoo-bwee-bdwee-bdwee-bdoo-boo-bee-bwup! Or fill jumble, fill jumble, fill rumble-come-tumble, that doubtful old man of Spithead. That’s what’s happening. And so (in very profound theological ideas) it is said, you see, that when we finally go to heaven and we join the choirs of the angels—what are the choirs of angels doing? Well, they’re sitting around in heaven—or actually, dancing—singing Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia! You know? When you sing on Easter Jesus Christ is risen today, Alleluia! what is this Alleluia? Well, I must assure you, it doesn’t mean anything. It is a sound of delight, but of no other meaning. It is an expression like whoopee! You know? When somebody’s riding a surfboard and they’re going down, heeeeeooooooooowww! It’s just like that, you see? Well, what’s the point of that?

The point of it is itself! It has no point beyond itself. It’s there. It’s arrived. It’s in a complete present, it is here and now. And that’s what it’s all about. We say to swing it. Get with it. And that is, of course, what all those angels are doing. The beatific vision—that means, the word beatus in Latin, we translate it ‘blessed,’ but that’s a rather pious word. It really means ‘happy,’

‘joyous.’ Beatus And so all those angels—as Dante describes it in the *Paradiso*, when he first hears the song of the angels—he says it sounded as if it were the laughter of the universe. And what? No laughter in church? Well, we’re supposed to be a small replica of the beatific vision, and of the angels gathered around heaven, represented by the altar—you know, the throne of God. Why associate all this with solemnity?

You see, Sunday is a very interesting institution. It’s a kind of modification of the Jewish idea that, after the six days of creation when God was working, he took a day off. Holy day. That was, as it were, the culmination of the six days of work. In Christianity, of course, the Sunday is the first day of the week and not the seventh day, the Sabbath. But the same idea is involved: that once in every six pulses there is a seventh pulse which is a little space of time to take off. Now, six days of your life—say you’re working, and you’re being responsible, and you’re earning a living, and you’re being serious. If you do that all the time you’re going to go quite mad. You’re going to be like a bridge—a steel bridge—which is so rigid that it has no swing in it and, therefore, it will fall apart in a storm. For in order to be sane, every human being must allow himself a little time in life to be insane, to let go, to stop trying to control everything, to stop trying to be God and just go Bwee-bdwee-bwee-bdoo-bwee-bdwee in whatever way you want, see? So when you go to church on Sunday, that’s what you’re supposed to do! You’re supposed to take off from all this thing of laying it on. We’ve made the mistake, when we go to church on Sunday—present company excepted—but most preachers lay it on! They say, This is what you ought to do! That’s what you ought to do! You haven’t been conducting this right! And so on, and so on, and nobody gets a vacation. Nobody gets a holy day, holiday, a Sabbath, time off.

So when you go, the whole idea of church is that this is the place where we can get back to the fundamental sanity of nonsense, and sing Alleluia with the angels around the center of the universe. Which is, actually, manifesting these stars, these galaxies. For what? It’s a firework display. It’s a celebration. You say, Today there will be at 11 o’clock on Sunday, or whatever other time it is, a celebration of the holy communion. Do you celebrate? Or do you comport yourselves as if you were attending a funeral?

I used to be a chaplain in a university and I used to say, There will be a celebration of the holy communion at such-and-such a time on Sunday and, incidentally, if you come here out of a sense of duty we don't want you. Better be lying in bed or going swimming, or something. Because what this is: we are going to have celestial whoopee! And we're going to enjoy it! That's what you're supposed to do instead of coming in and saying Ungh! You know, you're going to go to this thing and you're going to feel how awful you are, how undutiful you've been, how absolutely terrible you've been. And however can you expect to be anything more than terrible if you don't really enjoy your religion? That's what's going to give you the strength and the power to be something other than terrible. But if you just go in and make your religion an occasion of saying, Oh, we've been terrible and we're awful sick, and we need help, and here's the holy communion which is your medicine, and I hope it tastes nasty, you know? That's awful. It doesn't get to the center of the thing, you see, which is: Chesterton put it in another poem where he said—it's called The Song of the Children—and it says of Jesus that he taught to the adults:

He taught them laws and watchwords,

To preach and struggle and pray;

But he taught us deep in the hayfield

The games that the angels play.

Had he stayed here for ever,

Their world would be wise as ours—

And the king be cutting capers,

And the priest be picking flowers.

Because that's the sense of the thing, fundamentally. That everything that's going on is a sort of jazz. A ba-doo-ja-daa, ba-hoo-da-daa, je-doo-be-dah, de-bup-ah, de-dup-ah, de-dup-ah, and everything in the world—the flowers, the trees, the mountains—all going ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-

de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo, ga-joo-de-doo. And we have piped you and you have not danced. We have mourned you and you have not wept. You won't join the game because you human beings think you're so special, and so serious, and you've got to make sense of it all. There isn't any sense to it! Just join in, come on! Make ba-joo-dee-dah, ba-joo-dee-dah, ba-joo-dee-dah with the whole thing. And finally, you'll be singing Alleluia with the angels.

Fundamentals of Buddhism

I'm continuing this program with talks on some of the fundamental ideas of oriental philosophy. But before going on, I want to refer back to something that I said in the last programme in which I was talking about Hinduism which may possibly have been misunderstood. At the end of the programme, I was referring to certain trends in modern Hinduism which I described as being of a somewhat namby-pamby nature. Perhaps that wasn't quite the right phrase because that suggests weakness what I really wanted to suggest was bloodlessness lack of earthiness, or excessive spirituality. And I think this arises in certain schools of thought. From a wrong interpretation. Of the great commentator Shankara. Shankara and Ramanewja, probably the two of the greatest medieval Indian commentators on the will punish obs. And. The traditional scriptures. And the way some people interpret this is somewhat as follows. That. There is but one reality which is Brahman. Which is without form. Without any quality that the mind can imagine following the usual method of description by negation. And that this, being so, it excludes there being any reality whatsoever to the seeming multiplicity of the physical world. And other words the physical world that we perceive with our senses is in reality simply not of there. And there is even no cause within reality for it seeming to be that and this is rather like the Christian Science doctrine of mortal mind, producing the era of suffering and physical existence. That it has no reality at all, and our seeing of it. Its seeming to be real again has no basis within the divine reality which is the sole thing that exists now this is an interpretation of Shankara which I believe to be fundamentally wrong. I don't believe that Shankara can correctly be interpreted as saying that the world of sensory experience which this to my mind a wrong interpretation

of his school identifies with Maya. I don't believe that this is the way he ought to be understood.

Maya, I can think of passages in Shankar where my yard is given a much more positive sense where the world is not to be considered. Identical with Brahman in the sense that it's not really there and Brahman is the only reality which exists. But rather, that the world is Maya is illusory only in the sense that we do not see it to be one with Brahman just as it is. The seeing of its one this with Brahman does not involve its disappearance and if it does then we've got not a non-dualistic doctrine a tall we've got an extremely dualistic doctrine. Because after all if there is the seeing of an illusion. Supposing you say what you see I. The illusion isn't really there but you can't deny the fact that you see it. And then if that seeing off it has no basis in reality if that in turn is an illusion and the illusion that one sees an illusion is an illusion then you've got a principle that is fundamentally distinct from the Supreme Reality, and in a way stands against it is not explained by it is not grounded in it and therefore this is a highly dualistic form of thought. And as a result all fundamental dualism is lead to. Consequences in feeling and in conduct which are world beating. And this is seems to me why there are trends in modern Hinduism to be excessively spiritual, to regard all sense knowledge as basically evil, in the sense of being fundamentally. And I mean fundamentally unreal.

And this in other words is what I want to educate about these trends in modern Hinduism which I do not feel are representative at all of either Shankaar's doctrine or the doctrine of the punishments upon which the whole tradition of Hinduism is based. Now then today I want to go on to the subject of Buddhism. Buddhism originates in India, somewhere between six and five hundred B.C.. There is always some conjecture about the exact dating of individuals at this time. But it was during this period that there lived a man called Gautama. And Guatama was the son of a king or perhaps tribal chief. Who lived very close to modern Nepal in the north of India. And Buddha is a title given to this man wasn't his proper name just as Christ is not as it were the son name of Jesus as when we say Jesus Christ we should correctly say Jesus the Christ Jesus the anointed one and in the same way one should say not Gautama Buddha but Gautama the but her for blood means an awakened one. A man who woke up. Who In other words,

you must understand this term within the whole Hindu tradition a man who is no longer spellbound by Maya, by the seeming separateness of all the things in this world. That's one of the forms of my yard. And so it would have is not a unique historical character. That can be and it is supposed that there have been, innumerable Buddhas.

But, the idea of it is related to the Hindu idea of an avatar. Which means an incarnation of the Godhead in human form. But is don't think of it as an incarnation of the Godhead. Because, they, although not rejecting the idea of a god or gods, relegate all gods to the world of my yard to the world of relative reality. And in this sense, it is felt in some way to be superior even to the gods let's put it in this way perhaps I'm a. You have seen what is a sort of fundamental illustration of the principles of Buddhism a diagram or map like thing called the wheel of life. And into death and versions of the wheel of life you will notice that the wheel is divided into six realms. And these six realms include human beings, gods or perhaps angels would be a better term for Devas. Spirits of Wrath called asuras, personifications of the destructive forces of nature. Animals. Then what are called naraka, or Purgatories. Preta, or tormented frustrated spirits with tiny mouths and immense that is having in other words immense appetite but very little means of satisfying it and then again humans. And the basic idea of Buddhism is that awakening Buddhahood can be attained only from the human state. Deliverance from the vicious circle which the wheel represents. Life considered as a vicious cycle. The gods are too powerful and too happy to concern themselves to be delivered. At the opposite extreme the people in the knockers the tormented souls in purgatory as it were are too miserable at the animals too damn they are sure those too angry the predators too frustrated. You can take this wheel as a matter of fact not as referring to any actual worlds other than ours of ghosts. All gods and Purgatories. But you can take these six realms as representing states of the human mind. And the human state as representing even mindedness what is called in Sanskrit the picture I can imitate. Now when it is said then that one can become a Buddha only from a human state it means you see that it brought us downs about the gods as being released from the wheel. In a very popular but as I'm of costs as in popular Hinduism. The idea of the wheel is taken rather literally it is in other words believed. That the individual passes from life to life. And is rather funny if that although

Buddhism actually denies the existence of an individual soul as an enduring reality. Nevertheless in Buddhist countries it is popularly believed that some sort of equivalent of the soul passes from life to life and that if your present life is miserable it is a result of foolish actions in the former life but if in this life you act wisely your birth in the next life is to be more fortunate and you may get up of cost to the heaven world of the world of the gods.

But human birth is the thing that is always regarded as most fortunate. Because you can be tied to the wheel not only by chains of iron, and that is to say by acting wrongly. You can also be bound by chains of gold. That is by acting wisely so as to inherit good fruit. Now, of course very sophisticated Buddhists not only in modern times but in ancient times did not take this idea of reincarnation literally. They looked upon it in quite a different way. And just as they regarded the six worlds as states of the human mind so they regarded reincarnation as something happening in this life. Those of you who've read T.S. Eliot's Four Quartets will remember the passage perhaps where he says. That those who have just left the platform of the station on a railway train are not those who will arrive at any destination. Those who in other words, walked in at the door of the Roman are now sitting down in chairs are not the same people as those who stepped in at the door. We are in other words, constantly changing. Just as we know physiologically speaking, that our bodies are, in all their molecular structure completely changed every seven years or so so that we are as it were not enduring entities but rather something like a university where the faculty in the students and the very buildings themselves may change completely within a span of years and yet somehow the university or something by way of a pattern, goes on.

And so in this sense, freedom from reincarnation would be by very sophisticated Buddhists interpreted as freedom from the illusion that the person who came in at the door is the same one now sitting in the chair. And that in its turn signifies freedom from an emotional habit the habit of grasping at one's own life. At seeking for continuity. And you see the idea of continuity in Buddhist philosophy is that we desire continuity in order to perpetuate our past. In our past in other words, we have accumulated various things experiences material goods knowledge but use power, so on. The desire for continuity is the desire for the perpetuation of a past self or

string of selves with which we identify ourselves. And, Buddhist insight involves the recognition that the past is perpetually vanishing. There really is no past to continue. And therefore to cling to it to identify oneself with it is to perpetuate an illusion resulting in incessant frustration resulting indeed in that very vicious circle which the symbol of the wheel represents.

Now Guatama made it very easy to summarize his teaching. He was really quite an addict in what we call name on ix in putting things in simple form so that they could easily be remembered. And he summed up the whole of his doctrine and what is called The Fourth noble truths. And although it becomes sometimes awfully boring to read fundamental. Text on but isn't much you just go over these things again and again I think it's only boring if one goes over them in a very formal way that these texts adopt really it's a very skilful outline of the nature of but as I'm and it's based on an old medical formula in ancient India, as in almost all ancient cultures. Every activity was ceremonial lives and when a physician came to pay his call he gave his diagnosis in a ceremonial way he made for pronouncements. The first pronouncement was the name of the disease. The second, the cause of the disease. The third, the curability of the deed to the disease. Can it be cured yes or no? And if it can be cured the fourth pronouncement is the giving of the prescription. And that's exactly the form of go to most summary of his doctrine. He said in other words the first principle is that mankind and indeed all forms of life suffer from a disease which is called in Sanskrit Dukha. And the most general translation of that word is suffering. To come in suffering in all its forms. Moral physical spiritual. But Western interpreters of Buddhism have sometimes represented him as saying that life is suffering period. In other words of enunciating a highly pessimistic and world hating doctrine that to be alive is to suffer and that in other words the amount of joy of positive pleasure in life. It is after all so negligible that the game is not worth the candle. Now, if one study is the method of teaching of sages in ancient India, you have to realize that one of their fundamental pedagogical gambits. Is. To arrive at their point of view they wish to inculcate. By is exact method, when we walk you know we put down maybe first the left foot then we shift to the right foot then the left foot then the right foot and in this way we go along neither to the left not of the right but straight ahead. And you find to that in thought. That the human mind tends to go from position to position but it always when it settles on

any fixed position we can always point out that that position is an extreme. For example, in scholastic philosophy in the Middle Ages whence and Thomas Aquinas fastened on the idea that God is fundamentally of being, a Buddhist philosophy would point out that he had settled upon an extreme that has an opposite nonbeing. And that therefore his position needs to be corrected by the opposite position somebody else will get up and say No no God is not being God is nonbeing. And from this facing of opposites with each other, we arrive at what Buddhism is sometimes called the middle way doesn't mean the compromise position. The middle way is the doctrine of relativity. Of showing that all positions or experiences which we can formulate, must always be perceived on known. By contrast with opposites.

So in other words, Buddhist doctrine that life is fundamentally do cause of suffering. Is an antithesis. Directed towards those people who believe that the object of life is to attain sukha, or sweetness, pleasure. He is saying in other words. You cannot experience pleasure except in reference to non pleasure. And therefore the more you pursue pleasure the more non pleasure will arise to frustrate you. The more you pursue permanence the more you will feel the empowerment of things. And so it is for after all when we are bent on enjoying ourselves we become at that very moment curiously aware of how rapidly time is slipping by when on the other hand we are not enjoying ourselves we become curiously aware of how time is dragging. So then Dukha, arising from an exaggerated pursuit of sukha, its opposite, becomes the basic characteristic of life. And he goes on to say in his second principle that the cause of this. Is Krishna or grasping sometimes translated desire and indeed I believe the word Trishna does underlie Etymologically the English word thirst. But Trishna is not quite desire for example one's appetite when your haven't eaten for some time and you get hungry this is not Trishna. It's a perfectly natural occurrence. Trishna is based in turn on. Which means unwisdom. Which is the way the Tibetan scholars around here Alex women like to translate it. It's good translation and wisdom of. A simple lack of insight, lack of consciousness, lack of well a special sense of ignorance not the ordinary sense of ignorance of not being informed but ignoring us. Action based on ignoring something. And ignorance is not realizing the relativity of experience is not realizing the inseparability of pleasure and pain existence and non existence life and death up and down good and bad. So that as a result of such ignorance, or

unwisdom, people try to separate these opposites from each other. To corral, to gain the good ones and to exclude and I have laid the bad ones. And as a result of that because these opposites exist mutually. They go around in circles and that mutual existence of these opposites is a really seems to me the basic meaning of the doctrine of karma which is involved in Buddhism the doctrine of conditioned action. Which put a miser in the phrase this arises that becomes. In other words, without this on the one hand this on the one hand always implies that on the other good on the one hand implies bad on the other and so on example. And so, if a person a person becomes involved in karma involved in conditioned action leading to a vicious circle if he is ignored of the into dependence of all states of experience.

So then the third truth the cure of this do cause. Suffering is the truth about Nirvana. Nirvana is most grossly mistranslated word in all foreign languages it's probably. Because we early scholars of Buddhism translated as annihilation and nowadays Nirvana means the state of being doped up to most people popularly used as being. In ecstasy in a kind of dreamy bliss. And your vomit doesn't mean not at all it's a state of being very, very wide awake. State of being completely aware. But the etymology of the word is disputed. There are several etymologies that you can offer and so I just choose the one I like. And that stew blowout. As when, having tried to hold one's breath you discover that you can't hold it you lose your breath by holding it therefore you expire you D. spy rate. And so you he have a sigh of relief. And so only advantage is the side of relief the expiration or desperation. In other words, the giving up of the attempt to clutch at life. To hold it in a fixed form to resist change to separate the good side of things from the bad side and I hate the bad side it is the giving up of that fundamentally contradictory self contradictory kind of conduct.

And so then in the fourth truth there is, set up the Noble Eightfold Path. But as prescription for to cause. And the Noble Eightfold Path is really in three divisions one of which concerns itself with understanding might almost say intellectual understanding of the doctrine. That one is concerned with conduct. And the third part of it is concerned with the state of consciousness or meditation. Now, to summarize them briefly one of the first stages of the path as a right view. Or I prefer to translate the word samyak, not so much as right. But as perfect in the Greek sense as telos or

complete. And, thus, to have a complete view, is a view which does not take sides, which takes the middle path. Which in other words, does not go off to extremes. And so, on the part of the eightfold path that is concerned with conduct of Buddhism is often represented as having a very exalted ethical system and this is true in a way it does. But also one must recognize the difference between Buddhism and Christianity as any rate as Christianity is ordinarily taught is that these ethical ideas are not commandments. They are really, forms of expedient conduct. The Buddha counseled his followers to take upon themselves sudden obligations they have not killing not stealing, and not exploiting the senses of not getting drunk or intoxicated with poisons, not lying. Because, not because these were against the will of God or against the fundamental laws of the universe but the. As they are inexpedient forms of conduct for a person who wants to wake up call if you get thought only doped up you're not liable to be very wide awake.

And then finally, the end of the path the last stages of it are concerned with one state of consciousness. With the being...the with the process of what is sometimes called meditation. Or of bringing one's mind to its maximum awareness through clear recollection. And then finally the attainment of what is called somebody which means integrated consciousness consciousness no longer under the influence of avidya. No longer bamboozled and fooled by the apparent separateness of things which are really inseparably interlinked. And thus samadhi could be called Integrated a unified consciousness in which it is seen that the subject of the now is inseparable from the object the known that man is inseparable from the totality of life and so on and so forth so that somebody at the end of the eightfold path might be described as being the entry to all realization the making real of the state of nirvana, which constitutes in time being a Buddha.

Daylight Savings Time and God

The last Sunday in September is the day when we go through the amusing ritual of putting our clocks back, and to revert what some people might call God's time. I say amusing. Because the practice of altering our clocks for saving daylight has always 'jiggled my funny bone just a little.' It seems a kind of way of fooling ourselves into getting up an hour earlier. Why don't

we just get up an hour earlier and let it go at that? Well I suppose in practice the idea of putting the clocks back has something to be said for it in the way of saving a reprinting of all the airline and railroad time tables. But it's very illustrative of ways in which human beings fool themselves. And it offers what I feel to be a very instructive parallel to a lot of argument that is going on these days about going back to the old time religion.

I've speculated a good deal about this, and I'm not at all sure why, in certain circles, there is so much talk going on about God. And there is a kind of flavor in this revival of the idea of God which I don't like, it's sort of sinister. People want to write into all sorts of documents that this country is under God. And in this idea of God of course there speaks the projection upon the cosmos of the benevolent despot, the great patriarch. Because of course, it's very convenient for people who want to play the part of benevolent despots and authoritative patriarchs to feel that they have some backing.

It is as I suppose. You feel a greater sense of authorization if you get up an hour earlier by doing so at the usual time through altering the clock. But the practice of changing the clock illustrative of another phase of this whole recrudescence of the idea of God. The patriarchal God. Because in going through all the various reasons which in the past twenty five or thirty years theologians have been advancing for reasons why God should be believed in, this kind of God should be believed in, I come across only one really dominant argument. That is to say, I've never found anybody yet in writing in modern times who has advanced what seemed to be any new simply logical reasons or metaphysical reasons for the belief in God. Most of these are simply repetitions of things that have been said hundreds of years ago.

Most of the reasons that are now advanced have to do with what an advantage it would be to human life and human society to believe in God. In other words, we have problems with juvenile delinquency. What a pity, if outside the Roman Catholic Church we cannot scare these children into good behavior by frightening them with ideas of hell and judgment. Or appeal to that sentiment by saying for example, look what your sins have cost to Jesus Christ, you put another nail in the cross. But it's a strange thing isn't it that sin has been running around in the world for an awful long

time and people did desperate depraved and horrible things. When the old time religion was in full swing. And one of the reasons why it nowadays we think the world is going to the dogs. Is that everything happens not only on a much larger scale, that everything happens within the sight of everybody that is to say there's so much news, there's so much communication. And you just slug someone in a back alley in San Francisco one night and it's all over the headlines in the morning. And therefore, the presence of evil is perhaps drawn to our attention more than it ever was before. But people very frequently say that the belief in God is necessary for preserving the dignity of man. In other words, if a man, say in the conception of the nature which is held by people we might call mechanists, if man is simply a piece of machinery. Of very complicated machinery which emerged as a result of the blind. Changes and processes of nature then he is qualitatively no more than a cow. Or any other domestic animal. He's just more complicated that's all. And therefore the argument goes, if human beings are only a mechanical cattle, and cattle are only very complicated chemical mechanisms, just as we exploit cattle, breed them impersonally, kill them when we want to eat them, and generally push them around. So also, if man is just this kind of thing there's no reason why we shouldn't just push him around there's no reason why we shouldn't gas millions of Jews if we find them inconvenient, and so on.

In other words, that the basis of the argument is, if man does not have some sort of guarantee beyond himself for his dignity, for the rights of his personality, then all chaos can break loose. And the Human being can be simply degraded, as indeed he has been degraded in modern times. But it seems to me a very very false and perhaps dangerous argument to say that the foundation for this dignity must be a belief in God. Because the believer in God will say no you must not humiliate human beings in this way. You must not despise human dignity, because man is a child of God. Every individual human being is the object of the love of God, has a special destiny planned for him by God, and therefore for this reason and on this authority, you must not treat human beings as if they were just machines are just animals.

This is similar to the argument frequently produced by Roman Catholics in commending the superiority of their form of Christianity to the various

forms of Protestantism. They always say, well, what you believe as a Protestant is simply a matter of opinion, and it's your own private judgment whereas a Catholic suspends his private judgment and believes because he also believes that he is bound to believe, it is an act of obedience. And this is an equally silly argument. Because it simply conceals the fact that to believe that you are bound to believe in something that you believe it's a matter of personal opinion and private judgment. It's an act of private judgment to accept the authority of the church. And in the same way, if we say the guarantee for the dignity of human personality is the existence of God, I'm going to ask then what is the guarantee for the existence of God? I suppose this is a know sort of sophisticated form of the child's question, if God made the world, who made God? But it really is rather a good question because you can answer nobody made God. God isn't made, and then the child can come back if he's smart enough well why couldn't you say the same thing about the world.

And so in the same way, when we say only God can be the guarantee only belief in God can be the guarantee for the proper treatment of human beings then we must ask again what is the guarantee for belief in God. And it's simply, in other words, a way in which we can kid ourselves into a certain forms of conduct by laying down a premise just as we kid ourselves into getting up early about changing the clocks. And while as I said, changing the clocks may be actually a practical idea because of the time tables and all the reprinting of stuff, it's very important to know what you're doing when you're doing it it's very important to know that you're just changing your standard of measurement and that you made the standard of measurement that the clock is your invention. And so in the same way, it should be important to realize that when people start talking about the need for belief in God again, this is just a gambit in the art of ruling. A gambit in the art of preserving law and order. Only, it seems to me in this case to be not so useful and in many ways to confuse the issue profoundly. Because it gets us into the strange state of mind which you find so often in discussing the problems of human conduct and thought, that people want to base their actions and their ideas upon some sort of authority. And it's strange this, for a Christian, because it said of Jesus that He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes. And to have authority is a very different thing from following authority. The scribes, you know, were the sort of people who

never said anything unless they could quote somebody else as having said it before some great and Rabbi of the past to whom time had given the kind of distance of divinity.

And in the same way, when we nowadays in our academic world get what is called an authoritative text, you may be sure that the author Orotate of text is absolutely jammed with footnotes nobody dared say anything without documenting it. But, in a deeper sense than that, people want to feel that certain forms of conduct, certain ways of life, are not things upon which they can safely embark unless they are in some way authorized. That is to say, unless they feel that this is in accord with the will of God, or if they don't believe in God In that sense they want to feel that it's in accordance with what is natural with what is in accordance with the laws of nature, or else it's perhaps with what is in accord with the opinions of a very celebrated person or with some other forceful and successful group of people. There's always this curious desire to found what one does and thinks on authority. To get, as it were some basis outside one's own judgement and one's own will for doing what you're going to do. And then of course, when it what you do is challenge either by other people or by life itself you can say well I, really I wasn't responsible I acted on authority, but without authority.

And so we can see how in this sense we kid ourselves by invoking and inventing reasons for what perhaps deeply we are going through what we want to do and we're going to do anyhow reasons which somehow seem to pass the buck, to shelve the responsibility on a higher shelf. At the same time, you might think that an argument of this kind would Come on naturally from a person who is simply an atheist. Who believes that the universe is a drifting process that is absolutely without any sort of authority behind it. And that man finds himself in this process and has to make the best of it that he can make. And this is the difficulty which I think today, very very many thoughtful people find themselves in. The notion of God, as presented by tradition whether Hebrew or Christian is utterly distasteful. But mechanistic atheism is equally distasteful. Because as a matter of fact both of them rest upon the same premises. The atheists, mechanistic universe, of course, not all atheists would be mechanists but very often they are. But that universe is based on the same premises as the universe of the

theist. Atheist and theist seem so often to be heads and tails of the same coin, acknowledging the same premises because both of them naturally look upon the universe as an artifact, a machine as an artifact only in the case of the atheist or what we might call the moon mystic naturalist the architect has disappeared and there is just left the machine. It's all part of this thing which I've mentioned occasionally our attitude of regarding the world as a collection of objects.

And we of course have justification for this in so far as looking at the world as object has been such a successful way of dealing with it we don't pray to the wind anymore. We don't speak to the rain or to the sun as if they were people we look upon them as objects, that is to say, just as not people. And of course as time goes on we know more and more objectively and scientifically about ourselves in our own minds we can regard ourselves as objects. And so indeed, we do get the depersonalization of man which the people who call for a return to belief in God or at least some of them are afraid of and we get this feeling of the Universe being hollow, empty, a rattling shell. An altogether impoverished affair, with no more any life in it it's all just hurrying atoms, as Whitehead said. Now, it's always seemed to me that the difficulty or one of the main difficulties with the Hebrew Christian idea of God is that it's much too specific. In fact, it's strange isn't it that many apologists for Orthodox Judaism or Catholicism or some sort of neoorthodox Protestantism, rather pride themselves on the specific character of their god and make fun of say Christian Scientists or new thought followers or liberal Protestants who have a very vague idea of God and they say oh these people are so we're really and so vague and so sort of the implication is that timid and haven't got the guts. Whereas we have a good strong definite belief. And they laugh about it and make jokes and have a great time, not realizing that it's precisely this specific idea of God as something not just unimaginable but having a nature which has been revealed, say through the character of Christ, or through the Scriptures or through the church, which is intelligible to man even if man can't know everything about it. But the difficulty you see with all these specific accounts of God is that on the very terms of a Jewish or Christian attitude to life then I don't address. They pretend to knowledge which nobody has the right to pretend to. They form a specific image in the mind of what God is. And that specific image in the mind is far more idolatrous than a specific

image sitting on an altar, because it is more persuasive. And therefore, it seems to me at the same time, that while we cannot lose while I cannot utterly reject every meaning that the word god has ever had. I at the same time feel still. That I want to be able to have at least a symbol. Which will embrace the concept of the totality. Or worlds. By that, I don't mean simply an additive concept, world plus world plus world, just the total collection. Because I don't think this world is a collection it's only a collection of things if in the first instance you have split it up into things in order to think about it. But if you think of the what a physicist might call the total field of phenomena, there's something that we can think about because we can't get our minds round it we can analyze it and measure it and so on and so forth but all we have is various projected systems of measures which we use in just the same way that we use the measure of time to chart the movements of life.

But time isn't up there. There isn't a kind of cosmic clock with calibrations on it. We invented it. But at the same time, the, I think of almost anybody of any sensitivity at all finds it hard to regard the total realm of physical nature as something which he can sort of shrug off and say well radioactive gas and machinery. Because it always makes us wonder there are various ways of wondering one way of wondering is to ask well, what explains it all? And that creates that kind of question in the mind which we call wonder. But that's not the only ground to wonder, Supposing I say well, perhaps to ask for an explanation of it all is the wrong question. That's only after all translating the history of what has happened into words. This is what we mean by an explanation. And explanations never fully explain because there's always more explanation that can be done more words that can be said, more events behind the events of history and so on and on forever and ever and ever.

What is also at the root of wonder is something perhaps more aesthetic is simply the admiration. The astonishment. That a world exists at all. And the realization that a great deal of it in fact, almost all of it, is something which influences us, rather than something which we influence. Now of course, if that is then something of which the world as an expression which we will just call X. Or, if we say energy like a physicist might say energy is a kind of devitalized word Strangely enough it means something mechanical like

electricity. But we don't know what it is. And part of our difficulty is that wherever we look, with our eyes, with our instruments, we find only the surfaces of things and the surfaces it within surfaces so that there's only one place where we as it were have a very intimate acquaintance with what existence is, and that is in us.

But it's a strange thing that at the very point where we have the most intimate acquaintance with existence it is the least susceptible to objective study, because it is too close it's the very middle of us. And it is there, in the unknown. and ultimately it unfathomable springs, of our life our action and our thought. That we are linked with. Whatever this X is, of which all the world is a manifestation. I don't want to say man... Manifestation is a curious word, because it sometimes suggests that. What is manifested. It's very different from that which is manifested. In other words, that while on the outside in the manifestation we see all the multiple and glorious variety of this world. What's on the inside must be somehow one instead of many, and therefore sort of an interesting live shapeless, something like wasn't it C.S. Lewis said tapioca pudding. Or Jell-O. or something like that. No, I only say manifested in the sense that there is a way, and we experience this way when we experience our own existence. In which the world is not accessible to our examination and our control in a very intimate deep way. And I would say it's there you see that our ingenuity stops. Not it doesn't stop at a dead halt it's slows down gradually as it penetrates deeper and deeper. And it's at this point that we could exclaim God, more perhaps as an exclamation of wonder than an affirmation of a theological proposition.

And I feel that it's profoundly important, not just to put out of mind the illimitable mystery from which we spring and from which we act. As something that just can be neglected. Because then indeed we do become what the theologians writely fear. We become inebriated with pride, we become cocky we become people who think that they can push the whole universe around and arrange everything just so and then we get into these enormous difficulties, like the Sorcerer's Apprentice who got hold of the magic, and didn't know how to keep it under control because he didn't have respect. He didn't proceed with a certain caution. And so, if anything it seems to me that the future of the idea of God will involve less definition and much more vagueness. And in this wakeness of clear delineation will

lie this strength and the difficulty to exploit it by people who just want to rule human beings.

Constitution of Nature

As I think it over it seems to me that the high civilisations of the world have produced exactly three different views of the constitution of nature, of the physical universe. And to enumerate them I would call them respectively, nature as a construct, nature as a drama, and nature as an organism. The first two, nature of the construct, has until very recently been characteristic of the Western world. The view of nature as a drama has been largely characteristic of India. And finally of nature, as an organism, has been characteristic of the Far East. I'd like to compare these three views and point out the certain of their advantages, disadvantages, and the ways in which they complement each other. And I think that was part of the interest of this is that our thinking more and more I've been fascinated by this, that are thinking about the world is strongly influenced by analogies. By, sometimes analogies that are almost hidden, so far back in the history of the thought of any given civilization or culture. That they have taken as something more than analogies, they are taken out almost you could say as logical patterns. And they are basic to our grammar, to our common sense, and to our attitudes, in ways that often go unsuspected.

Why don't we start with the Western view of the world as a construct? By this I mean, the the the physical world has historically in the west been looked upon as a created or manufactured article. The work of a creator external to the world, and this view has continued in many ways even after the rise of deism in the eighteenth century and the general tendency of the scientist to dispense with the hypothesis of the Creator, the idea still remains that the world is a construct analogous to a machine, and indeed obeying laws all plans in the same way as a machine obeys a blueprint. Even though the law giver and the planner himself seems to have disappeared. The basic metaphor though, underlying this is not so much the machine. As the work of clay the pot or the sculpture, of the modeled figure. For as you know it is said in the book of Genesis that the lord God created Adam out of the dust of the ground and breathed the breath of life into his nostrils.

And so our language, our poetry is full of all of allusions to the fact that we are really after all clay. Imperial Caesar dead, and turned to clay. Might stop a hole to keep the window away. And because of this figure, it is as I have often said come to mental to our common sense. But the world is formed matter. The forming the shape of the pot, the matter being the clay. And thus, we think of life as being basically. Something done to a medium the medium is stuff, a kind of ominous and inert self in out and unintelligent goo, which requires an external agency to give it form and intelligence and life. And naturally because we have thought this way for so long it's a terribly difficult idea to abandon to get out of I had the notion. That, in the same way that tables are made of wood and houses of stone.

So we tend to think that trees made of wood and mountains of stone and people are flesh and all of it eventually reducing itself to the primordial goo that the universal Clay the primal matter, the formless original water over which the Spirit of God is said to have moved in the beginning of all time. Now, beyond the idea of the world as a work of pottery lies the most sophisticated idea of the world as a mechanism. In this western view of the world as a construct. As soon as men began to understand mechanical principles, it became extraordinarily convenient to make analogies between various types of machinery, and things to be found in the world. And it is really upon this analogy, that the great achievements of Western technology have hitherto been based. And, it's really very difficult to think that we could have devised our technology and that our practical sciences could have made such progress. Without the idea of the analogy between the world and a constructed machine. You see, one of the most fundamental things about a machine is that it is an assemblage of parts. And, the successful measurement and description of nature depends upon the calculus, upon reducing it to parts. You know the word calculus originally meant pebbles, and pebbles were one of the oldest methods of calculating. Counting pebbles. In a funny, kind of association of words, calculus is also calculating, in the sense of having a calculating attitude. Scheming. And scheming is associated with turning things to calculate. It is a sort of killing the world, reducing it from the living to the dead, from the organism to the machine. But nevertheless, it has had the most marvelous consequences so far as we are concerned and the cultures which thought of nature by analogy with drama and by analogy with the organism did not produce the

technology that we in the West produced. Let me just for a moment, contrast the attitudes. The Indian attitude of the world as a drama. In Hindu thought, the world is not thought of as being made or constructed by God, but as being actually God himself playing a game. The idea of one single divine actor who is playing all the parts of all the creatures in the world imagining himself to be them. To see me as it were, myriads of masks behind which there is simply one where of the mask.

In a forthcoming book, the second volume of the masks of God is not published yet but I've seen a copy of Joseph Campbell. Contrasts the way in which the myth of the one who became to the one that became many, has gone into quite different directions beginning in ancient Sumeria, which constitutes as it were a sort of cultural watershed. It has flowed eastwards in one way and westwards and another to the east the idea that the one the Godhead in other words split itself. And dismembered itself into many parts quite voluntarily, and thus became the world as a play. To the west, the theme of the one who became many is different because, as he points out in the book of Genesis it is not the divine who becomes male and female it is the creature. In the Upanishads say the breed had the long ago punishment of the divine self. Is. Described as have a saying in the beginning of time let me become two and he splits into male and female and thus generates the world but in the book of end of Genesis it is not the Godhead who splits it is man the creature who is split into Adam and then into Eve.

But thus in the Eastern world we have the dramatic view, in India in particular. And although it's interesting to note that in say in the writings of the great philosopher Shankara and others the or very often encounter the analogy of the potter, or of pots as representing the world the roles are reversed. The it is the clay is used as the symbol, for the divine reality. Just as pots are all made of clay or as jewels or all made of gold. So, all things in the world are of one divine substance which is of the nature of the Godhead, or Brahman. Is interesting, the different use of the simile. And so, from the standpoint of the dramatic view of the universe, all the divisions and distinctions of the world are looked upon as being a kind of as if. They are in play, they are not quite serious. And this contrasts very sharply with what has been the characteristic Western view the distinctions in the world are the most important things about it. That they are deeply serious. The

distinction for good and evil is an eternal distinction as is the distinction between the creator and the creature. The world in this view is not a drama. It is played not by actors, but by what we call real individuals even real persons although funnily enough as I suppose you know the word person is originally persona. The megaphone mask worn by actors in classical Greek drama.

Then thirdly, there is the organic view characteristic of China. In this there is no real thought of there being a divine creator or a divine actor behind the world. But rather the world is thought of as being self-moving and self-creating. The word for nature in Chinese means what is of itself so. When, in the West, a child asks its mother. Who made me? And she replies darling God made you and the child asked But who made god. She has to say nobody made God. And that is a great puzzle to the child who thinks of the world as a construct. And, it may be explained to the child if you like, that god makes himself, he exists off him self because he is existence. To put it in more theological language, he has the attribute called Say it. From the Latin OS A by himself.

Perhaps, some kind of off on telly but would ask the question well if that's true of God Why couldn't it be true of the world in the first place? Why did you have to make that additional step in the first place? If he did so he would be thinking more or less in the Chinese way. Which does not think of the world either as an artifact of some make all as a mosque or appearance warm by some sort of deeper reality. He doesn't, in other words, have a two level view of nature, as an appearance underneath which there is something else to explain it. He sees it all rather as self evident. As being something which regulates itself. And indeed alters itself. There is a sudden sense you see in which the Chinese view is fundamentally Or you could almost call it anarchical. Or if you don't like that word, you could call it democratic. A world which is self-governing. Not even through a president. But self-governing in every way a great and colossal an it because which moves itself in the same way as you and I move our fingers. Without directing them in the sense that we know exactly what we are doing and how we move them. We don't.

Now, I've said that the Western view is probably what made it possible for us to develop our highly advanced technology. By thinking about the world as a construct. We could think about the laws or principles, or plans, or regularities upon which it was based. We could think for example, of the calculus, of number, as the basic characteristic of the law upon which nature is based. By doing that, we caught on to the idea of thinking of all things as reducible to atoms to parts, to bits. And then by thinking of bits, we found that we could measure the world very accurately, describe its regularities very accurately. And that gave us an astonishing degree of control over it.

But this is a point of view which is successful to a certain degree. It goes well up to a certain level after which it begins to develop complications. One thing, you could say, it has complications which of psychological on the one hand and practical and technical on another. From a psychological point of view, it's complication is that when it becomes common sensical to us to look at the world as a mechanism, we begin as humans, as people capable of feeling and love, to feel the external world rather alien to us. Yes, it's a machine. It's a great big automatic mechanical arrangement. Which, in essence, is simply stupid energy. We thereupon feel that it has nothing in common with ourselves, and perhaps even though we try to give the same sort of account of ourselves, and try to reduce our brains and emotions to some kind of neurological computer mechanism, that makes us in a way hate ourselves. Because soon as we start thinking of ourselves as automata, we begin ethically and psychologically treating ourselves as automata. We lose respect for ourselves and thereupon feel that what is central to us the feeling center of the person is trapped in a cosmos that is a mechanical night to match foreign and strange. We can see ourselves as a kind of ghastly accident. And I don't wonder that this engender has certain kinds of suicidal tendencies in our culture. So much for the psychological point of view. From the technical point of view, the analogy of nature with mechanism develops its own disadvantages after a certain point. That is to say, the disadvantage of trying to manage the physical universe as if it were indeed a an assemblage of separate parts or separable parts. The first sort of person to notice this mistake would be the extreme subject law medical specialist. Who knows for example. All about hearts or about stomachs but they're little about brains or lungs. And who treats one or going at a time and becomes unaware of the imbalances inflicted upon other organs by

what he's done to the organ in which he specializes. Also in the same way, the specialist always tends to see the units of nature and to be unaware of that connection is all relationships, which are after all inseparable relationships with all the other parts.

There is you might say also, another technical disadvantage again which develops them in the course of time to this particular mechanical analogy. And that is, that when you begin to rely more on more upon minute and careful description of the world. For dealing with it, and that of course involves the reduction of the world to describable units it. The world then becomes terribly complicated, and it becomes increasingly difficult to keep track of all the minute units that you've described. Hence the difficulty of specialists in the various sciences communicating with each other and the difficulty of the scientific specialist in communicating with the layman. The whole thing becomes much too complicated to manage. And this then means that. The more we know, the greater our skill in managing the world as a mechanical construct, the more difficult it becomes to control because it becomes increasingly complex. We talk endlessly about the increasing complexity of political, social and economic affairs which makes the problems of the world increasingly unintelligible to even the average well-educated citizen.

Now, it has been suggested that the Western view, nature as a construct, has in some ways done its job. And that from here on we need to explore to a greater degree, other views, perhaps the organic view of the Chinese where in we get a became really a harmony of points of view with our own sciences biology, ecology, and so forth. As if somehow this view had been tucked away in a store cupboard, waiting for us to be available at just the time when we needed it. The problem here is an entirely new one, because we're so used to thinking of our problems of controlling and understanding the world in terms of the methods of mechanical science.

Not so long ago, I was talking to Lyn White, who used to be president of Mills College, and he was saying that our academic world, values only three kinds of intelligence whereas it is said there are many more that at least seven I don't remember what all the seven were but he said that the kinds of intelligence that we value our first of all mnemonic. Which is the

ability to remember. Computational intelligence, the ability to figure. And verbal intelligence the ability to read write and talk. But he said there is also social intelligence. And that is also kinesthetic intelligence. A kind of intelligence, kinesthetic, in which we learn as children to walk to run and throw and catch balls and to do all kinds of acts dreamily complex and very subtle actions without being able to describe, or counts what we are doing. Perhaps, in handling far more complex matters, and catching balls, or skiing, or riding bicycles we may have unknown resources of kinesthetic intelligence for dealing with some of the problems that now face us. Here is the germ of an idea, which Chinese culture and Far Eastern culture in general suggest to us. Perhaps they themselves have only dimly begun to explore these things, but I think that it's in that direction that the future of practical philosophy and government of the world may lie.

Buddhist Mysticism

Just this month a new book has been published by Dr D.T. Suzuki called *Mysticism, Christian and Buddhist*. I'm not intending to devote this program to in review of this book as such but I call attention to it. Incidentally, it's published by Harper's in New York for three dollars and fifty cents. But I rather want to call attention to a particular theme, with which the book deals with will seem of a peculiar type of Japanese mysticism I suppose you'd call it, associated primarily with the title put design which is caution Shinju. Should issue are to know it by another name God of our land but isn't is one of the most popular forms of Buddhism in the Far East.

Spreading over China Japan found Tibet, originally had some following in India. But has undergone a very marked and special type of development in Japan. And what makes it so popular is that in contrast, or apparent contrast I should say with other forms of Buddhism, it stands as a kind of easy way, as distinct from a difficult way. In Japanese technical terms the two types of Buddhism are respectively called Jiriki and Tariki. Now Ji means one's own are self and means other and Riki means power and so the schools of Buddhism which call themselves Gili. Are ways of Deliverance which one follows by one's own will one's own power one's own strength. Whereas on the other hand the, type of Buddhism called tariki, is where you rely on the

power of another and this other is usually speaking. If I may put it in somewhat mythological terms. A great supra-mundane Buddha. Known as M E Tara in Japanese as Amidha. And the story goes that in incalculable ages in the most distant past this great Buddha made a vow. That he would not enter into the state of complete Buddhahood. Until. Any human being upon the face of the earth who pronounced his name in phase would after his death be reborn in the Western paradise of which we target presides. And find Larry in. Far greater ease of spiritual development of awakening of the coming of border than is to be found on the face of this difficult earth.

And all this of course to rise from the ancient India Indian idea that the present the park of the world's unfoldment is the darkest of dark ages, called the Kali Yuga. And in the Kali Yuga, or the Mapol is scholars it is peculiar only difficult. To advance towards any kind of spiritual development because it's an age of decadence the end of which will witness the total destruction of the world prior to its remaining manifestation and some future time. And therefore, the story goes on to say that this great Buddha, did, in course of time, attain to complete put up with. Signifying fact that his vow is fulfilled and that any. One who simply repeats the formula Namita higher in Sanskrit or in Japanese now. Which is roughly translatable in English as the name of Amitabha Buddha. Or Namu who is used in the formula is used in Sanskrit or Japanese somewhat as the French say Nandan Nandan are they just same name. Meaning hail I suppose in English we have no real equivalent of it.

And the idea is that anybody who repeats the name of the Buddha Amitabha in perfect faith. Will without any other effort, any other kind of spiritual endeavor on his own part. However evil however it prayed he may be. He will be reborn after death in this spiritual state in which the task of becoming a Buddha is rendered so easy as to be as we should say in perfect cinch. And of course all commentators on Buddhism say Well this of course is how religions degenerate. They become popular, pie-in-the-sky selling organizations. Where absolutely nothing is required of the faithful except an occasional contribution and the easier you make it in contrast to the other sects which make it more difficult for more people of luck to your following out of the contributions will be and it all ends up with the

pressure we all well all you have to do is make the thing revalue don't even have to think about it and incalculable supernatural merits all start up on your behalf.

But it's very dangerous to jump to conclusions of the sky about this type of Religious or spiritual manifestation, because in practice the Shin school of Buddhism has had some of the most remarkable adherents. And produces a type of personality which is known in Japan as a Miokonen. Literally translated Miokonen means a wonderful and fine man. That's just a literal translation with doesn't at all convey the sense of this kind of personality of them are common. But the Miokonen A man likes in run him self cool found in the shins school of brothers and in Japan is a man who has in a way, understood the profounder meaning of the doctrine of the school. And perhaps before I talk about the personal characteristics of the Miokonen. I should try and indicate. What may underlie what may be the deeper meaning, of this seemingly, decadent highly popular and easy form of Buddhism.

Perhaps the best way to do this is by means of the critique, which this particular school uses against those who follow the other way will follow the way of Jiriki or self power. The followers of the sions coom would say, that a person who attempts to make spiritual progress by his own efforts is betting against the worst possible obstacle to any progress at all. And that is that in thinking that he can do it himself he is like a person trying to lift himself up by his own bootstraps Or to put it in another way, he suffers from the pride of imagining that his own will, his own energy is sufficient to change himself. After all, if he needs changing at all, it is precisely the character in the motivation of his own will and his own energy that needs changing. And how is this change going to be achieved by that very will win so stands in need of change. To put it in the more usual language of the school of thought, they say that the average human being is so weighted down by karma. That is if we put it into more modern terminology we would say, he is so fundamentally conditioned by his upbringing, by his social environment, by the temptations of the world, the flesh and the devil, there's really nothing he couldn't do to make himself any better and everything that he does do is simply a manifestation of the same conditioning masquerading like a wolf in sheep's clothing. Therefore, if the

human being cannot transform himself. If used to be transformed at all, he must rely on some power greater than his own.

Now of course, this other power may be represented, figuratively speaking, like we represent God in the Christian tradition as a spiritual entity off force or intelligence quite out of them and apart from man or it may be represented on the other hand as other than us in just the same way look at the functioning of our own bodies the beating of the heart of the operation of the lungs goes on quite independently of the conscious will and his other in that sense although in another sense those unconscious and automatic or spontaneous functioning of our organism could be understood as Ma fundamentally and truly ourselves than the things that go on in our other superficial consciousness and if you interpret it in that latter way, the idea of how to keep our reliance on the power of another is really a reliance on something deeper in yourself than yourself is consciousness, and that I think is the sense in which the profound the followers of the school of Buddhistic thought to understand doctrine. So the Miokone, As I said literally the wonderful fine fellow, is the kind of personality which this doctrine in Genesis Now what is he he's the kind of person, who has realized through and through the fallibility of his own humanity is the kind of person who knows himself far away who has a rather wry and humorous view of his own own, shall we say his own high motivations and ideals. He knows himself thoroughly for the rascal that he is and doesn't pretend to be anything.

And this. If that were all the word to it is a very likable former fellow from my point of view. I always feel uncomfortable with people who don't have this realization of their own inherent rascality the people at pretensions to holiness and righteousness, who are so deceived as not to know that in their heart of hearts they are after all rapacious and selfish human beings. But the Miokonen makes no bones about this. He knows that's what he is and he knows that by the exercise of his own will and his own intention and his own conscious effort, he can't be anything else. And so there is in him a kind of fundamental honesty and sincerity from the start.

And, what he goes on to be beyond this is something a little different. Because a Miokonen is called a marvelous fine fellow, because somehow or

other he does seem to transcend the ordinary kind of human rascality to become. A truly unselfish. A truly human being loving others, understanding others, sympathizing with others, a wonderful compassionate man. Because he has been unable to love himself, to accept himself in the profoundest possible way. For if you translate it into more modern and less symbolic language this idea. That by the mere repetition of a formula, by the mere act of faith in the power, a transcendent Divine Being, one is able to be saved or made a Buddha or perfected just as you are by an act of magic which lifts you up and transfers you to another realm.

If you were to translate that as I said, into a more contemporary way of talking. It would be to say something like this. That the intent of the symbology is to say that the condition of growing, psychologically and spiritually, is to let yourself and alone, and not to fight against what you are. The more you try to make yourself great. To make yourself unselfish, to make yourself loving, you are simply tying yourself psychically into a knot, a kind of paralyzed state, which makes it impossible for you to be anything except as we might say all balled up. But if on the other hand, you let go of yourself and do not try to change yourself, you relieve yourself from this inattention, you as it were, unblock the conduits of psychic energy within yourself by not straining on and are therefore enabled to grow naturally like a tree or a plant. And this is exactly the attitude of the Miokonen.

I think that one of the most fascinating of these characters as one who as a matter of fact did not actually belong to the Shin school of Buddhism. Although he as in many ways entire. The same spirit because of room there is not so much difference between this profound understanding of the Shin school and other types of Buddhism such as Zen. Zen is ordinarily understood to represent the extreme of the jiriki way, of fighting along by one's own strength. But the intent of the jiriki emphasis of Zen, the self-powered, the willful, driving sense is something like this. To exert one's will to the utmost in order to realize its futility to make the most desperate attempts to change one's motivation and once conditioning in order to discover that in the last analysis it can't be done and it is this and that it is merely the futile struggle to lift yourself up by your own bootstraps.

And so, as a result of this, the jiriki form but as I'm producing very often the same type of personality as the Tariki. And one of the most marvelous examples of the Spirit is a monk or I'd rather call him a hermit and poet by the name of Riokan, who lived between seventeen fifty eight and eight hundred thirty one. A man who is extraordinary in all the annals of sainthood and sanctity. For the reason that everybody loved him I don't think he had any enemies at all, and this is really a very remarkable achievement. After all, it's so easy to be so holy that you are a challenge to the world, and everybody feels uncomfortable in your presence feels an accused by your sanctity and given a bad conscience and result the result of that you get loathed, you make all sorts of enemies and finally you get crucified.

But it's really a very remarkable achievement indeed to be all that and lovable and top. To be without enemies, the friend of everybody, and yet. Involving absolutely no compromise with one's integrity and honesty. Such a man was Riokan, really marvelous. And many, many stories are told about him and I think these anecdotes about him describe his personality more delightful than anything I could say by way of a character analysis or comment in that fashion. First of all it was to be understood that the Miokonen, or the type of person like real can is one who has truly become again as a child. He's not seen a whole he's not in second childhood in that sense but a person who is really full of a genuine wonderful life. Who has some accepted himself some let go of him self is so you're not pretending to be anything gives himself, no airs and graces that he can relax and be perfectly natural and so the story is told. That one day in Riokan was going along baking is food and he met friend invited him to spend the night at his home. Well, in the room where he stayed it was a picture of a tiger egging on the wall. And real can look for a long time in the picture and was so intrigued by it that after a while he came to feel that he himself was a tiger and he fell to the floor and all running around on all fours he growled at the tiger in the picture he said and the Tiger seemed to look at him and answer him you know can again shout. And the Tiger seemed to answer and appeared to be going to approach him. And Riokan getting a great deal of fun out of this game repeated it many times. But just then a maid of the house. Appeared. And was quite astonished when she saw the priest on the spot. For a moment she didn't understand what had happened and was very

frightened and then she recognised him oh Rio comes up so it is you who frighten me so much what are you doing there. Startled by I have voice real can't stop his game of imitation and shamefacedly spoke to her on his knees. Did you see what I was doing he asked you did oh that annoys me very much about good mate please keep it a secret otherwise I would not to do will know what to do for people will think I'm crazy.

And then there's another story which tells of. A certain party who came to the little hermitage where he lived in the mountains. Bringing a letter from one of his friends. And just at that moment real count was absorbed. And trying to juggle his big bowl on the top of the pole. When the messenger called out and delivered his letter real can stop his juggling for a brief interval glanced over the letter and wrote his answer. The Baron made his departure. And Riokan resumed his play his bone time after time slipped down to the floor but again and again and set it up on top of the pole many hundred times that he struggled to accomplish this feat. And after some time the messenger returned Riokan was so engrossed in his play that he felt annoyed at this interruption and did not pay any attention to his visitor. While the boy waited for some time and finally called out in a large voice real grandson I look here what does this answer mean my master is angry with me and has ordered me to ask you to take back the letter you wrote before and give me your real answer please do. Riokan had pity on the intruder and opened the letter he had written only a short time before and what was his surprise when he read. The bone turns round round. He broke into laughter, Oh dear me excuse me I made a mistake exclaimed. He then wrote another letter. But as his mind was filled with thoughts of the bowl and into play the answer didn't come easily. The great delight of real was playing with children in the village when he went down to make his food. And one fine autumn day when he was going quietly through the village he was suddenly disturbed by the sound of a voice. Apparently coming from a persistent tree. And turning his eyes to the place where the sound came from he's discovered a boy clinging in great fright to the top most branches and crying for help. Oh wait a moment my boy he said I'll help you down and then I'll pick some of the fruit for him. Riokan brought the boy safely to the ground and then began to pick the coveted fruit. He plucked one percent when Mom was about to hand it to the child when he decided that it would do well to taste it first, in order to give away the very best the first

persimmon was therefore thrust into his own mouth. How sweet he exclaimed he picked another and again stuffed it into his mouth. Good and again and again Simmons found their way into his mouth accompanied by the exclamation. Sweet our sweet. Meanwhile, the boy was waiting with open mouth at the foot of the tree, growing more desperate every moment. Riokan, last in rapture over the percent had entirely forgotten. Only when the boy shouted out in. Riokan to him selfe. Oh dear me he said Pardon me do forgive me I shall pick the best for you now the very best of all and as many as you like. Saying this Riokan dropped persimmons to the boy one by one all red am very sweet.

And then there was once someone told him that if you picked up money on the road it made you feel very happy. So, one day as he was traveling back to his home it if you thought he would try it and see what it was like. Accordingly, took some of the kindness which he had begged from the villagers and let them drop to the ground he didn't pick them up one by one but though he did this many times, he didn't experience any particular feeling of driveway I can't understand it he said They tell me that it is pleasant. Surely they wouldn't deceive me. He tried it again and again but always without and it was out. In the process of dropping and picking up his money he gradually lost all you had in the grass kind of a long time he had to search for the money, but he found it at last, and then when the crowd joy he exclaimed. Ah understand now to find money is certainly a delight. And once, when he was invited to stay in the home of some friends, they had to go out. And they asked him to watch the house and he got kind of sleepy. Cap was going to sleep on. Suddenly heard a funny noise, he thought it was a cat but there was the cannot sleep on his lap What was that Sam. You still need to the paper screen which separated the verandah from his run and peeped through it with childish curiosity. And there in his room, he saw a shabbily dressed man searching in a chest of drawers and taking clothes out of it. All he's a sneak thief thought really count. Of course Riokan didn't want a thief to take clothes from his friend's house. So he made up his mind to frighten the robber and drive him away. And therefore crash into the room and stand behind the thief. And the robber, utterly ignorant of this, went out of the WRONG with a packet of clothes and hastened into another room to look for Mott and Riokan follow stealth any stepping always about ten feet behind him and when the robber turned to the left he also quickly

went to the left and if the thief turned of the right real can do the same always just behind him another slight turn brought the robber almost in Riokan's direction but the priest was so quick that the thief didn't see him. It seemed a real count as if you were playing a game plan and, so absorbed had he become in the game, and before he knew it the thief had slipped away with a stolen package increased suddenly came to himself and realized what a serious mistake you made.

But his concern was not so much over the last thing his heart was full of pity for the feet. As he thought of his shabby clothes sad face. Late in the evening when the family returned them are full of dismay and they saw what happened but you can't just. Sat in silence and smile as usual. And among his written effects was found as curious little document. It just said, favorite things, cotton cap, how paper than money ball and marbles. Necessities: bamboo hat, gloves, stick, well. Things for travel some clothes and oil cake a bowl in the back don't forget to read this before stuff. Otherwise you will suffer from want.

He liked to smoke too. He was very fond of tobacco. And he always had a shabby old skin tobacco pouch which he kept his tobacco in very often it was empty and he would go out on the streets with his tobacco pouch tired at the end of a long stream down his back. People knew at once what he meant when they saw the power dangling behind him he would hasten to finish the tobacco. Among other things Riokan very famous as it can be great for years and writing was great it promised. And it was a bar to who used to go to be a. Very much wanted a specimen of his writing to hang on a crack in one of the hanging scroll as was not real congress wouldn't get that. Well one day. In the middle of shaving his head in the bar stopped and left him and said Now I want to go on finish saving unless you give me the piece of writing I want so immediately real can write it for him. And then the barber finish shaving him the mother couldn't read and some days later when somebody who could read came into his shop said Why this inscription is incomplete there's a well missing so next time we'll count came by. The Bible said but you didn't write the full inscription or no I know he said I didn't write the full inscription because you didn't shave all of my hand the missing work you'll find I've written the same inscription to put the missing word in twice at the home of an old widow who always

gives me extra bean curd when I needed. Such, by anecdotes, is the temper of a man who is profoundly at home in the world. And difficult to think about, difficult to talk about. Because, to praise such a character is to tempt one, to imitate him. And one can only imitate him by not doing so at all, but by being just completely oneself.