

Sunday, September 4, 1938

Let me first express my pleasure in being here with you again. I see many faces that I have seen before, and so it is not as coming to a strange place, but coming back in a sense to one of our homes. Let me also express our appreciation to those who have prepared this place, and especially to those who have given us the music. I particularly enjoyed it today, and you are particularly fortunate here in having such a rich group of musicians.

We come to you always dealing with one subject. Regardless of the titles which we may give to lectures or classes, it centers around one thing. I will say a word first to make clear, if possible, just what that one thing is. It is not simply a matter of bringing to you more information. Our resources today for the gathering and the dissemination of information are very well developed. Perhaps never within the range of our history have they been so well developed. Through the universities and the libraries and the hosts of speakers you can gather all the information you want in any direction, provided you put forth the necessary effort to understand. Nor are we concerned with the resources, for they are enormous and well developed, but we are concerned with something that is relatively very greatly neglected, and that something is the transformation of consciousness. This does not mean simply increasing the knowledge or the experience which you may have as you now are, but it means changing yourself, becoming transformed as a conscious being so that your whole relationship to the sum total of all the universe and the subject is changed. Now, many words may help to make this meaning a little clearer, without your first becoming transformed, but only by in some measure realizing just what happens to consciousness when it has passed through transformation can alone give you an understanding of what is implied.

I speak not simply as a student of this subject. I have been a student for many years. Many years ago I found evidence that there was something which could not be reduced to our ordinary knowledge form; something that could not be learned in the schools; and yet the evidence was very strong that this something was important because there were men and women throughout history here and there who have revealed this something other than knowledge. I became so interested that I made a search for it, naturally groping first. I was then not aware intellectually as to a clear idea of what it was I was seeking, and while at last with it came success, it took twenty-four years, but I succeeded in proving the reality of the thing I then suspected from the evidence that existed.

Now it is true that none of you can know this otherness of consciousness without yourself realizing it, but we can bring to you perhaps that evidence that builds a strong presumption that it is there, and that it is valuable. Now I have run into a difficulty that has become very apparent in the past two years, and that is that in my use of language I do not seem to be very intelligible at times and it doesn't matter whether I use Anglo-Saxon words or words that are Greek or Latin derivatives - entirely apart from it - because the terms are used in a way which evidently is not familiar. It is in a way experiencing. Oftentimes I seem to myself to have found a very simple ~~expression~~ ^{experience}, and then when I see a blank face I wonder what the trouble is and I have to, with some difficulty, recall an older point of view and bring up my own difficulties to see why it is. I think I may have something that will help. Concerning words ... by the word I mean concept, language, as a means of conveying something to another.

Now ordinarily this language is implied to express that which lies below its own level. In other words, in dealing with a material that is objective - objective is like things, like states, like concepts, things that stand out apart from the individual, as the conscious center, and the ideas or the words refer to these contents, experiences and so on in a method which you may call representation, and we say a system of ideas is true if it in some sense has a correct correspondence with the external or objective reality. I might say "That object on the wall is a mirror." I have made a judgment in terms of words which corresponds to something that is perceived by me through the eye, through the sense of sight, and I think most of you would agree that the statement is correct and therefore in the ordinary sense of the word true. In other words, there was a correspondence in the idea, group of words, and the external or objective reality. Words are built up with that usage in mind.

There are two other ways of using words. In one sense it is used on its own level, and in this case we have pure thought, and only a very few specialized individuals work with the word in that sense. But, there is a third sense, the rarest of all, and that is where the word is used to convey a meaning that is above its level. Now this meaning is not a content such as the object seems a content of consciousness. It is something else. It corresponds more to what we may call a state, [^]quality in consciousness, so when we use words, sentences and so on referring to these values, as in art or music, that are not objective, we have to employ a medium that was not designed for the purpose we are using it for. That gets us in difficulties right away. When we use words in this sense it is not something that represents something else. It is rather a symbol, and

in speaking in that metaphysical sense the words and forms are to be regarded as symbols. Now one could use another meaning^s. I could use any one of the arts for serving the same purpose. The life lived often is the instrument used, so that individuals who are defective in capacity of verbal expression become a force through their lives lived, a power that tends to change men through what they manifest through their own particular experience; something that can touch the consciousness of the individual that hints or points toward something outside of his present range of consciousness. Thus the symbol of which I am speaking is not a sign, (as for instance the individuals may be a sign - begin to search } but it is something that tends to transform consciousness, like a catalytic agent. Now again I am using words that may be unfamiliar to some. Catalytic agent, as you may know, some of you know, is a substance or something else used in chemical reaction; certain reactions will take place only in the presence of this substance, but the substance does not enter into^{the reaction}. The symbol, whether^a word, a painting, a musical composition prepared by a musician, or what-not are the^{objectively} subjectively seen system.(?). Many of you, I know, are familiar with that something which operates upon consciousness to change its nature, and such real symbols never can be understood in the ordinary sense of the word. They would not be beyond the present level of consciousness if you could understand them more than partially. You may understand them a little, and that is necessary, but as effective transforming symbol pries in to another state of consciousness which you must become, which you cannot understand in the sense of being apart from it and then learning what it means. Now, as very often, I use ... those of you who have used the Aphorisms - taken as a symbol - you will find that it tends to transform the consciousness to the level from which the words were spoken.

Now our work is primarily grounded in this function of the word.

We make use of information, but the information will ^{used as} be illustrations, ^{will not} and we attempt to demonstrate what cannot be demonstrated from the basis of current knowledge, but we will try to prepare the consciousness to see that it is possible, and then you must be ready to become different.

We come, not simply casually, but because there is a great need. We come not simply to those that are gathered in this room, but to them and through them as far as may be, in meeting any need that is massive. I might state this in this way. Very largely this humanity, but especially our Western humanity, has become enormously taken up with the objective side of consciousness; enormously engaged in the relations, the acquisitions of the particularly objective side of consciousness. Now I am not condemning, please understand this, I am not condemning the objective side of consciousness as such. We will see that it is a necessary component of the sum total of ordinary consciousness, but the onesided attachment to the objective side of consciousness leads to certain results that become dire ^{in their effects}. Perhaps you have heard this spoken of as materialism. That is another way of approaching it, but if we take it in psychological terms, the essence of materialism is a state of consciousness of man being bound to the object in a more or less exclusive sense.

There is something in us which we call our own Self-Identity. You may call it "I", or you may call it "the Consciousness Principle", and that has its peculiar capacity, though it can be shifted, something like a shuttlecar, in the play of consciousness between the objective and subjective through many intermediary positions. When the consciousness is extremely attached to the object this Self-Identity becomes one with the object, and then we have the habit of

identifying ourselves with that which we experience, which we possess and so on, and all of the limiting circumstances attached to the object, to experience, to things, are assumed by us. Consciousness in that position, for instance, cannot be sure of what follows death. We might have beliefs, hopes. We cannot know, because the characteristic of impermanence is characteristic of objects, and if I am identified with objects then I attach as true of myself that which is true of the object. A great many of our problems of relationship in the world have become so difficult that it doesn't seem that we can find the rational solution for ordinary things, and there is the problem of different social groups in nations, and different nations. I needn't enlarge on this because you all read the newspapers and you perhaps have struggled with questions of resources, doctoring solutions, everything ... You will find that they give the problem too simply a formula. That won't work, because they are onesided, and you try to apply that and you are forced into humility in trying to make them go. We have seen plenty of examples of that in the last twenty years, and the reasons why these problems have become so baffling and threaten to become destructive to our culture is because the other half of consciousness has been neglected. Of recent, working upon the millions we have now will not give us the solution. That something which I have called the other half of consciousness must come in to show the way that cannot be imagined. The dangers of the detached (?) objective consciousness are even greater ... if carried to extremes, for that consciousness has an effect of being partially separated from its roots; the roots which lie in the subjective. It therefore becomes a starved consciousness, and starvation cannot continue beyond a certain point without bringing exhaustion. There is thus a sense

of attachment to object which can be carried to a point where the consciousness is lost. There is very real danger here. I am speaking about the massive problem. Many of you I know are far from that problem because you have taken necessary redeeming steps, not simply the redeeming step for yourself but the redeeming step for the larger community of which you are a part and for which we must be concerned. This consciousness, this detached consciousness, as it becomes exhausted, may go through several disintegrating stages of parapsychosis, psychosis or straight insanity, disruption of organisms. Certain other things happen. Continuing on he simply goes out in unconsciousness. Now in a situation of that kind something more than a true philosophy is needed. We are dealing with a pathological problem. Simple nutrition in a spiritual sense becomes a prime need for this starged consciousness must have help or it cannot take the necessary redeeming steps. Yes, there is a real psychological truth as well as a religious truth; but psychologically it is not a matter of being saved from a devil, not a matter of being saved from sin, but it is a matter of being saved from a detached state in consciousness where it becomes severed from its roots. Now I might state, incidentally, something about how the idea of a devil arose. ... When consciousness becomes fractured in this way, apart, separated, ^{cut} off from its roots, there is a revalk in the repressed side of the complete man; a repressed side that is for his personal consciousness unknown, therefore unconscious. It rises up in many forms and among those forms it can appear as something terrible, as destructive, and it can appear substantially in a subjective sense to you, and if he doesn't know what is happening he can very well .. some extraneous ... so that the repressed dark element, and in greater or less degree, takes control over him. You don't have to have some interpretation

of what happens there, but, however the problem is interpreted the problem is a very real one, and whether we speak of being lost through sin, or the ... , or the evil one, or of a detached consciousness Now there is a sense in which nothing is lost. The whole problem is extremely broad. There is a vital sense in which that which says "I am this being, and am conscious of myself as this being" can fade out if it is attached too strongly to the object. The saving factor is that substance, that life, which springs up only through the roots of consciousness. I am not now speaking of the ordinary, the reflective form of life which keeps this machine which we call the body, running, the kind of life that has a beginning and death, but another kind of life, which is the source that wells up through the roots of consciousness, the subjective flow - and when this is flowing then there is no starvation. I am speaking, of course, in a subtle manner, although by a certain law of correspondences it works that way outside too. There is instead the redeemed side. It is possible for this saving life to be temporarily transfused by those that have set up a correlation in a special sense with those roots, and it is in this sense that men like Jesus and Buddha and many others not so well known have served as saviours of men. It is a real function, and this life is no figure of speech.

Jesus, you remember in the story, when the woman appeared before him at the well and he asked for water, he told her that he would give her in exchange for the glass she gave him, that which would quench her thirst eternally. Of course she couldn't understand what he meant, and I wonder how many have who have read those words. It wasn't really a figure of speech, but a reference to something very real - Life, the Substance that is Life - that he spoke of, but it is that Immortal Life which does ^{not} pass from the past to

the future. It is the very Life out of which Time itself is born. If you think about that you will find that the problem of immortality becomes simplified. Time and Life are to be considered together. A great mistake has been made in the interpretation of the function of those who served as saviours. The transfusion of this life can be temporary only. Ultimately every individual must establish his own roots in that source from which it springs, and the transfusion can extend only for the interim or period in which the individual may ... and stand on his own. There is no such thing as a redemption by mere act of belief. Lots of effort has been wasted down the centuries by that mistake. By correlation of the ... there can be this which corresponds to transfusion, but only for the period during which the individual has the chance to establish his roots for himself. The interim will be long enough if he tries, but it may not be long enough if he is lazy and refuses to try. Those who have *need* are more numerous than the workers, and those that make use of their opportunities have rights which the laggards do not, and which refuse to make use of their opportunities. So, do not forget that in the end one arrives at that consciousness that is durable, immortal consciousness, by having done his part, by having walked the path himself. This path is the path in consciousness transformation. No two will walk it in precisely the same way; an encouraging thing for those of you who like to be explorers, to know that you can be in the sum total of this universe a unique individual who will travel the path in a way that no one else has travelled it. Some satisfaction in that, but it carries the thought that you cannot travel the path by walking in the footsteps that are already there, nor that you can arrive on the shoulders of someone

else alone. But there is help, and I have indicated to you one form of it. No one need fear about being able to win the goal if he but tries and keeps on trying. There is time enough.

May I bring to you too this fact, that this is not alone for you as an individual. It is important for the community in which you have a sphere of interest, for, as each one makes progress toward that goal of immortal life he too helps to radiate something of its values to those who know less than he; to those who are less illumined than he; so, it is a social need as well as a private, individual need. Now this work will take us throughout the coming weeks. I have to repeat often here how to approach our subject from different angles, and possibly leave you pretty well snarled up at times, but one thing you can do is to listen as you do to music, when you cannot understand the idea. Often I know it takes a metaphysical background to see why words are put in a certain position; but, you don't have to know composition and technique of music that the real musician always has to get in order to get value from music. See the point? You can listen to me as you listen to music and you will find something happens to consciousness even though you cannot describe it well. In fact, you would be pretty good if you could describe it.

Heretofore we have emphasized both the religious and philosophical approach to the problem. We are now adding the psychological approach for it falls more into a form of consciousness that our Western race has itself evolved. It isn't enough to try to graft on to Western consciousness ; that is the reason our Indian Yôgâ is only effective with exceptional individuals among Western people. It is a grafting on of something that doesn't belong to our

own particular psychology. We have to deal with our psychological problem with a method that fits us, but whatever the method the goal is one. If you look beneath the surface of any sage of any country you will find a common ground with a lot of differences in the way in which that common element is expressed and the way it is approached. That common element refers to the goal, and it must be common, for we are all children of one race whatever our race. The return to God, to use the words of the mystic, is to return to the root from which we all spring. Yes, that word God refers to something that is very real, that can be known, but most theological notions about it are very false. They cannot describe it but it is very real and can be known by each one, individually, and that is the root from which we all spring.

I hope as many of you as possible will come and travel on this journey toward the redeeming consciousness.

Monday, September 5, 1938

I expect to become pretty well acquainted with you before we are very far along because when you get through with certain questionnaires that we will ask from time to time I will probably know a good deal about you. To begin with I am going to give a very brief outline of the purpose of our work, a sort of a sketch, in which the rest of the work will fall, so that you will have some general idea of what we are aiming at. First of all, as I said last night, we are concerned with a very large problem. It is a large problem that we may call the spiritualization of consciousness. That term is an old one, so that it has become trite. I am going to use another word for spiritualization as we go on that will perhaps bring it more within the range of a fuller understanding, because when they become trite, cease to carry the real meaning, we take them for granted. You will find that spiritualization has a very definite meaning that you can give in psychological terms. It really involves the awakening in fuller degree of the subjective pole of consciousness. As pointed out last night, many of this humanity of ours are in danger because consciousness has become too greatly oriented to the object. Part of the evidence of the danger is found in the increasing number of individuals that are being admitted to insane asylums, and still vaster numbers that are partly unbalanced and are unhappy because something is wrong in their consciousness. What I am about to explain some of you will understand because of your studies; others will have to take it for the moment on faith.

If within a time that is not unlimited, a considerable portion of this humanity does not achieve a certain transformation in consciousness it will cease to be able to continue on the path

of the world evolution but will have to go into a sort of laya or quiescent state until another cycle rolls around. It is not absolute loss but it is a loss in the sense of time. The reason for this, again, should be obvious. Just as an animal consciousness couldn't possibly function as a human being for the reason that certain ~~forms~~ ^{waves} of consciousness are not unfolded within it, so the human being cannot continue in its evolution when the current of consciousness steps up a degree if that human being has not also stepped up his own consciousness. There would be no place for ^{him} ~~them~~. Many of you have heard of the coming race. To become part of a new race is not merely to have a different kind of physical body. More fundamentally it means having the capacity to be conscious in a different way. Physiological differences follow the conscious differences, and not the other way around. Not all of this human race can be part of that coming race, because not all will make the grade, but we desire that as many as possibly can should. Concerning that coming race, we take (?) the future. We let the causes of the past work out their destiny, because once the causes are sown the effects must follow, but we sow a new cause. We establish a new base that will take in command seeds sown in the future; that future which belongs to the coming race. Now just how this is possible will become clear as we go through our class work, so we are not primarily concerned with amelioration of present conditions. There are plenty of others that are concerned with those problems. We are not merely concerned with making things a little more ^{portable} comparable now. Many of the problems of the present day are in a snarled condition because of pictures behind them that cannot be eliminated. They have been sown in the past and they must work out their course,

but it is possible to step from one level of consciousness to another and thus rise out of an old causal stream into a new. It is a sort of transformation. That will become clearer, I think, before we are through.

In another part of work, which is more specific, and that concerns more immediately why we are here, we are interested first in inducing as many as possible to take the first step upon that course which has long been known as The Path. Many of you already believe and are convinced of the reality of reincarnation. I won't attempt to build a case for this. Therefore, in the case of those of you who are not yet convinced of that reality, I will simply say, assume it for the present. If it can't be proven in the scientific sense, neither can it be disproved (?), and I will admit that we cannot prove it in the scientific sense, but there are other ways. There are reasons why we cannot prove some of the fundamental truths in the scientific sense, for science is concerned only with a certain kind of material and not with the sum total of consciousness; not with the sum total of reality; a kind of material that falls within a certain range of possible observation - a material that can be accounted for by perceptible causes - and any material that cannot be accounted for by perceptible causes falls outside the range of physical science - but, the reality does not cease to exist because it falls outside of the range of physical science ... There are some ways of securing for yourself another function of consciousness, and we are concerned more with this other function of consciousness than the already highly developed scientific forms. ... Again, there are those who, in another life, have taken the first step on The Path. We seek to facilitate in such way as we can their further progress on their path. Mayhap, we may also facilitate that final

step when the goal of The Path is won. And, this step is so important that if all of our work were to achieve or to facilitate one such instance, and accomplish nothing else, it would be justified - that one step alone. Again, I shall not try to justify that statement tonight.

Again, as to our method, first of all we are concerned with the preparation of the understanding of the student. I do lay a great deal of emphasis upon having the understanding as much illumined as possible, but understanding isn't the whole of the problem by any manner or means. You may see why understanding is important, if you bear this fact in mind. Even though a person were to succeed by meditation in reaching into super-functional consciousness, if his understanding were not sufficiently prepared he would merely attain a state of unconsciousness. Now I am going to have to modify that statement when I come to using my own talking and language, because you will find that later I drop the ^{notion} ~~matter~~ of the unconsciousness completely, but that word will convey to you the meaning that I have in mind. Now, more usually, because in that case you would be in a state where you could not say "I am aware of this state." Later I shall say that 'all is consciousness', but I shall make a very great distinction between a primordial consciousness that is not aware of itself and consciousness that is aware of itself. To be conscious and not conscious of itself is indistinguishable from the state of unconsciousness.

You may say that the one grand fruit of all experience, no matter how the ages of experience, is simply 'becoming conscious of consciousness' in progressive degree. That's the one positive, lasting achievement retained out of all experience. It doesn't matter

whether your experience is painful or joyous, whether you succeed or fail, it doesn't matter what it carries you through, whether you succeed in making the goals that you have set or whether you fail, the one important thing is a progressive increase of the capacity to be conscious of consciousness; so if one who dies executed were to increase ^{this capacity} ... that would be a very great blessing. Everything is to be valued by the degree to which it brings about this capacity of being conscious of consciousness. It so happens that the greatest teacher in this respect, in the ages we know historically, is pain and suffering. It is not the sole teacher in this method of becoming conscious of consciousness. Now perhaps I can illustrate this point in a way that may be rather obvious. If you are perfectly healthy, have been all your life and have never known, except perhaps from your study of physiology, that you have ~~an~~ internal organs, never from sensations, you might say that you are living unconscious of the internal part of your body, but let something go wrong with an organ and you experience certain sensations that disturb, may be quite painful, and you do become quite conscious of that part of your body. You know then that you have an organ. Now another thing happens, when the organ becomes well again the pain disappears, and you know in a small degree a state of joy that has taken the place of the pain. You can be happy simply through the absence of that pain. Any of you who have gone through any extent of pain know that the sheer absence of pain has a pleasure value, possibly a highly bliss value. Now your first state was unconsciousness. Your last state is in one respect like the first; the organ healthy, ~~or~~ having a pleasure or bliss value, you have become conscious of yourself in a way that you were not

conscious before, and the path was pain. In fact this point is so important that the profoundest wisdom has given as the first noble truth the fact of suffering, because of its vital importance in the awakening of consciousness of consciousness. So, our teachers, those things that are blessings, are not always to be judged by the degree of comfort with which they come. That which is uncomfortable is hard for us to appreciate at the time, I know. If we can take depressions and sicknesses and disappointments and losses as possible values they will teach more rapidly what they have to teach. Also, he who is wise enough to do this doesn't have to be taught so much through pain. He is beginning to be ready to be taught through joy; another side of the story. If you growl at pain, and if you resent it, and begin to feel resentful towards the world, society, the other class, and all that sort of thing, then the lesson has to be learned over again, and over and over and over. You can shorten the road if you will. Most people don't.

Now the preparation of the understanding will occupy in point of time most of our time in the classes. It will continue through your collateral reading and through your meetings in the Assembly. The other part is practice, and practice has its general forms, that which applies to life, relationship as a whole, because, you cannot be careless. Let your practice be toward what you believe, and hope to get results. Now I don't mean that ~~we have~~ one has to be perfect in practice, but it is important that he shall not be content with the practice that contradicts his belief. It takes a lot of skill to be even moderately perfect, but anyone can refuse to be content with anything less than perfect. And, there will be the practice for those who are parts of the Assembly in their

relationships to the functions of the Assembly. Then in addition, something of special practice. The Path is one that all who mean to reach the goal must follow - the Pilgrim - from The Voice of the Silence. There is one factor that is common to all ages, to all time, to all people, and that is a certain fundamental transformation in consciousness that leads to a stage which we may call the goal. We often liken that transformation to a path, a road, a way. It is a symbolical way of speaking. All our statements are symbolical, necessarily. Don't take it literally, but, it is a progression through stages that does arrive at a culminating point. Those stages are very real, and the culminating point is very real. Now the way there is one for all, but how do you travel? Just as upon a road, one may walk, one may go by horseback, in automobile, or by airplane. We have different means over the one way, and the point is that it must vary with every individual. No two go precisely the same method. One may crawl upon his knees for quite a while, and one may manage to get hold of an airplane and go quite quickly. The one that crawls on his knees will know a lot more about the details than the one who goes by airplane, so there are compensations. If you go on your knees you will very probably be able to say more about it later. Now there are certain general steps, as outlined in the Voice of the Silence, but if you try to understand - and you must read these things more in a meditative sense, you will find that something tends to happen in your consciousness.

Now we don't have to step out of this general outline immediately to the purely individual needs, for human beings are organized more or less in groups, which we may call types - different kinds of psychological attitudes, and the rules that

apply to those that belong to one type often vary from those that belong to another. Those of you that are familiar with the Oriental Yoga know that there are various methods:

Those are really ... of the path adapted to different types. Not every one has to go precisely the same way, and the rules of one are not necessarily the rules of another, so we will have occasion to give a lot of attention to type psychology. In fact I expect to know a good deal about you before we are through; but I have discovered that it is not enough simply to outline the path that I found because I would be talking of something that would fit the needs of those that are like me as a psychological type, and the needs of others would vary, so it has become necessary to reach across to other type forms, particularly so as I happen to be a particular in my individual psychology. So we have here one of the contributions that has come to us from the psychology of our own age. That is a real help in the problem of consciousness transformation.

I will give you an example. I was just reminded of Krishnamurti. He has a good deal of the developments of the mystical sense. He is a man that has shown strength of character when he renounced an organization that had been prepared for him today and renounced certain claims that were made for him, but when he speaks he defines a process that is intelligible only to a perceptive or aesthetic type, and wholly inadequate for one that is highly developed intellectually. Now one that know directly, something of super-functional consciousness, will sense the thing that Krishnamurti is aiming at, but one that has not that and must be satisfied in a reasonable way, will not get that reasonable satis-

faction from him. Now the problem becomes clarified if you understand that we have different psychological types and we are not justified in saying 'this is the only way to get there.' Some countertypes may have to go a way that is almost diametrically opposite, and some individuals who are quite a typical may have to carve out a road that is practically pioneer ... for available literature doesn't cover. Available literature covers the more general form of the path that fits a larger number of students, though their variances at times are quite strong. So I am going to begin by a preliminary work in getting some type of ...

We go into a very simple phase of it. I am going to ask you to put your name at the top of the sheet. I also want you to put under your name your height and your weight. ... We may classify most people accordingly to their psychological types - picnics, kleptosomatics ... I am not explaining all words. I want your answers to be as honest as you can. Don't forget, each type has the characteristic virtues and incompatible weaknesses that go with those virtues. They go together, and your best security, if you are bothered about my opinion, is to be perfectly honest with yourself. because that is the thing I respect most of all, and you don't always know when you are putting ^{down}/something that will be complimentary. Now, you may have been long conscious of a habit ... and therefore you must again consciously seek to make it correct.

QUESTONNAIRE

1. Are your physical movements slow or rapid?
Your dominant tendency I am after. We shift our attitudes at different times. I want your dominant tendency, and what you would do spontaneously when you can be yourself, under no restraint.
2. Hand shake. Is it weak or forceful?

I want that which you would do without your being conscious of the act. I want you the way you were born, as it were?

3. Are you conservative or stylish?
Assuming that you had plenty of funds.
4. In making purchases are you slow in selection or rapid?
This is part of the process of looking at oneself. Of course now we are looking at the outside man. We will look a little deeper later on.
5. Manner of conversation. Are you blunt or considerate?
6. Eyes. Are the eyes challenging or friendly? (Do you go out of your way to be friendly, or do you make a person prove himself.)
7. Humor. Are you lacking or quick in humor.
8. In social relationships, are you retiring, or are you good company?
9. In regard to personal possessions, are you careful or careless?
10. In answering questions, is your answer premeditated or offhand.
11. In making decisions, do you hesitate or are you quick.
12. Are you strictly loyal or generally loyal?
Remember, if I find an overabundance of the merits of the two types I will become suspicious.
13. Your preference in work. Do you prefer to work alone, or with others?
14. In directing subordinates, are you strict or lenient?
15. Outside interests. Are they principally intellectual or sports. Artistic, or interests in intellectual things.
16. In expressing statements, are you explicit or implicit?
By that we mean do you make your statements precise and complete - that would be explicit. Or, is it a sort of implied or involved, without being so awfully clear?
17. In the matter of taking offense? Do you take offense easily or rarely?
18. Executive or administrative?
Executive -has to carve out. In executive there is more of the constructive element, like putting through new enterprises, whereas in an administrative capacity it would be like continuing an enterprise that already existed.
19. Before public gatherings are you uneasy, or at ease?
20. In lending money, are you stingy or liberal?
21. In making friends, do you make them easily, or are you reserved?

22. In dealing with others, are you conscientious, or not always candid?
23. If someone orders you around, like a soldier in the army, any member in an organization, do you tend to resent the order? If your attitude to resent, or obey. (with respect to the feeling) Some people have no trouble obeying the arbitrary orders; others resent .
24. Are you moody or cheerful?
25. Are you affected by dress or not affected by it?
26. Of others motives, are you suspicious or trusting? Do you tend to be subpicious or trusting?
27. Are you radical or conservative?
The conservative attitude ..
The radical attitude cannot adapt itself to the rules that are laid down in case of injustice ...
28. Sportsmanship. Are you a poor loser or a good loser?
29. In doing things, do you hesitate or are you impulsive?
30. In solving a problem, do you solve it alone, or do you ask for help?
31. In the question of writing and speaking, do you write better or speak better?
32. In detail, are you accurate, or inaccurate?
33. Do you prefer company or of several people?

Now those who did not take the purification last year and wish to qualify for it, we will give these papers as a guide in self-examination. This is not a requirement. It is simply a privilege. This is a very important part of the preparation for an actual transformation of consciousness. We have to make clear as time goes on something of the real significance of purification. There are deposits, in which is known now in analytical psychology as the unconscious, that are sediments, as it were, from our conscious attitudes, conducts, or ways of the past. These sediments form what many of you who have been students know as the astral light. They are more or less unclean, and sometimes very unclean. They are factors that operate in the psychic, and until a certain degree of purification is attained penetration into the -11- depths of the unconscious to reach

the supernal level cannot be safely undertaken, so the first step is a purification of this sediment deposit. All sorts of repressions, all sorts of uncleannesses, as you know. Now there is a way by which we can materially aid that purifying process so that it doesn't take a long time, which is required by the individual if he works entirely alone, and this self-examination is a preliminary part of this purification. It is very important that he shall be honest. There is no use in trying to kid yourself. Learn to look at yourself as you are, and that will mean looking at things that are far from nice, and it will also mean that you will some day have a chance to look at something supernally beautiful, but there will have to be a housecleaning. Now we have 14 of these questions. I wish that you shall, once every day, make the examination, going through the fourteen questions, each day taking out one of them for special concentration but reviewing all.

Take this matter of No. 1. Now you are your own judge. It is not a question of my approval, or Martin Luther's, or Calvin, but you are your own judge. You are ~~taking~~ doing this by yourself; it is a conventional opinion of yourself. It's not my standard, but your own.

No. 2. Do I in subtle ... steal. It may be gross stealing or subtle stealing. Again, let your conscience be your guide.

No. 3. Do I original or carry unkind ..

No. 4. Do I from indulgence ..

Failure to do, you know, is action in the fault. ?

No. 5. Am I in any respects cruel to my fellowmen ...

No. 6.

No. 7. Do I indulge in anger, hate, jealousy or fear?

Fear when properly understood is a vice.

No. 8. Do I in my mind profane that which I feel to be sacred?

No. 9. There is a twofold attitude there.

No. 10. Do I indulge in pride or conceit?

No. 11. Especially do I, as an individual, indulge a tendency to become a floater?

No. 12. Do I indulge in superstition? Be honest with yourself on that point.

No. 13. Am I in any respects untruthful?

Now when you have made this examination acknowledge to yourself what you find, no matter how unpleasant it is. Then I want you to make a symbolic offering, then and there, of all this that you may find. This that you may call junk, or refuge, make an offering of it, to the Christ. And don't hesitate because to you it seems unworthy and unclean to offer, for only so will it become transformed you freed. Do that once every day between now and the close of the first class, or until such time as you may qualify for a certain initiation; but it must be done every day, with exception, every day, until the initiation, if you qualify for that.

Now I want you to hand in questions for me to answer throughout the class. If this work is taking any hold of you, you will enable me to direct my efforts in such a way that will be more effective. You help me to be effective. I want the questions written because you have to think them out better, and I have a better opportunity to understand them. Sometimes the wordings are obscure.

Tuesday night class - 802, 8th Floor. Secret of the Golden Flower. Deals with one of the deepest mysteries of all, and I hope you will come to the class.

Now a little exercise; a little start on the problem of turning conscience upon itself. Look at some object - a pencil, one of your fingers. While looking see if you can witness or be aware of the act of perception as distinguished from the object looked at; while you are looking at the object. This is not so easy. Look at any object, and while looking at the object see if you witness the act of perceiving as distinct from the object perceived; as an act - not merely as an intellectual analysis.

Wednesday, September 7, 1938.

The plan of arrangement of the students tonight has been to arrange the extraverts on my right and the intraverts on my left, the scores being most marked intravert to the extreme left, and the order being 1, 2, 3, back 5, 6, 7 and 8, with those in the neutral position being nearest to the aisle. A chance to get acquainted with those who are like ourselves in certain psychological ways. The number of those that showed a predominance to intraversion, and bear in, was 22, extraversion , and 2 neither intravert and neither extravert. Combining all the answers there were 693 intravert, 706 extravert - only 13 points difference, which is practically equality for this sort of a thing. The total effect of the class as it stood Monday night was practically an equal balance between intraversion and extraversion. In Los Angeles a little balance over on the extraversion but not enough to be significant. Here a little overbalance ... What may this mean? Some suggestive questions come to my mind; worth following up. Is there a tendency for a group association such as here to form a sort of neutral and balance center with respect to intraversion and extraversion. Furthermore, for a time suppose there were a predominance of extraversion, would it make for a magnetic field? Have we got something analogous to that field of balance that is characteristic to the atom? ... Here is an interesting question; something that's going to be very interesting to watch.

Now about 19 of the cases ... 44 answers put in - 2 of them in neutral position, 1 only ... 23 cases in which it was sufficiently strong to be intravert, 9 of them intravert, and 14 extravert. These are the ones that may show more markedly the particular characteristics of the ... Class being pretty nearly divided between intravert and

and extravert, I find in the answers a very marked differentiation ..

We would look for something approximating an equal division...

Class as a whole is markedly extravert, more extravert than introvert.

Typical movements of the class are rapid, at least in their own estimation. And now I am inclined to believe that your answer is objectively correct, for this reason, that you are living in a city where the tempo is fast, and in order to survive you have to follow, but the introverts are speeded up whether they want to be or not.

This class, at a ratio of 9 to 32, have forceful handshakes. Again I think this is ... Extravert handshake, firm. Class very considerate in conversation, friendly eyes. Astonishing fact - very liberal in lending. Trusting others motives. Everyone trustworthy in your own estimation. On top of this, all of you are good losers. ...

The view that we have of ourselves has got to be the fundamental basis of classification. If we classify from the view of an observer we may .. 37 to 7 conservative in dress. I believe it is objectively true; that's my general impression. You are also quite socially retiring, and you prefer to work alone. Your interests are predominantly intellectual. I believe that. I don't believe that you would be coming to meetings if you were not. But, you are quite uneasy before public gatherings, whether introvert or extravert. You prefer to solve problems alone, and as a final question, prefer solitude to numbers of people. These answers are the ones that ... preference for working alone, liking to solve problems, predominance of intellectual to sport - are significant introvert characteristics - begin to give us the key as to why both introvert and extravert are interested in working toward liberated consciousness. 26 consciousness, and 15 not always candid. Introvert

weakness - resentment. Natural type virtue and the natural type weakness don't have particular ethical value.. If there has been a personal progress in overcoming a type weakness, or the cultivation of the opposite type virtue, that is a personal ethical credit. It is a thing that is difficult for you to do, and in your self-examination you will find ... A given weakness that belongs to a given type is not to be judged harshly, but that same weakness when manifested by the opposite type is to be judged harshly. You have got to allow the individual some of the weaknesses that go with his type. We should make the allowances accordingly. A certain course of action in the extravert, and the same course of action in the introvert would have quite different ethical values. Each has difficulties to overcome that are different from the difficulties that others have.

The subject of one's type is a great deal more complicated than that, as you will see. We will have to bring in what are the functional types; differences, there is reason to believe, that .. one can shift the attitude. A kind of specialization... It is something with which we may be born. We often find that infants have distinguishable differences of attitude. It may be born to parents of the opposite attitude, and one child may be born with one attitude and another with another. Presently those of same attitudes marry, and those of opposite attitudes marry. So far as I can see there isn't much division on the matter of man and woman ... It is also known that if you try to, in some cases at any rate, force a child from his normal psychological attitude, which can be done by training, it may produce sickness - maladjustment - that will have physiological results. It does so happen that our society is predominantly extravert. The West is extravert as compared to the

East, and our emphasis socially and scientifically is upon the extravert virtues. The soliloquies that we hear on all sides - be objective, be socially-minded, be a good mixer, and so on, all of these are characteristic extravert virtues, but strike the intravert upon his weak points. On the whole the extravert is more articulate. He has better command of action. He will speak out, and the intravert turns in to himself. He always is loyal to his own type, and on the other hand the intravert accepts the standard laid down by the intravert and is .. with the result that he tries to fit .. and then he gets an inferiority complex because all the extraverts here in the West for centuries have had the floor; and I am going to try to offset that.

Let us get at just what we mean by extraversion and introversion; and, if you ever go to a doctor, and you are an intravert, I want you to get on your fighting feet and ... The doctor, the medical man, much more than the surgeon, there is a reason why - the medical man, not only because naturally he has an extravert type, has a theoretical background, training in the schools, that tends towards an overemphasis of the object matter; in other words, purely material, and he envisions as the superior virtue the extravert virtues, and he does it with force. I remember that one time I visited a doctor; happened to be a medical man, quite a ...

I said "You better watch out." He said "Do you enjoy being an intravert?" and I said "Yes, I am proud of it." and he kind of ...

I want the intraverts to be ready to stand on their own, because it is weak on the active. Just as the Indian is at a disadvantage, so also are our intraverts at a certain disadvantage, so it is for them to stick together, put a chip on their shoulders and be proud of themselves.

Extraverts (?) you dominate schools, politics, science, medical field, business. That whole field is dominated by them. There are relatively few intraverts in them.

Now I want to say this, that taken as a whole there is no question of ultimate superiority of either type any more than a positive and negative pole are superior in any electrical field; one is a complement of the other...You cannot destroy the one absolutely and have the other. There is an interdependence in the last analysis, but there is not an equal accentuation between individuals. At different times there is a playing back and forth, just as we have waking periods and sleeping periods. Q....

A. When you do, you go deeper into an intraversion. Think of the advantages now. If you can maintain consciousness across that transition, often you have an advantage. Cultivate the extravert phase. (For the extravert). When you are on the extravert phase you have the world of action and command too. The extraverts command this world right here, in the present. They always do. It is the extravert's nation, England, that conquers India on the present field, but the intravert takes the future. Important point in philosophy. There is a reason why it is possible. The extravert commands the current stage. He conquers in the field of battle, he governs, he is the economic leader. He dominates in physical tasks. He is the engineer that drives tunnels through the mountains, but he isn't the whole show. You go into the religious, philosophic, the poetic people, and most all of the mystical - get into the domain where the intravert comes into his own.

Our consciousness is a compound of a self or subject aware of a world or object; and those who were in the class last year

remember how much I emphasize that point. It is a very crucial point of our knowledge. "I am conscious of that world out there." and I speak for everyone of you. What happens to the seeing world, the objects, as they exist for sight, when you close your eyes? Try to close your eyes. The seeing world disappeared, vanished, when you closed your eyes. Nothing was done out there. We had no machine-shovels, camels, or anything to wreck these walls. They disappeared by simply closing the eyes. . . The seeing world around us is dependent upon our power to see it. We destroy it by closing the eyes for the time that they are closed, and we establish it by opening the eyes. Now there is something which the subject has done which has affected the object. Now we could approach the object as an external thing, operate upon it, and produce effects accordingly. We do that when we construct our buildings, build our cities, make masts for our ships to sail the seas, vast creations of our activities; our thought operates directly upon the object., Now the extravert consciousness, and the intravert takes these, although it is not his most usual attitude, is one that is taken up with the primary consideration of the object, external content. Already While the intraverted attitude is one that tends to recede from the object toward that subject that I that is aware of the world, now, very rarely does the introvert go so far as to reach that I. More often it only goes part way, a small way, ordinary intraversion, as most of our psychology doesn't go across to the "pure I." That's way beyond death. An intravert that reaches way beyond where man ordinarily drops off at death - far beyond, but you can recognize certain stages of progressive . . . where the attention may be more upon the sensation instead of the object that corresponds. He

goes further; and he has an idea about that object, and he functions more upon the object, and yet he may be what we call an intravert thinker. Again he may use the idea of the object merely as a symbol for an inner significance, and an intravert thinker say, like if he has a sort of shifting of attitudes, like the breath, outward and inward movement toward intraversion, rhythm in consciousness playing like the theme; but some people oscillate here, others there, become pathological, and cannot take the regenerating bath in the depths of the Real Self, so there are avoidance (?) of the mystics. There are dangers in going too far in either extreme without keeping the anchorage in the other pole. We have got a very nice game to play, and the world has played it wrong so much that it one of the big factors.

The extravert has a strong sense for fact. You deal with a man who wants to know the facts upon which the matter is based. There is a situation upon which he is quite right, but tends to carry it over when consideration of principal, necessity even of imagination, are far more vital than the producing of psychical values. Fact doesn't give us truth in the last analysis. Fact is made by truth. You go back far enough, and that which we call fact today was the imagination of another day, so there is something fundamentally more important than fact, but a consciousness that is oriented in a certain way, fact is primary. [Again, the extravert consciousness has a keen sense for relations, human relations; much the best people to get along with. They understand how to adjust, far better than an intravert does. I am speaking in general terms. An extravert knows better how to compromise. An intravert is not so good at compromising, and more apt to be strict to fixed program, or a

a thing he sees, uncompromising about it; in fact, fanatical about it. Here is where we come into a nice problem. An extravert says to us: "Now let's handle all these coail difficulties between people by adjusting things, by compromise, by give and take." But here's the intravert consciousness - strict philosophy, attention to .. unconscious .. What will happen to Fritz Kreisler? Some problems you can't solve by compromise. What would happen to a bit of mathematical difference? Compromise doesn't apply to such an individual. Now do you begin to see perhaps why the social problem is so infinitely complex, and also why it is that most problems are unjust, because they envisage ... There is literally no program that is ever worked out, because programs involve a systematic thinking it out, working it out as conscious fact. Our problem is right there all right.

Q. Introvert intuitive?

A. John the Baptist. Clothed in loin cloth, warning the world concerning the crime ... Man in L.A. - long hair - irritates you.

Q.

A. Fact in consciousness - whether pleasant or not, you have to reckon with it. There is no use in dodging what is a fact in consciousness.

You may even have to ^{recognize} ~~recognize~~ that your God is the very vilest devil, and try to find the basis of brotherhood in spite of that. Peace and good will in the world require that. A good many of our battlefields can be reduced to a conflict of type, and many of our religious wars now are a conflict of type; economical, secondary.

We don't get together because of type barriers, so for us it will be necessary to broaden our understanding, to let the other fellow have his gods also, and then I will say 'Beyond that which you can imagine, and beyond that which you feel or intuit, there is that which unites all, and that this is beyond thought, feeling, sensation, and beyond intuition in the ordinary sense of the word.

Friday, September 9, 1938.

Personality is a combined consciousness function. You may liken it to a molecule, a combine of consciousness function. As in the case of the molecule again, in their case, molecules are very firmly organized, persistent. In the same way we have some personality organizations that are well organized and persistent; in other cases, subject to more or less disunion, or disintegration. They may combine through a habit or emotion of an effectual shock, and then one part of the personality may be driven into the unconscious, but also, at times, under favorable conditions; a portion of the split personality is driven to the unconscious, in addition to the type, and then a different kind of personality shows. We may show that elements are eternal and combines are not eternal, but combines may be relatively persistent or weak. It is an interesting fact that the more persistent known are the oxides - corresponds more to life. Let us take the symbolism of that. If you would attain relative immortality of personal consciousness you would strive to combine that personal consciousness (?) with the immortal light. In that way it is possible to extend the continuation of myself as being, this continuation, beyond that, and so on? That's something that is achieved. It is by mastery. It is part of the great work of individualization. Just a very important part of the thing we are interested in. (This appears to be in answer to a question.)

Q. Pertaining to 'lost souls'.

A. In occult sense they are lost, but not necessarily in case of.... It is said there are not many such, and that such cases arise only when there is no residue of good left in the personality. If there is anything at all they cannot be lost. It is a misnomer to speak of the lost soul. It is rather a lost personality. The entity that

is travelling down over long series of incarnations - but that particular personality will be left out of the book of life when read.

Q. Could you explain anything about the Endocrin Glands? Ductless G.

A. That is a question that falls in a specialized technical field. Concerning the ductless glands and nervous system, organism as a whole, we only have the signification from our standpoint of a mechanism which makes the coordination of consciousness with this plane possible. Now we would rather think that deformities of the ductless glands are due to crime, but that crime most likely would be one in another life.

I want you to get into the habit of regarding the material condition as an effect of a conscious cause, and not the other way. The primary causality springs from consciousness to the object, from within out.

Q. I am anxious to know more about how to meditate. Be still & know that I am God.

A. That will develop somewhat through the classwork.

I see no objection at all to using that. The meaning is very vague. With different individuals different factors are a help, and what is best for one may not be the best for another, so there is no generalizing on that particular point.

Q. Do the Irish have an accent like the Atlanteans?

A. Is there any reason to believe that the Atlanteans had one characteristic accent any more than we find among the different branches of the Fifth Root Race. Maybe the Irish have an accent like some.. Thus, as you learn in esoteric teachings, know that a large portion of population on earth is still of the Fourth Root Race, and so you may find somewhere in your studies mention of some of the Mongolians, Japanese, Tartars, Indians of Africa

q. How can one proceed to develop intuition?

a. That's a very large question. Insofar as you have intuition, cultivate it by encouraging it. It is a way in which consciousness moves. It gives you a different sector of the totality of consciousness. It is complimentary, therefore it is a means of tapping the unconscious, but there are several levels of the unconscious, so you can see the value of what you tap is quite wide. There is a world of difference between the depths of the type, the supernals and the zone of credence, seven, and yet it by this function that we reach in toward those zones. So it is a way of consciousness rather than an authority. Meditation is a practice by which we seek to enter in to the unconscious, so meditation is also a method for awakening intuition.

Q. What am I to do to gain Cosmic Consciousness?

A. That is what we are working upon in these classes; what we did last time. Remember that it is the culminating flower of all the cycles of lives up to this time, and that every life lived has been a preparation toward that, so there is no one little thing that does it, but there is a time when the flower does bud; some time it will. We seek to facilitate the opening of those buds where the bud is already developed. Why are we studying type psychology? To find the varied ways to this superfunctional consciousness. There is no one effective agent or formula. One finds it one way, another, another.

These questionnaires that I have been giving have given me certainly lots of work. Now the purpose of the last group of questions was to bring out to preliminary or partial segregation of what are known as the functional types. Our first examination covered the matter of attitude types, and gave us a rough segregation there as to extraversion and introversion, but the type psychically (?) is more fundamentally involved in the case of functional differences than it is in the attitude differences. You may shift your attitude, even at will, and be in the extravert phase at one time and the introvert phase next. You may at one time in your life be predominantly on the extravert, and at another vice versa, so that there is not a very great barrier to crossing over. Of course in the highly differentiated the type is more defined, the shift is not so ... but when it comes from functional types it is very difficult to shift, and the ground of misunderstanding between functional types is apt to be greater than between attitude types. It is a whole lot more difficult to determine what a person's functional type is. I haven't got enough information about you to offer a final conclusion as to the individual. We will have to go on with questionnaires to clear the matter up definitely, but we do get some general information at present. There is an interesting thing I find by these questions. There is a tendency for the answers to fall in a certain pattern, quite definitely, in all except three questions. In other words, the answers predominantly fall on one side or another.

Most preferred an ideal of devotion to loyalty. Most would state an untruth rather than state a truth that gives pain. The third question "If you are nursing somebody who is very sick, who desires to know his condition, and the truth would cause a state of depression

in the patient while an untruth would later cause the patient to lose confidence in you, would you tell the truth and risk the depressing effect, or tell an untruth and risk the patient's subsequent confidence in you. That was a vital question, touching predominance of feeling or thinking. It gives about 23 pointing to a thinking type and ... No. 5 is also conditioned to whether you would follow the strong impression or the evidence and logic. The division was almost half and half there. The evidence and logic points to dominance of thinking.... No. 4 you mostly agree, but I am disposed to disagree. You mostly agree that you would follow evidence and logic and would give your support to a social movement or philosophy which was antagonistic to your temperament, rather than putting your force in the direction that was congenial to your temperament. I doubt very much that a person will ever stay put in any place or any city that is not congenial to his fundamental , and there is a reason for that. Temperament is an indicator of what you are in your subjective. You won't find that you have to sacrifice the logic, but you will find that re-examination of the situation from the base that is yours will give the facts a new value, and the same logic will lead to very different conclusions. To illustrate the point I draw a figure very often from mathematics. Some of you may know of the use of different systems as a base of reference in mathematics; if you don't I think you will follow the suggestion in a general way so that you will get the idea. We can refer all points in a plane to two intersecting lines, and that gives you

We can write a conclusion in

$$\text{Algebra} - x^2 + y^2 =$$

Polar coordinance

The same fact viewed from a different base has a different effect. Your base of reference is shifted.

Variable r

The base of reference, representing difference of temperament - your logic appears, stands as at first - same facts take on different appearance as seen from different base. So, the world as viewed from the perspective of different appearances, takes on different appearances, and therefore nothing that we can say is absolutely true in relative consciousness apart from the perspective of the individual who is looking forth upon the world. That perspective is temperament, in one sense. No one can disprove to you that you are right in your own temper and the view of the universe that results from it. In fact our logic can change that because it is outside of the domain of fact as objective. It has to do with the base from which your consciousness is moving in here. That makes it possible for us to see that every one has a right to his universe. That is, the universe as seen from the base that is peculiarly his.

The answer to another question were very significant, and that is, relative to the aphorism that appeared to you most fundamentally as carrying or seeming to be of the highest value. These I gave as "Love is God. Truth is God. Beauty is God." Now I know perfectly well that from a superfunctional point of view these are heavenly, exclusive values, but from a relative point of view they often appear different, and there is a tendency to give prior emphasis to one or the other. The class divided pretty evenly with a slight predominance in favor of Love as contrasted to Truth, and

one individual who showed evidence of being esthetic, in placing beauty first. Where beauty comes first we have evidence of perception being first, not ..

Then we have some interesting facts. Some seem to fall in the thinking group, some into the possibility of thinking or perspective, some into feeling, some into feeling .. , and some into purely perspective group. Now here's an interesting fact. In the thinking group as I have it here (9), 7 are intraverts and 2 extraverts. In the feeling group 2 intraverts and 5 extraverts. That return fits what is already known on the subject. Thinking is more introverted than feeling, taken as a whole,, and the reason for that is that the quality of feeling can reach out into the objective - has the capacity of feeling in it. ~~Thinking~~ The peculiar capacity of extraverted consciousness is that reaching and feeling into the other human ... Thinking is polarized more to the idea, and the idea is already a state of withdrawal from the object, hence thinking as a whole is somewhat more introvert than feeling. That capacity for feeling into is the reason why extraverts make better teachers than introverts. They can get the need of the student. When an introvert answers a question he doesn't answer the student. An extravert answers the student rather than the question. Teaching is not the strong fort of the introvert. Research is strong fort of introvert. Another thing, we find 78% of the men in the thinking or thinking and perception group, and 37% of the women. In the feeling group 22% of the men, 62% of the women, in the feeling and perception group. That again follows the pattern I would expect, men being the more oriented to thinking and feeling, and vice versa with women. In the perception groups we have both sensation and intuition, and there of there is no reason for predominance of men or women. There is a pre-

dominance of men in sensation groups and men in intuition, but we probably will have in this kind of work always very few of the sensation types represented. The sensation type is of all types the most extravert, and is not one apt to be concerned with matters of reflection, matters of meditation, or the piercing into subtler phases of consciousness, unless it is a demand of the unconscious attitude. Now that can happen, and besides, presages the turning over to another type.

There were 42 for Ghandi, 1 for Lenine. I didn't get any division there.

35% were for the highly intelligent and selfish; 9% for the altruistic but unwise. If the selfish becomes wise enough it will reach the same place - the highest good of the individual and the highest good of the totality in the end.

30% preferred consistency combined with coldness, 14 warmhearted with inconsistency, nonthinking type. On the practical plane we know which kind of ruler or manager of affairs we would prefer. We find that as the world is, a person puts forth more of an effort to be skilful with a selfish motive than with an altruistic motive. It is not an ideal; it is a fact. We have more hope of getting wise .. The Chinese have a saying that it may take the mistakes of a good man who is not ... Soundness is more important than good intent, though (?) when the good intent is unsoundly backed up. Now, of course, our ideal is the altruistic outlook that has just as great intelligence back of it as we often have nowadays with selfish men, but we have to rule the world with what we have. Some time in the future it will be a different story.

Another set of questions -

1. Which do you prefer:
 - a. A well-developed, organized, attractive environment with the resources of culture; or
 - b. A rough, undeveloped environment full of pioneering possibilities?
2. Which do you regard as the greater sin?
 - a. A sin against Truth; or
 - b. A sin against Love.
3. What kind of business would you prefer?
 - a. One with a secure future, and moderate income; or
 - b. One that offers ~~x~~ possibilities of real wealth at the risk of a large probability of poverty.
4. Of the functions of organized religion, which interests you most:
 - a. The doctrinal
 - b. The Ritualistic
 - c. The humanitarian service
5. During waking consciousness do you ever see subtle colors, appearances as of human forms, or symbols, either fixed or moving, with open or closed eyes?
 Frequently
 Occasionally
 Never
 Don't know
6. Do you tend to be contented or restless under stable conditions?
 - a. contented
 - b. restless
7. Suppose you were in the army or jail; may use one of the religions which they supply. I have taken three groups that represent the more extreme attitudes of the Christian groups. I have left out the Evangelical, with which you may have been associated, and I want you to make a choice, supposing you were in a situation where you had to use one of the following groups.
 - a. the Catholic group, including Roman, Greek, Old ..., where the common denominator is an emphasis upon ritual and sacraments
 - b. the Unitarian, where the emphasis is upon salvation, character and complete freedom; no actual freedom ?
 - c. the Quaker, where emphasis is inspiration, and there being no organized clergy or ... ; any member in the congregation gets up and speaks; much the sort of function that manifests in ...

These are the extreme wings of the church.

I have something to say about certain ugly statements in connection with the subject of object relationships. How many of you know of NATURE'S FINER FORCES? Well, in that we have given a partial statement of the esoteric ~~statement~~ teaching in more or less vague form concerning nature and it reveals what our science has discovered. We ordinarily say that (our occidental statement) the object produces an impression upon our senses and we simply receive that impression as an image upon the retina of the eye, projected by the object. It gives to us a certain positive relationship to the object, but the esoteric teaching is that the primary action of the force is a force which goes out from the senses to the object, catches a return force from the object, but the return force is secondary. Now this is a very hard idea for most of us brought up in the West to accept. It doesn't make sense to our ordinary thinking; but possibly if you follow up one of the little experiments I gave you you may be able to find the presence of that outstanding. They call that luminous ether, tangible ether, and so on. We are only concerned with the point that the flow of consciousness primarily is from the subject to the object, and this flow has an energetic value.

In that little test I gave you, and I wish you would keep up the practice of looking at an object, and then when looking at it direct your attention to the perceiving action, [?] to the thing perceived. You may catch the actual flow of a force; detect it. You might use a general term "feel." That's a much abused term. You don't see, you perceive; you don't think, you perceive, and you don't feel it in the strict sense of the word. It is the beginning of another way of consciousness. I am getting at something more than merely our sympathetic ... I am trying to get you to actually witness this, which is a more diffi-

cult matter. You may be able to see that it must be so from theoretical considerations, but you don't really know until you witness it. We are starting a process of making consciousness conscious of itself, causing a partial flowing backwards of consciousness. That's the beginning step when you are looking at the perceived; analysis of consciousness itself by direct witnessing of itself in its and then building toward the control of it, the mastery of it.

Symbols are a mark of the introvert individual, and they are a way that the unconscious speaks to the conscious, carrying a value that cannot be known in terms of our ordinary faculties of thinking, feeling and sensing, and it therefore has to be conveyed through a form, as a serpent (seen extending above pencil by a student). Yes, we get to what is involved in seeking the meaning of that serpent. In a case of that kind the serpent shows a reference to a life principle; serpent power, Kundalini power, is the basic life power. It is that which the analytical psychologist is finding and for which he has developed the term La Bido; had a very humble beginning.... whereas with Freud it was ... In Yung's account he says it is divine, but this is a concept of psychical energy which in one sense may be thought of as life energy and in another sense as consciousness energy. Introversion is focusing of libido towards the subject; extraversion is focusing of libido towards the object.

Now, if you start to be aware of the flow of the energy of consciousness, or of consciousness itself, rather than the content of consciousness, you are becoming aware of the very thing that is properly symbolized by the serpent. It has other meanings, but you have to take the meaning that is pertinent to the particular situation. It is part of the process of becoming conscious of consciousness. We have struggled down through untold lives building this power of being conscious of

unconsciousness (?). It is fundamental in time, obviously, to affirm that there is not anywhere in the universe anything but consciousness. In the last analysis there is not any state that is unconscious. I won't go into the justification of that now, but consciousness which is not aware of itself is indistinguishable from unconsciousness, and Primordial Consciousness, that which exists before time was, and unaffected by the presence of time, is pure consciousness not aware of itself, and the great labor in the cycles is to build in their understanding degree the power of consciousness to become aware of itself, to become self-conscious. The culmination of the cycle as man is to be one of the gods who can consciously function in Primordial Consciousness, but no one can swim in that sea at command who has not in sufficient degree built the power to become conscious of consciousness.

Now the first movement of consciousness from out the primordial depths is naturally a movement outward in a broad sense, and in that long journey within the midst of the object in the universe gradually the power to be conscious of consciousness comes to birth, and then the return movement takes place. Now there is a grand cycle, those of you know who have studied in nature, whereby all creatures including man and the other kingdoms, swing outward and swing backward into the subjective depths, but those who have not built the power to be conscious of consciousness under the subjective depths in the state of dreamless sleep of which they know nothing and are born out again in the new birth and ~~in~~ a new cycle, but he who can carry that power of transformation - Pralaya, into Nirvana - in the outgoing phase, - Manvantaric, extraversion is a primary importance - in the going phase, intraversion of primary importance.

Can one cultivate the other in time? Yes, you cultivate it when you go to sleep. Ultimately it turns consciousness into that

apparent gap. You would not say that one is totally unconscious, but rather that there is a state in which there is not self-consciousness, consciousness of consciousness. There is such a thing as carrying self-consciousness across into the sleep world, into the world beyond the world, and deeper far than the zone of death takes most men even today, though while still living. That, of course, is Yoga. I think a few words on those deeper subjects is enough, so we will come out into the easier field of drawing a diagram. (Downward line neutral line between extraversion and intraversion - extraversion on left.)

T h i n k i n g

F e e l i n g

S e n s a t i o n

I n t u i t i o n

My reason for this particular diagram is to show that thinking is a little more extraverted than intraverted, feeling a little over, more extraverted, sensation perhaps most (?) extraverted. I leave intuition enclosed at this end because we cannot set definite lines. Let me see if we cannot suggest what those functions are. Our word feeling is used with three meanings:

I feel happy.

I feel a pain in my finger.

I feel that the stock market is going to go up today.

We use it in those three senses and the meaning is so different that it is as great as between thinking and feeling. We bunch them together. We need to use different words. "I feel happy" as a true affective

state, and that's proper use of the word 'feeling'. It has to do with the general basis of evaluation. Something is desirable or undesirable. That which produces happiness is desirable, and that which produces sadness is undesirable. 'I feel pain in my finger.' is obviously a sensation. 'I feel hunger.' is also a sensation. When I fill the stomach the hunger vanishes.. It is ~~the~~ not a feeling and not thinking. It is intuition. You should say 'I have a hunger.' It is confusing when you use the word feeling in all three senses.

Now these functions of consciousness are independent in the sense that no function or group of functions can take the place of one of them. If you liken a complete zone of them to the ocean of consciousness it perhaps would be close. You cannot get around it to it through the other functions. They are like four dimensions in consciousness, each having its own proper zone of freedom, or capable of giving one sector of consciousness and the last governing one ... Thus logic applies to thinking, but logic has no bearing upon perception. The bare perception without thinking involves no logical perception. Things we see around us. It is only when you begin to judge relationships that you enter into the zone where logic rules. Perception by itself would never say "The piano rests upon the floor." I would have to add thinking before I could judge. We combine thinking with the judging. That way it is a little hard to separate, but in the purity it is simply a presentment. There is no question of the presentment being true or false. It is simply presentment. Now the question of truth or falsity implies only when we get to interpretation. Now presentment comes to me in the form of a mirage in the desert. What I see I see, and there is no challenging that. It is a fact, an unassailable fact. I see something out there that we commonly call a mirage, but as merely seeing, it isn't a mirage. The meaning mirage

attaches only when I make a certain judgment. ... If I begin to form a judgment concerning that perception, begin to draw conclusions - what I see is something which will quench my thirst, and when I get to it I know I can take a swim - and if I act accordingly I will find that I am in a state of illusion. The error arose when I began to draw the conclusion, and drew the wrong one. When I drew the conclusion that there was something I could drink there was an error. So long as I drew no conclusion it was just pure perception. Pure perceptions are of that order. Never true and never false. Same way of feeling, in proper sense of word - never true or false.

Everything can be cultured, it can be refined. Feeling is very closely related to the attitude of liking or disliking, a given complex. The judgment "It is good" depends upon feeling. A pure thinker who had no feeling never could make a judgment "It is good." That quality of consciousness to which goodness applied could not exist for him because goodness is an evaluation. Goodness and badness - it is desirable and undesirable; there is evaluation and judgment. You see, there is a kind of logic that can be developed in connection with feeling, and in the highly developed feeling types this sense of this order is strong. It's the sense so strongly developed amongst social leaders - the proper thing in the proper place - which you might never discover by straight thinking, but you have to have this other function of consciousness to be aware of the meaning, the proper thing in the proper place. The thing that I used to think of, say, rather cynically, was the way a tailor could recommend a particular thing, saying "That's just the proper thing ..." and when another year rolled around "That's just the proper thing ..." My inclination was to judge him as something of a hypocrite in order ? to sell his goods. .. I can't follow him I quite admit, but by reason of studying

the thing I quite admit it is possible for someone ... in certain lines of business, to insist a certain thing is fitting, and that's one of the peculiar qualities of the extravert feeling function. That's most highly developed in women, not so well developed in men. Take a case of this kind: the extravert in a woman who seeks as a husband a proper and befitting man, who has the right family connections, the right education, the right appearance, the right dressing habits - she takes that man who has those standards and you would think 'there isn't very much love in that' but in the genuine extravert type the love will follow the judgment. I am talking about things that are relatively mysteries to me because happens in relative degree, repressed into the unconscious. Your big job is to get out and discover that thing which you have repressed into the unconscious. Let us say that a logical trend of thought is developed: Now we have another trend of feeling that follows the curve something like this.

If you are going to follow this law you must suppress that function which is operating against it, so you are following this thinking pattern or you are following the feeling one. Thinking can enthrone feeling back of it; feeling can enthrone thinking back of it. You get ... but you cannot be a primary thinking type and the primary feeling type at the same time. One or the other must be repressed. Thus thinking requires for its best achievement a state of affective indifference. The less you feel the better you can think, if you are a thinker, in a cool, detached position. If your job is a matter of following out ideas according to their law, to their conclusion, without distortion, when the feeling element comes in we will find

steadiness for carrying it through must revert the feeling. The same is true of the feeling type. Only those thoughts which .. no better and no worse. It is absolutely necessary that all the functions shall have . Don't work against a function. If a function is undeveloped it is more a matter of drawing out the undeveloped than working against the overdeveloped. We do go to extremes - involve problems, psychological - quite awful. You can never say to either a thinking or feeling type, bring out the other judgment function directly, because it fights against his thinking nature. You have to get at it indirectly, through another function.

The feeling type is the type that has control of feeling. He has it organized. The feeling type is not the explosive, emotional type. It is not a question of merely having feeling and not having feelings, but the feeling type has his feeling organized, cultured. There is a definite instrument by which he is oriented to life and therefore of all individuals he is least apt to be emotional, explosive, just as the thinking type is not disturbed by trouble about the value of ideas. Ideas don't appear to be as dangerous things. Very often to the other types certain ideas may come as threats of danger, and they shy at concepts, but the thinking type doesn't. He is in his own native domain, but in the unconscious the other function is .. and the repressed nature is not well developed. It is not under control, and it may manifest explosively when it comes out. It is rather dangerous when too much repression goes on; much better to have some sort of safety valve to put back into unconscious. Part of the problem of individualization. You have to get a brotherhood between your different functions. Of course, some are going to be oriented so, the more as you are incarnated in a body like that. You will have

to put in another plane where you can be all at once. I think that will be enough.

(Vishnu - pigs - went back to God-business. He didn't function the Vishnu power when he was .. to the vehicle of pig consciousness.)

It is harder for the intravert to conform to the extravert's standard than it is for the extravert to conform to the intravert's standard, and not knowing the reason why he is apt to feel that there is something wrong. You can cultivate the intravert attitude. You become a type only when one side or another is a habitual one. Many individuals are not strongly marked as types. (More strongly marked nearer wall.) Sometimes one gets out of his own particular attitude and adapts himself according to other attitudes, and makes himself live according to that attitude, and in some cases producing physiological disorders. It does happen that sometimes an individual does change over through some kind of growth. It is also true that an intravert in a favorable malu (?), means unfoldment, may act like an extravert.

Is the type something that is just ones veil during a particular incarnation, or is it something that is characteristic of the reincarnating Ego? No, the total consciousness of the individual involves all functions and most attitudes. You can see it then as a compensating play back and forth. We can very well assume that when it was too extravert in one incarnation it was shifted over to another in the next, because nature is seeking balance all the time, and what's neglected is what you have to take.

(Diagram - inward movement to left -
line up and down)

You can swing over to the counter attitude by effort and make yourself act that way but it is contrary to your natural attitude, and there will be a certain fatigue attached. You want to swing back to your own attitude as soon as you have a chance.

Q. In development do people go to the extreme of type or to balance?

A. The ultimately perfected man will have brought up all states of his nature but he cannot manifest all states of his nature in one of these .. psychological organisms that we have. We would say that he would have a greater capacity to function properly in the different attitudes, so that he wouldn't be so much the victim of his type structure as he becomes more evolved. He can play between them.

Q. Isn't there a time that a person could be entirely governed through reason, and another through feeling?

A. One may be of a thinking type but it doesn't mean that his feeling side isn't cultured in a sense of being well organized. He may have intense potential. Now there feeling may take the ascendancy at certain times. Feeling would tend to be more explosive. It is possible that if an individual was .. perceptive or rational functions, as they are called, that as a secondary function he might oscillate pretty well between thinking and feeling. It would mean simply that his primary function was not a judgment function but a perceptive function. And, in much the same way, if predominant organization is judgment, thinking and feeling might be capable of swinging between sensation and intuition, because the judgment function occupies the neutral position between those two and the perception occupies a neutral position with respect to thinking and feeling or judgment function. Explosive person may be very matured in a thinking principle or in the thinking function, and be explosive in the feeling function. Now a feeling type that is well developed will have a corresponding kind of, shall we say, thought explosions - negative kind of thinking comes up, very inferior, as he takes the negative form.

It is sometimes called the "nothing but" thinking. A feeling type may take a critical attitude towards her own felt values, and give some surface explanation and say "It's nothing but - that". That you might say is a kind of thought explosion in a destructive.... Sense will have to judge their culture by the development of the function that it is most developed in.

Q. Inner and outer subjective?

A. You cannot move into a subjective phase without inversion. To go into the subjective is to intravert. We do have mystics like Whitman, M.La ? , Carpenter perhaps, who have a strong orientation toward nature. Particularly is that true of Whitman. The exception would be this, that they are intraverted on one function and extraverted on the complimentary function. Now Whitman was able to find a very great joy in the very ordinary object. In fact he made a point of that. Got a delight out of a walk in a very ordinary woods, and unusual special bits of scenery like the Yosemite Valley did not have the great spiritual value as compared to the ordinary. We all have it more or less equally. Now you see in that a good deal of the extraverted attitude, and that's true of a number of mystics but it is not true of all. Suppose the attitude is intravert on both functions. You might get a consciousness that is metaphysical in the sense that it is empty to value. I struggled for sometime, studied this point, and it is clearly discernible among those who have won some degree of what we call Cosmic Consciousness; and there are some that go a great deal on the object itself, and others who see in the object only a mire, an illusion. They endure the life in the midst of

bodies because there is work to be done, but naturally look forward to the day when they would be released from them. Now if you had both functions intraverted that becomes understandable. If you had one function intraverted and the other extraverted, then the first becomes understandable. I think we are beginning to get a key to something that otherwise was perfectly unexplainable.

Take a painter who produces an object that doesn't correspond to anything that you actually see. There you have evidence either of his following out the intravert phase of sensation or intravert intuition. Oh, yes, both phases would be represented in art.

Q. Is Mme. Blavatsky an intravert or extravert?

A. I believe she would show divisions of functioning in both attitudes.

As some of you know, this phase of the work of the last two years has grown out of a transformation of consciousness that I realized in 1936, as a result of something like twenty-four years effort, after having first learned or found evidence that there was something like a kind of consciousness that didn't fit into our ordinary consciousness as Western philosophy thinks. First of all it was an academic interest which grew out of university activities I was in, so the whole person ... afterwards part of a course. So naturally I was groping for some time, spent in finding of the right tracks, but after about twenty-four years, with a lot of time that was lost in groping in the wrong way, I finally found a key that worked with me. Now the thing was so astonishingly simple that

I was appalled that it was a universal discovery. I discussed it ... and then I was astonished afterwards to discover that it didn't seem simple to the fellow I was talking to. Analysis showed me that the real difficulty was in its very simplicity. The tendency of our times, at least here in the west, is to go out into elaboration, and therefore the thing if sufficiently simple is missed, overlooked, not even noted. It is closer to you than the eyeglasses on your face that you are looking through and perhaps have forgotten were there. It is simply that which is flowing through your consciousness, intimately a part of you; you don't see it, don't take it into account in point of fact, but you find it difficult to give it recognition. This realization came to me after having been studying on the subject of liberation, that in point of fact there was nothing to be accomplished; that this consciousness was the pure subject, and that I eternally was that subject, couldn't help myself about it, never started (?) and so wasn't a matter of looking for something to happen. It was just a matter of being still and knowing that I was that self, so I gave up all expectation of anything happening, but then something did happen; mostly of the nature that defies expression. Now it defies expression because it was like a journey in consciousness that doesn't fit into any of our four dimensional forms. See the point? Therefore in the effort to express it by means of one of the four-dimensional forms you are at the same time falsifying its nature; you are distorting it. There are certain precipitated efforts, you might say, that result from this shifting of consciousness, of which you can speak.

The outstanding quality is one of a supernal Joy, of an order of intensity that is not produced by any pleasant experience whatsoever. You cannot measure in terms of any of our ordinary value.

I find myself saying that any kind of suffering or pain as an exactitude would be justified in the realization of this state; and then when I began to check through the literature afterwards I found that that same statement occurred over and over again. It is true - there is a sort of a release, of feeling, a not being bound, of having arrived home, with the strain of seeking something to complete yourself gone, for you are complete, and you are not ego-bound; that is, bound by the limitations of being merely an Ego. A symbol for expressing came to me later, in thinking of the "I" as being like a Space instead of like a point.

If we ordinarily think of our "I" as the Self", as a bare point, from which we look forth, feel forth, and otherwise experience and think, and that that process of sinking into the "I" would be like a process that might be, well, approached by arriving at the mere power of being aware at once and becoming an expansion into space. Now that isn't myself in the Space, but "I", the Space itself. Now that Space mustn't be thought of as this space, as a place in which objects are. It is pure subjective. Now a state of consciousness that is purely subjective naturally wouldn't be a state having objects. These are mystical states where there are objects. They occupy an intermediary position, but that Consciousness which is purely subjective is not a consciousness of something outside, not involved in objects, but it carries all of the values that ever possibly could be aroused by objects, and then intensified to an immeasurable degree; the state where you can have all the values at once, and you know the law of compensation out here: you can't have your pie and eat it, and when you choose one thing it is always at the price of foregoing that which is incompatible with it. But in that Consciousness

it is all values at once. That perhaps can suggest something of its richness. In other words, think over everything that you think valuable; imagine that sense of value intensified beyond your power to value, and all of it at once - a value you couldn't think. That may suggest something of the subject state. It is that state that the Hindu and the Buddhist speaks of as Liberated Consciousness ... It is therefore intraversion carried to an extreme degree.

I am very much interested in Dr. Young's discussion of the subject, which shows that he is on the borderland through his investigations, where he can see something like a crossing over. He even does speak of the goal, crossing journey, at one place ever remarks that In the process of intuitive intraversion typical elements in the unconscious are of a type that are not of the nature of the objects that we think, sense and feel out here. By a mysterious process they are fabricated into subtle images that symbolize their meaning, and then those images are projected so that they appear to be as seen or otherwise. But intraversion can go so far as to reach a level where no image, no symbol can be fabricated to represent its content. Then you have consciousness moving in what is genuine Formless Consciousness, without boundaries. It is matter, a space, shall we say, that interpenetrates this space. It is co-existent with this state, but which, if one is completely centered in it, all of this space and its objects would at that time disappear.

It is, however, possible to some degree to so split one's individual consciousness principal that a small fraction of it remains aware of purely space world while the larger portion of it pierces into that subjective space, and if one's discrimination is keen enough, then in spite of the fact that one fraction of his consciousness is

aware of external objects he knows that that other Space has no objects whatsoever, but by that division of the consciousness a certain degree of consciousness ...

Now we have called that other Cosmic Consciousness, and I now add, in addition, another term, Super-functional, being a type of consciousness that doesn't fall into any one of the four dimensions. There are certain interesting things that happen to you when an event of that kind comes along, which is no event at all. It is only the simple recognition of what is eternally true when viewed from a metaphysical standpoint. In that metaphysical standpoint nothing happened; from the relative standpoint something did happen. If you want to get technical you will have to deny everything you say; you will have to, for it isn't . If you ever read mystical literature you will see for yourself. The key - the speaking in two levels - it is no event at all, and yet it is the greatest event in ones cycle of lives.

Now there is something in consciousness which seems to be best expressed by calling it a turnover, so that the base of consciousness and the base of self-identity is completely changed. It is a turning over of valuation. Here's one way in which to work. Before and while you are approaching them, you may say that you have used all sorts of objects - natural base, books, ideas, as instruments - to arouse in your consciousness of value something that was a worth. You read books for the worth you can get out of them, and when you get the worth of them you may drop the book. Objects meanwhile have been helping you on and on. The effect of the turnover is, you find yourself posited on the side of worth, and the object no longer is needed. Instead of being in the object phase of consciousness where you are

struggling over these various instruments that you have, to a valuable state, you find yourself now identical with the value state, far beyond anything that you ever achieved as a matter of personal effort throughout such lifetimes as you have had. You find yourself identical with the fountainhead of value, and then when you look at objects they seem to be like ghosts. They no longer have the significance that they had; you might the ... but objects are not carriers of value for you. Now that will give you some idea of the turning over of the base of consciousness.

What we seek is to promote this turn in consciousness to such degree as is possible with those who, shall we say, the bud is ready but has not yet bloomed. It's a mystical event. The hour can be predicted by no one, but, shall we say, there is an atmosphere in which the flower is more apt to open than if the atmosphere were not there. It is a curious combination of trying and not trying. The rule is to try earnestly and do nothing. Learn the art of doing nothing with a lot of effort. You if you understand that you are good, for it bursts forth in the very still, balanced state of consciousness. Act content in that action. ? I can rationalize that somewhat but I won't at the moment.

I want you to be prepared to answer questions some time later upon this material.

Start from the standpoint of the turnover of consciousness, not from the present level of consciousness, as of course I cannot assume that that turnover has taken place in everyone:

LET US ~~ASSUME~~ IMAGINE REALITY AS A PLENUM (FULLNESS) OF PRIMORDIAL, UNDIFFERENTIATED CONSCIOUSNESS.

This is a root idea - in the first five Aphorisms, and to them you may add:

CONSCIOUSNESS WITHOUT AN OBJECT IS ALSO
CONSCIOUSNESS WITHOUT A SUBJECT.

As you get the meaning behind those words it implies that it is not the consciousness of any being but is Consciousness before any being became. That's the hardest part of the whole thing, to get that root idea. It upsets all of our usual theological ideas so far as I know, and ideas in Western philosophy and Western psychology. I know of only one place where it exists also, and yet it's not there so very clearly stated. It means:

THAT CONSCIOUSNESS IS SELF-EXISTENT;
THAT CONSCIOUSNESS IS A SEED, (THIS PRIMORDIAL CONSCIOUSNESS)
NOT DEPENDENT UPON ANYTHING ELSE.

I doubt that it is really possible to imagine. It is only possible to know it by realizing. It doesn't fit into our relative consciousness forms at all. I am merely taking to you therefore a symbol, a group of words, upon which you can focus meditation, and that will have a certain power for steering something of a light consciousness, but with the relative mind never hope to understand it. You cannot, because the relative mind is contained within that and can never contain that. From out of that come all things but it is not identical with anything. Now I ask you to assume this, assume it as true, and then as far as you can act, as thought it were true, and that will tend to bring your consciousness into that level which is more favorable to the realization. Now we come to the next point. Let's think next of:

CONSCIOUSNESS AS BEING IN SOME WAY DIVIDED INTO
TWO ASPECTS, WHICH WE WILL CALL THE SUBJECT AND THE
OBJECT, AND YET REMAINING IN ANOTHER SENSE ALL THE
WHILE UNDIVIDED.

Of course I could have been less considerate and say it was divided and not divided, for, it is never divided at all, and yet in some way it is divided into two aspects, which we call the subject and the object.

If you ever get a crystallized picture in your mind, cut and dried, about all of this, know it isn't true. No cut and dried picture is ever true of these transcendental realities. So, remember that while we say it is divided into the subject and the object, that at the same time it is not divided at all. You ^{must} always bring that second redeeming thought along. Then you can proceed with the ^{analysis} analization of the seeming division.

Don't worry. More than your understanding is involved in this. It is enough to just try to understand. The effort to try to understand gives the opening of the mind which is necessary. Something enters, like an inner stream. Consciousness is not merely awareness of a group of ideas. It is a stream that surrounds them. It is that stream that does the work.

Now always remember that when I say 'subject' I mean 'I'; that which you really mean when you say it ^{yourself} back, capitalized; and so it ^{consciousness} means that it divides into two aspects: an I (subjective aspect) and ^{the} objective. A self or I, aware of something that stands opposed to or over against, ^{it} as its own other. The object is the 'eternal mate' of the Self. The Self is the I. So, when I speak of ~~it~~ as that which stands as the other, it is that which I am not. All that which I am not is my mate; that's my 'other'. I am speaking, of course, in the transcendental sense of the I. THIS UNIVERSE IS MY MATE.

THIRD POINT: Think of this consciousness as now flowing from the subject to the object, and back again, thus completing a circuit, and thus I am speaking of Maha-Paramanvantara - Consciousness without an object is the totalling of ...

Now I am that eternal subject that produces the whole universe as the consciousness flows through me to that other and returns.

There is a sense in which something happens, and it also remains .. true, timeless, eternal, primordial being can be affected by nothing - so that again that is time a base. Yes, there is a sense when consciousness is made aware of itself, and completes the circuit, and something is gained.

FOURTH POINT: AS PURELY SUBJECTIVE CONSCIOUSNESS FLOWS TOWARD THE OBJECTIVE PHASE IT PRODUCES THE OBJECTIVE UNIVERSE AS AN EFFECT.

To help make that idea a little more acceptable I want to leave with you a question:

IF THERE WERE NO PERCEIVER OF THIS WORLD COULD YOU SAY THAT THE OBJECTIVE WORLD WOULD CONTINUE TO EXIST?

I want everyone to think of that and get their own answer. If any of you think it could what reason do you have for thinking it could? If no perceiver, upon what ground can you evidence that belief. Prove to me that the world would exist even though there were no perceiver, and that means no object in the world, no one has ever seen it, no creator has ever seen it.

BEFORE OBJECTS WERE CONSCIOUSNESS-WITHOUT-AN-OBJECT IS.

The meaning is, we are dealing with Timelessness. The present and future and past tense have no meaning, and, strictly speaking, the present tense has no meaning, but the nearest we can get to the timeless state is by the use of the present time. More potency that you will get in a long time because these truths or words symbolize .. Read these Aphorisms in meditative spirit. It may possibly be that you can be in a meditative spirit even when in action. In fact a good while this evening you were in that action....

Sunday, September 11, 1938

Let me first thank Mr. Sedivy for the music they have given us. I enjoyed it, and I am sure the rest of you did.

Regardless of whether an individual has had a glimpse of the mystical states of consciousness, but if he is an unprejudiced student, he will easily find a large mass of evidence that there are states of consciousness that differ in important respects from our ordinary consciousness. I could refer you briefly, if you are a stranger to this subject, to two books that are very reasonable: one by William James, "Varieties of Religious Experience", and Dr. Bucke "Cosmic Consciousness"; and if you wish to go further afield you may go through all the greater religious ... , particularly from the Orient, but you will find built up very strong cases that there are ways of being conscious that do not fall within the limits of our ordinary psychology or ordinary philosophy. This consciousness, all the evidence points, I am speaking of that part which can be apparent to an observer, are within this consciousness as very marked characteristics. First of all it ineffable, and that means simply that he who has realized a moment or a longer period of this consciousness cannot express in terms of any of our ordinary functions of consciousness. He cannot express it as an idea. His feeling is inadequate to unfold it. There is no sensuous image nor even intuition to represent this that he may have realized. That's always the case; always found in any report one may come across. It is an important common earmark. I shall later speak of why this must necessarily be so, but at present I am merely outlining the earmarks of a kind of consciousness different from that with which we are commonly familiar.

In the second place, always, he who has had a glimpse or more feels from it a strange and profound assurance. For that moment at least he is above doubt. He is not believing, but knowing. He finds

the uncertainties that may have dogged his trail through life are off. His knowledge carries an authority, or this knowledge, this consciousness, carries an authority that is more than ordinary. Often if he speaks of it it is imagined that he is , that he has become conceited, because speaking in the impersonal as he may, he is forced to use our ordinary knowledge, and conveys a false impression. He is not speaking with merely a personal assurance, but a more than human assurance.

In the third place an outstanding characteristic is the quality of Joy, of satisfaction. You know how we seek in life always something that will satisfy a yearning, the desire in one direction or another. That profits us not. Ordinarily when we find or think we have found the object of our desire we find it inadequate. It is disappointing, often not worth the effort put forth to obtain it, but this other satisfaction, as you will find always reported, is more than anyone could wish for. Now that's a simple statement. Just stop and think what that would mean. If you had a value that not only was all that you could imagine but more than you were ever even able to wish for, that brings with it a sense of abundance that is overflowing, because it brings with it a sense of completeness, even in dimensions that this personal consciousness has not been aware of.

And the four characteristics of which I will speak - there are others, the conditions that nearly always are reported: duration of these periods of this unusual consciousness is very brief. Very few cases recorded where it lasts for over two hours at the most; often hardly more than a flash, but even though it had been only a flash, it leaves that individual in some way different. He finds himself grounded in something other than that which is the common property of most men. And so far, everywhere on the pages of history we can

find evidences of individuals who report realization of such consciousness, and in every case that has reached maturity, it is not the private possession (?) of any man or race, or place, but only a very small percentage of the whole of humanity have this other, peculiar consciousness. We are very deeply concerned with this consciousness, not merely as a theory. While it is interesting to speculate about the possibilities of consciousness, that's only a passing interest after all. We are interested in awakening, or progress toward the awakening, at least in some measure, of this consciousness. It is not merely our prejudice as it is thought. There are conditions, course of action, which facilitate the awakening toward it. We can do something about it. I think I may say a word about its nature by contrasting it with the consciousness we know.

The most common, the most fundamental characteristic of our consciousness in the ordinary sense is that it is a consciousness of a self or subject or I, aware of a universe outside, and that's a very simple thought with which you are probably all cognizant. It just so happens that it is just such simple facts that give us the key to the profoundest mysteries. We usually stand - you might stand, as centers; each one a center, which he calls himself, an I, that stands in contrast to the world of his experience including other individuals or persons whom we generally regard as possessing I's also. Do you ever stop to think that you don't know that. You don't know that there is a self anywhere else except in yourself. You have never experienced it; have you? Except for your ownself you may assume it. Do you really know it? And don't you find, therefore, a fundamental characteristic of this that we call "I", and after you have pressed down through the shell of personal characteristics of all subtle

things you can analyze, there remains the core, which has the characteristic of being just "I" - and I am that one. It seems like a point, and from the base of that point, the place where we stand, we look out and see all of the world of objects about us and engage ourselves with those objects - a great deal of the time mistaking that particular object which we call our bodies, personalities, for the Self. That's again confusing ourselves with the idea of multiplicity where there is union, because, your body that you can look at is not yourself. It is an object for your consciousness. So long as you have an object for your consciousness you haven't yet found the witness. You must reduce the object to a subtle form, but so long as there is an object you haven't yet reduced the object. Important factor - consciousness has these two aspects ...

and looking out, feeling out, or thinking out for an object; or, it may be a sensible one, it may be an idea, but it is an object, and I stands as distinct from that. In contrast this other kind of consciousness is not an instance of a self experiencing any kind of world outside, subtle or gross, but is rather a state that you might describe as an identity between the perceiver and that which is perceived - an identity between the self and the quality. So you have the mystic saying, very profound reason, "I am Truth", "I am Beauty", "I am Goodness and "I also am able" and all other things, and all the other polarities, and in that he also is reflecting what is true of the consciousness, and in that state one isn't the self experiencing something objective to the self. That is, we can describe it this way - a state where the Self, the Ego (?) extended with the object, and by that I mean anything whatsoever that you ~~be~~ in any way may be aware of.

Incidentally, I might say at this point that if you can accom-

plish this apparently simple act in consciousness - of isolating that which we call "I" from everything that is not I - do it completely, and not merely a "me" that is an object of consciousness, but an "I" which is never an object; in other words, can really get that state of the consciousness that has no content, recognize it - that instant you can break through the door. It is so simple that it is difficult, because that stripping down to the final pure subject is one of the most difficult (?) pieces of analysis there is, just as simplicity is hard for us.

It is that which is closest to us at every moment of our life, we carry it around with us, and that which we never are away from; that, Myself, is the key. It is not something that belongs in a distant place, it is not the operation of knowledge in our ordinary sense of knowledge, it is not great experience, but it is through that which the simplest and the greatest have in common - the Self - that lies the key to the supreme consciousness, and yet how few have made use of this magic key. You know that the only purpose in the last analysis for which religion exists, around which all uses of religion are secondary and subsidiary, is the purpose of finding this Door to the Liberated Consciousness. The ways by which men have sought this door are devotion, and the rights for many, and the struggles are not by any means simple, but this oh, so simple thing opens the door that is the end of all religion; more than that, the end of all philosophy; and he who has opened that door and entered in needs no more religion in the ordinary sense of religion; he needs no more philosophy. He might ~~enjoying~~ endow a religion, he might give birth to philosophy that would have value for others, but for himself he would have finished the climb for which both the religion and philosophies and the self are maya. For himself they are broken things,

but their work is not finished for others. So, I am speaking now of that quest which we find recorded in the Upanishads, the oldest literature, which has continued down to this age, and which tradition says has existed far before the Upanishads and Vedas, that quest that moves every man, whether he knows it or not. It is the quest that drives him towards the ordinary objects of desire, because when he desires ordinary things, unknowingly he is desiring the supreme, but because of ignorance seeks in the wrong direction.

What is wealth in the ordinary sense but a means to an end, and what is knowledge in the ordinary sense but a means to a value that is worth while, and what are human relationships? Do they not represent a seeking of a superior value, a value that doesn't stop at the concrete objects? If I may use mystical terminology, "What man seeks through all of his desires is God." but mostly he doesn't know it, and he thinks that this drive in him that won't let him rest, but makes him go on and on to acquire various things, and master various things, he thinks it is for these concrete things that he is seeking, but you will note, when you reach these concrete things there is always a disappointment. The promises that they were are not realized; somehow or other they are like mirages. As you approach them the thing you sought recedes, and then you try again, and you say, now it's some other object; you say, I sought wealth, now I seek knowledge, information, and so on, and when it is attained, the thing that's sought recedes on. You look over life with a critical and unprejudiced view - watch men, watch your own experience - you will find that's the universal story, when the object is attained, perhaps briefly a moment of satisfaction, and then you are not satisfied. It doesn't carry the value that somehow you felt might be there, and the reason is that these things, these objects, are merely ghosts that enveil

the value you seek, and the mystic's name for that value is God. God is not other than the better part of every man, but we are all orphans, or wanderers in a strange country until the day we come again to this that is the better part of ourselves. I more commonly speak of it as Super-Functional Consciousness, as Mystical Consciousness, as Cosmic Consciousness. You might call it Yoga to use Oriental terms. They are different ways of speaking of it, and they are all true. Yes, it is God, but every theological definition is false. It is a reality, and no man conceives that reality correctly. It is a reality that is unthinkable, real and living; close, yes, as close even as the self, but it is that other part of man that never really is separated from man, but his consciousness is so blinded that for ages he has been a pilgrim on the outer rim, wandering, starved and hungry for the communion he craves. Now any other search than search for this attainment is a waste of time. For the individual that has reached the point where he knows the direction in which that search goes, he must be successful. Once having recognized that this is the only goal that will bring enduring values, and satisfaction, and completeness, once having realized that, it is folly for any man to allow anything else to take first place in his consciousness. That's an excuse for those that don't know, but for those who do, even though they know it only through an intuitive thinking, it becomes the first duty, otherwise you are but playing with ghosts. All things else apart from this are but ghosts in value, and there is no hope in them. The wisdom of all the sages: no hope in these empty shells that objects are, when they are separated from that one thing which can envisage them with value, namely, the supernal consciousness which is divine, the search for reality can be satisfactorily completed.

It is a message of hope. There is the enduring real, I know. There is that which does not change, which can be trusted, and reach beyond any man's dreams. When I say rich I mean that every value whatsoever that you may envisage is there; not merely those values that the more narrowly religious has defined, but all values - the values that play so large a part for the thinker or for the artist, or for the practical man of affairs, as well as those who are more centered upon philosophy. All those values are there.

Now there is a reason why I have called this super-functional consciousness - one of the many names for it. We have been seeking in times gone on for an approach to this eternal value, and that fits peculiarly our own Western culture. Some time ago I became satisfied that it is not enough to graft on to the Western psychophysical nature techniques and approaches that fit totally different races. I have seen too many failures in that. I found the reason. We are a different people, differently oriented, different interests, different psychical backgrounds, and the right means with the wrong man does not work. You have got to have the right means with the right man, so, we are approaching the problem from the standpoint of our own peculiar psychology. - We are now in this day far enough advanced in analysis of the human state to be aware of the fact that not all men are alike, that they are of different types, and that our consciousness functions apparently in four main ways. These main ways are not interchangeable. One cannot tap (?) the type of consciousness that others can. They are complimentary but in no one individual are all four ways equally developed, so that human beings as we know them are fractional in their consciousness, incomplete. This higher consciousness may be thought of as the synthesis of all four functions, plus an additional indescribable element that has such a quality of richness that forces

one to use words like ... an infinite to convey its value. When you say that something is infinite you mean that it is beyond the standards of measure, and that is literally true. You cannot by the standards of measure of our ordinary consciousness put any limits upon super-functional consciousness. It is simply misconstrued ... No man who ever recorded the claims of realization of this state ever could use language that is too extreme in trying to represent it. Perhaps some of you are familiar with Pseudo- ... and with some of the poetic expressions of the Hindu. They have the sensuous imagery, perhaps the best of all, and they build up a picture in trying to ... that ~~in~~ to our ordinary mind seems impossible, just imagination gone wild, but I will say to you that their best efforts are gross understatements, for the very forms of those images they use are too utterly restricted. The sensuous that is so often used by the ... gives you an impression of something very sensuous. It doesn't give the idea of something that is satisfying to the profundities of thought; at the same time something that is not a thought, not a feeling. I prefer to use mathematical symbols. You can really imagine big things in mathematics, but they fall down too. It only gives you a certain cross section too. You know in mathematics you can even take the notion of an infinity that is infinitely greater than other infinities. There are places where I have had to use imagery like that to suggest. More powerful than any of the sensuous images but it is a different premise. You literally cannot use any device that we have in our relative consciousness to convey the real value - inadequate - what I want to bring home. Now I find that by interpenetrating what this small elaboration of words that mean large or superlative things, does not bring the full realization of largeness or superlativeness. We can very easily put down astronomical figures that would make the

imagery of great mountains and tops of canyons - the scenery value -
 specks ... and then you get to the rim of the Grand Canyon and you
 get a more powerful view - a hole 144 (?) feet deep and 14 miles
 across; certainly broad, beyond ones sight. He has the sense of
 immensity that dwarfs the million light years, so far as the effect
 upon his consciousness is concerned. Now I am just illustrating there
 how the mere concepts of greatness do not carry their real values to
 human consciousness. Grand Canyon - magnificent space - but when we
 see it as a whole we are usually overpowered. Perhaps we might be
 able to suggest values ^{through} ~~that~~ all the practical, through all the over-
 powering scenery in the world that makes ones senses reel, that makes
 one feel they were beginning to be equilibrated because they have
 not the power to comprehend or perceive, well then we might think or
 overshadow that fundamental of the super-functional consciousness.
 And how grand is it? Well, I can tell you. I can give you a ...
 that suggests something: I could conceive time (?) at least as great
 as that I conceived; I can conceive of interstellar space, distances
 on the order of hundreds of thousands and of millions of light years ...
 and bodies not only the size of our sun but many, manyfold greater;
 yes, I, man, have been able to conceive of that, yet I am at least
 as great as that I conceive. I contain that which I conceive when ...
 it is my image. Maybe that will suggest the majesty of this Self of
 which I speak. If we were smaller than that we could not conceive so
 great. Think of that. Think of that majesty which lies beyond
 this body ego. Oh yes, the body ego is I, and that's what most men
 mean when they talk of I. I am not talking of that. That's the
 polar opposite (?). But, I Am before that personal ego became.
 I am not a point ... I am a Space that contains this universe. I
 impose this universe. I am not unfolded ~~next to that idea~~ but to that (?)

out here it seems so, and so that is the great universe. I impose this universe. I sustain it. Without me it could not exist. And every one of you can say likewise, for in principle that is true; that every one of these reflections of myself are here, are spread elsewhere, throughout the universe, for I am witness through all your eyes, and I think through all your minds and am many ... without me there would be no world ... no journey, no path, for I am, I alone produce, sustain, the end and ...

Let us have a few minutes of meditation. I will repeat first just a few Aphorisms. May I remind you that the work we are doing has to do with bringing nearer the hour the thing for which this humanity is starving, the lack of which causes all its troubles, and without which there can be no enduring solution of those troubles. ...

Nothing should ever be regarded as our knowledge until we have ourselves verified it. I mean that rigorously - that no statement of any authority, that I make, no statement that the great ones have made, no statement that came from one of the gods is knowledge for you until you have yourself verified it. Now there may be big presumption why you should entertain it, there may be good reason why you should have probably, faith in it, but don't treat it as your knowledge until you have verified it; and that goes through the whole domain of possible knowledge. Now you may entertain ideas as probably true, possibly true, something to be put on and tried, but we cannot say "I know" about a thing until we have verified it, and that which you have yourself verified, then you are getting on to bedrock. That won't slip away from your feet. And what I do, of course, is aim to be a guiding line, over which you may get help to awakening that consciousness by which you can verify, but it sometimes happens that an individual takes a different course from what I might expect, or because of his individual idiosyncrasy, but the stimulus may have been started, and what we seek is the awakening to self-knowledge.

Now, take the philosophy that I give, as a basis, let us say, a basis that is assumed. Assume it as though true, and that's the only thing you can ever really do until it is proven, and that's all I ever ask, and you cannot check its truth until you first assume it is true and try it out, because it isn't something that is objective, that you can test by purely external examination. It therefore involves primarily a new subjective pole of consciousness, that is tested in another way, but it must become your knowledge before you know.

Now the work on the last set of questions I have pretty well covered. There are certain contradictions that I will have to analyze, and that will take some time, but I can give you a general statement of our discoveries. There were some important changes as compared to the questionnaire before. The judgment types - not much changed in number, from 17 to 15, but there was a shifting around; i.e., by the judgment types, those oriented to feeling and thinking, and I find that those oriented to feeling and thinking are in the minority. The outstanding development, the one that seems to be most definitely established, is the predominance of the intuitive function of the class as a whole. Twenty-five members of the class seem to be intuitive types with intuition as a predominant function. Twelve members seem to have intuition as a secondary function. That makes 37 out of the 47 that came in last night. Twenty-nine reveal at least an occasional ... in the form of subjective vision. Of course the action of the introvert phase of this function is not necessarily in the form of vision. There are ways that it might manifest itself but it would be hard to word a question so as to isolate cases, but I find 29 cases that have at least subjective introversion and seven that are uncertain. There is no positive evidence that there is any member of the class that does not have intuition either in the position of the first or second function. Some doubtful questions, but no positive evidence that we have any in the class that do not have intuition in some degree. This is an interesting fact. It does concur with what I would theoretically expect. Now this helps to explain something.

Many of the answers appear to be contradictory in different places, and then in another question where you would expect a parallel answer, in one case he gives an answer that indicates thinking type and in another case he gives an answer that indicates feeling type.

It begins to become clear why that should happen; because those who are oriented to perception through sensation or intuition, but particularly intuition, follow a guiding line in their selections and choices that do not obey any conscious order or law, but some principle that is hidden in the unconscious. Thus, two given situations, from a standpoint of either feeling or thinking, would stand as being of the same type, governed therefore by the same law. To the intuitive it may be quite different because ~~xxx~~ of his awareness of hidden elements in one case that changes his choice. To the judgment type it seems contrary, because he is operating a different law than that which we can consciously formulate. Now if as evolution goes on, this element in the unconscious that guided came within our field of consciousness, we cannot then be able to extend the definition of law to include these deciding elements, so that in that case it wouldn't be inconsistent, but as it is we often get that kind of action. This ... seems radical but it is typical of the intuitive because he is guided by another principal of balance. Class as a whole is oriented to the intuitive function - this inconsistency becomes intelligible - perhaps you can see .. underlies .. many seemingly erratic things. What we discover in this class confirms a theory that I have already observed from purely a priori consideration, that all students destined to encourage mystical awakening must have intuition active either as the first or second function, and capable of functioning, with some facility, in the introvert phase.

Several of you were here on the first of October last year, and remember the event that took place that night. Many of you were carried on into an unusually deep state consciously. I had reports sent to me afterwards. Twenty-four were turned in, and going through them I found that out of the 24 there were only 3 that are not rated

among those that had interior vision, and one of those three I know has introvert intuition, but of a different sort again, bearing out the point that the function value which thus affects is of the intuitive, and intuition in the introvert phase. Now the principles will become clear why the Older Brothers have laid so much stress upon the function of intuition, for it is the function that is peculiarly oriented to the unconscious, and it is within the first domain of the unconscious that the supernal consciousness lies; beginning to become a little more intelligible, the reason why. Now it is not essential that intuition should be the primary function, but it must be the subsidiary function. A person might be extravert in his main function, but if he is capable of functioning introvert, in, he is capable of penetration. There, I think, we find our common denominator. We differ in other respects but we unite in it. The group is selected automatically, that way. Others might drift in out of curiosity, and quickly go, and those that have this particular ground, stay and feel that they have found themselves. To those of a different type we would be talking a wierd and strange language that would not be making much sense. And suppose we had an ordinary extravert sensational type with extravert thinking as second function - that would be the practical intelligent man in affairs; I think we would sound as though we should be in some place where we would be taken care of; wouldn't know what our words were referring to. He wouldn't be inclined to linger. So, we get our common denominator - some of us do think more, and some feel more, but we have this one capacity more or less in common.

I might say about introvert intuition, insofar as psychologists have been able to trace, that it is the most obscure of all phases of our psychical organization. The one thing they have been able to

follow is the presence of these subjective images, visions, or whatever they may be. We won't attempt to define their meaning. Let us just for the moment treat them as a kind of seeing. It's a seeing of an object that appears like an object but is unlike our external objects; somewhat different from external objects. As a matter of fact it appears a little more extravert-sensation than extravert-intuition. Now those objects represent a consciousness value that is unconscious, that has been separated by introvert penetration and has been brought to the consciousness in the only way, with that individual, at that time possible, through a symbolic meaning. The symbol has to be interpreted before it is translated into meaning, before it means anything for the judgment function. Now in the case of a pure introvert-intuitive type, one who is not developed either as thinking or feeling as a function, he is just content in witnessing these symbols, just follows them without connecting them, without any bearing in moral significance. There is no evidence that any one in the class is merely an introvert-intuitive. I am not so sure but that the pure introvert-intuitive would be so bored with these discourses that he wouldn't stay. Don't mean anything to him. ...There is an elaborate one here that gives you an illustration of it. (I Am Presence) Symbolic, and in the light of what was transpiring at the time - it is not so hard to interpret most of its matter. Purely intuitive would be simply taken up with the ... ^{-introvert (v)} Least understanding of human beings, are incapable of expressing themselves, so of course their lot in getting along with other men isn't an easy one. If, however, they have some degree of ... when they begin to ask the question "What does this mean for me?" there comes the moral valuation, and it grows into something, the value is taken up from it. We shall later do some practicing in what the

psychologists (?) call fantasy process. We might call it 'imaging', and so I have applied a word that I coined - we might call it 'introceptive projection.' It is a method also of calling upon this function to get consciousness out.

Questions 1, 3 and 6 were designed to isolate the introvert phase. One - in favor of pioneer, 26/14 - typical extravert intuitive. ... Pioneer - as soon as he got it half demonstrated he felt imprisoned by it and he had to ... that is extravert-intuitive feeling. He is always interested in the undisclosed possibilities of the situation, and and just as soon as things settle down into the region of living with everything easy and comfortable, he gets restless and has to run off. Jack London is a very excellent example of extravert-intuitive type - new possibilities, gold rush, Alaska, war between Russia and Japan; he had to go - couldn't help himself, and of course if he hadn't followed that drive he would never have written as he did.

No. 3. Here's where contradiction comes in - 28 in favor of moderate income of salary - 15 prefer the risk. That isn't consistent with the first one, because you can't have pioneering possibilities and security at the same time. .. and the pioneering problem, when you are pioneering in the untrod depths, dangers are even greater. You cannot say "I will do this provided someone comes along with me and brighten things for me."

No. 4. Do you tend to be content or restless under ... Contented 15, restless 27; again indicating extravert-intuitive. More agreement than in the first case with that one. ... Dr. says sometimes it takes months to determine the type of individuals, when obscure.

No. __. Sin against . 26 sin against Truth. 15 sin against love. Now here is a contradiction that I cannot reconcile by

regarding you as intuitive, because in the previous questionnaire "Which Aphorism carried the most value, Truth is God, or Love is God?" the answers came 21 for Truth is God, 22 for Love is God. Now there is a reversal. ... Some carelessness there, because they should follow.

Humanitarian service 38, 4 doctrinal, only 1 the ritualistic. I expected more to choose the doctrinal. Properly includes all of the philosophical ideation side of religion.

Your answers to the last question would indicate that you do give value to the philosophical or ideational, because the overwhelming side was for the Unitarian church. There is a problem that needs clearing up. 33 showed a preference for the ... , 8 preferred the questionnaire ?, and one the catholic phase. The keynote of the Unitarian, emphasis of inspiration. Inspiration is of course a manifestation of the intuitive function. It is interesting though for there is a considerable division in the same individual between answers that show the action of feeling and answers that show the action of thinking.

Now, what conclusion do we draw. Suppose we think of the class as a whole; a dominance of intuition. What follows from that? Relative repression of sensation. That would imply that the class as a whole does not spend much at fine eating, thinking much about the next meal, by living for the sensation that can be gotten out of life and so on. On the whole that side would be repressed; would have to be repressed for intuition to function. The dominating presence of the object has as a first effect the hindering of that intuitive process that seeks the hidden probability, so the object is something that acts as a barrier to the relative means of ... ; so the sensation enters into the function and this function works around to pick out the hidden side of the sensation. Sensation isn't the thing that you are content with as it is with the ... but it is the hidden

possibility beyond that the intuitive is interested in, and just because it is the one thing that threatens the intuitive function he therefore represses it into the unconscious, and that would be characteristic of the group. Now then, another possibility comes out: I might say, either perception or intuition, primary function. The secondary function must be either thinking or feeling. It cannot be the other, perception function. Now suppose the secondary function is thinking: there tends to be a secondary repression of feeling, but it wouldn't be nearly as severe as the first repression. It might be weak, or it might be that the individual could oscillate almost equally between thinking and feeling, and there is the one case where we can give it approximate (?) equality between the value of thinking and feeling in an individual by his being oriented to perception. Now when we have this how can we have an individual in one question give the answer that indicates his feeling type and in another the answer that indicates a thinking type? It means that he is giving those functions play instead of having one of them heavily repressed. Now let us suppose we reduce the whole class to one synthetic individual and describe his characteristics. He is ~~not~~ about equally capable of the introvert and extravert attitudes. Intuition is a predominant function. He has a marked capacity for functioning intuition in the introvert attitude, equally oriented to thinking and feeling. Sensation is his most repressed function. Now do you see what a group can do that the individual cannot? Because one individual could hardly combine all of that range in himself, but the group working together gives us a substantial function of the four varieties with sensation the most repressed. A group like that working as a unit becomes a more complete man functioning in all the ways. I think this study has helped to make rational, clear, these points that might have remained

otherwise obscure. Some of the things that the Elder Brothers have insisted upon - importance of awakening group work, the importance of group work. I hope by the time we get further on in the class I can handle ... many of your individual pictures are becoming clearer and clearer but some of them are still too contradictory. I am planning to bring a sketch ... functional - and then have you note which description seems to agree with what you know of yourself; then I can get some more material to combine with what I have.

(Extravert)

(Introvert)

THINKING

slightly more introvert than
feeling

FEELING

SENSATION

INTUITION

most introvert

We get four lower principles in terms of four functions.

The four functions are elements in the composition of our consciousness that the Western student, as a Westerner, has discovered, and this is part of the .. based on what we as Westerners know, have been able to verify; the sum total of all functions within the range, within this field of consciousness. One familiar with the seven principles would have suggested to him right away ... six principles - but out of the range of our present observation we do not understand these four any too well yet. We have to get above these functions, into that which is super-functional, to a realm that is called Formless. For consciousness to be able to differentiate into the Formless requires development of some skill, to say the least.

Now, carry on a little further, another correlation -
description of different consciousness phases of consciousness:

OBJECT

Not-I

Matter

Manvantara (being the period
of manifestation)

Form

Shadow

Perceived

Samsara

SUBJECT

I

— (Primary Essence forced from it)

Spirit

Prolaya (corresponds to the state
that we enter after death)

Essence

Light

Perceiver

Nirvana

Nirvana is a word that has been incomprehensible practically to the Western scholar, and when we identify it with the Subject, the "I", doesn't it give it feeling, and why it should be an incomprehensible object to thought. (?) What we mean by heaven is merely defined by all the people who use the word ... a relatively ideal component of Sansara, namely, a place where you have experience, objects, hosts that are visible or otherwise, objective. The heaven world is in Sansara. It is defined what Nirvana is but it is not possible to say what it is like. Forms are produced in Sansara. This creativeness is the process taken as separation from ... really a vital correlation. If you die in Nirvana, which in your readings you have found as the Liberated Goal, with the Subject, that to which you ... then you have the most verifying key to what is meant that I know of; why it is so difficult for one whose consciousness is polarized to the object; why it can be so close, so hard, "For closest of all it lies to thine own true self." I am Nirvana; I, the Subject, the Eternal Subject, am Nirvana, and when consciousness introverts to the point where it is in the pure subject, it is in the Nirvanic state, and that can happen whether you have a body here or have not got a body, by the breaking down of the hypnotic type of the universe. It has to be done while here, the bondage to the created object, that is the barrier.

OBJECT

Sansara

The World-Containing Space.

SUBJECT

Nirvana

The A-Spatial Void

The summum bonum

The Hindus state of Brahma

But, we will go on as did the greatest teacher of all time, to a synthesis transcending that. I am just preparing the way all through

this work for we still have a duality, and we haven't yet overcome or transcended the pairs of opposites; and those of you who overcome the pairs of opposites, when you overcome the pair you find another pair on a higher level. Now the highest point an individual may reach - all the contrasts of restraint have thus become synthesized ...

the Nirvanic state - and you have gone from one pole to another, but you are still within the range of the pairs of opposites, and the journey is not yet completed, and liberation is thus not yet the end. But, I use the notion of the Spacial Void as a symbol to suggest something of the of the subjective pole of consciousness, the Spacial Void being complete, unbounded vacuum of a consciousness unrestricted of a form in any sense and all values at once. It is the state of a supreme kind of inconceivable bliss. With respect to this truly ~~ecstatic~~ ecstatic state even our best pleasures are relatively painful. Of course, we come into other things. You don't need long approaching this medium line before you begin to get into fields of force that are a trial for the organism. One can stand in this organism more than a certain amount of blissful happiness. (?) In fact only a small percentage of potentiates, blissful consciousness - free-flowing of life, primordial light, and flowing with it as far as it flows, and that state of unrestricted free-flowing of life is bliss.

Now life also is like electricity, or, electricity is a form of life, and you know there is such a thing as having too much electricity for the capacity of a given conductor, and such a thing as having too much joy for the capacity of these psycho-physical organisms, and there you have the reason why mystical states Sir Geddes, rather prominent in Europe, gave in address before the Edinburgh Medical College a few years ago, referred to case that came before his attention - man who had been in a mystical state, evidently been unwise and gone in too

deeply, and his body hadn't been able to stand it, and he said that all of the cells looked as though they were in flames and exhausted. Now the explanation is packed, when you can see that this flame of tremendous life was taken up, and he didn't put up the breaks, and he allowed too much for the organism. So, when the mystical state comes some day, it may - when, you know not - it is like a thief that comes in the night, don't abandon yourself with extreme intensity; be content to take it gently. Oh, I know that when that time comes there is nothing you ... because you know that which the ... merely a work upon conscious, night and day, but there is a duty, and there is a work to be finished, and remember that a glimpse is not the end. There is the mastery of that new field to be achieved, and just as there are the problems of mastery of the Sansara (?) realm, it is also the problem of the mastery of the Nirvanic state, and it isn't enough to abandon oneself simply to the joy which is greater than ever known before.

Simply in explanation, first of all, the Ego is not to be identified with the pure subject. That's something built; but it is possible to be in that state which is one, and also individual; and that's a mystery. You spread through all space, you are identical with space - can have it be more than one (?). Illustration: In our outside space we have transmitting stations - several of them, all over the world. Now the electro-magnetic stations spread throughout our surrounding space; they are coming right through this space. Impulse might be so weak that you couldn't pick it up; put up your receiver anywhere and pick up those rays, so that you may say within such zones evolve the rays of a given station, fill all that space; but, there are other stations, at the same time, of which the same thing is true. The rays of Station A will fill all that space, the rays of Station B will fill all that space, the rays of Station C will fill all that space, and

yet it is possible by the right tuning in, to pick up one ... it is all interpenetrated and coextensive, everywhere, at once. Carry that figure on. Such a being is everywhere at once. They don't come and go. Just as the system of rays from a station is everywhere at once. Now, what does your receiving set do? It isn't true that music from these stations is passing through; it is electromagnetic waves that are passing through in certain forms that can be focused (?). Your receiver set has power to pick up those magnetic waves and translate them into music and sound. The sound hasn't gone through space, but the electromagnetic wave, the producing of sound, was done with the receiving instrument. ...

Now this psychophysical organism we have is a receiving set with most of its powers lying latent in it now, but those powers are capable of being developed. Suppose you had those powers sufficiently unfolded and developed so that you could tune in to the transmitting stations (Subject - all on right of line) your receiving set could now transform it into a picture, and if it were of a being who is historically known, whom you were convinced looked ... in a certain appearance, your receiving set would tend to ~~perceive~~ transform it into that picture. The reality that is there hasn't come and gone. It is there all the time, every moment of the time, but your receiving set somehow or other, through something that you either were consciously able to control, or some operation of control that you are not conscious of, were able to tune in, and you can transform these rays into the image that corresponds to your idea of that one. You know, those who have subjective visions, that in the appearance of the one who is known as Jesus, do not characteristically see a man with Jesus' features. Ever think of the significance of that? And yet the physical man who lived on earth almost certainly had Jesus' features. Those features correspond with the images that we have built up, often through our misconceptions. We, through our receiving sets,

translate the reality into appearance. Now there is in such a case something real and something unreal. The reality is something that is here all the time, just as the rays from the transmitting set are here all the time, but we unconsciously visualize form, translate it into form. There is one thing that is eternal, and the other thing changes; one thing real, and the other symbol, and you can read through the symbol the reality behind it; but whether you see the symbol or not, you may know that all of the reality of that plane, that value being within it, pierces through the space of all consciousness at all time. The power to tie in is the thing that is lacking. GREATEST OF ALL IS RIGHT HERE, WHERE EACH OF US IS, AT ALL TIMES, IF ONE CAN TIE INTO IT. Now the tying in merely helps him know and to correlate it when ... but to know, with consciousness, to be convinced of the truth, you can forego the feeling that it is important to have the power of vision; you can forego the feeling that you have to attain such and such a power, and rest in the unshaken and unshakeable ASSURANCE that HERE WHERE I AM, AT EVERY MOMENT, THOSE SUPREME VALUES, EVER HERE, and then REST CONTENT IN THEM. Then see what may transpire.(Did not take - very strong field of energy.)

The great moment came at the moment of REALIZATION THAT THERE WAS NOTHING TO BE DONE, and that THERE WAS NOTHING TO BE ATTAINED, and then it happened. These are profound things that I am saying. I didn't know that I was going to say them, and they are working things, though I do think that I may get more thinkable ... but what I have made thinkable is the symbol - anything I say is symbolical - that corresponds to an inexorable reality; the symbols remove the barriers that remain in the language.

Wednesday, September 14, 1938

Primordial Consciousness: that which you recognize as a consciousness that spreads everywhere and is at the same time substantial and also energetic (?) - the three at once, and yet in a curious way so that they are not separable but at once all three; it is a question that implies emphasizing the facets of a gem that can't have any of the facets removed; so that there are generally ways theoretically that we can approach the consciousness. Suppose we were to emphasize the angle of life - that would be involving the energetic form. Or, if we were to emphasize substance, we would speak in terms that are rather more objective; but the particular key that I find most effective and am most oriented to is that of consciousness itself, treating everything from the standpoint of states of consciousness ?. Sometimes questions have arisen in relation to conscious states and dream functions, and I always answer in a way to try to show ... relation to brain - we are taking the most definite interpretation. We say that we have brains. We know that we have consciousness. The inference that we have brains may be fairly reasonable, but we do not have immediate knowledge of that; but we do have of consciousness. You cannot doubt the fact of consciousness, but your knowledge of the brain is not direct. Knowledge of consciousness is direct. That ties us down to something that is extremely immediate. When we interpret what that consciousness means then we get into a field that is more involved, but the bare fact of it we can't doubt, and there we are anchored in something that is unshakeable, real. "I am I, an impersonal" and then I interpret that interpretation. That interpretation may be an error. There is something that could be wrong, but in the impression and the interpretation that was wrong there was one factor that is beyond dispute - that of our consciousness; that it was a STATE IN CONSCIOUSNESS. Now when we STRIP EVERYTHING DOWN TO THE IRREDUCIBLE LIMIT WE HAVE SOMETHING VERY SOLID. Then it is a process of acute

analysis to pick out just what consciousness as such implies, and we find then in the analysis often the elements that are contents in that consciousness are dependent on it, stand in dependent relationship to it, and many of the things that are contained are valued as stupendous - among other things, Time.

Time is the content of our consciousness - theoretically interpret it the other way around; so, I am a being in the stream of time. .. The one moment in consciousness. The one is time within consciousness. ? That leaves another conclusion: that THIS THAT PERMITS TIME IS NOT ITSELF TIME CONDITIONED. Now do you see that you can be assured of the indestructible of consciousness? Because, when that is destructible which is time conditioned, that which contains is not time conditioned. Now you see what an anchorage you get right away if you can get the VITAL GRIP ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THAT ANALOGY. You have gotten into the basis of the transcendental assurance. You realize then that BODIED ARE CONTAINERS OF CONSCIOUSNESS, but CONSCIOUSNESS CONTAINS BODIES AS OBJECTS, and THE LIMITATIONS THAT ATTACH TO BODIES ARE THE LIMITATIONS THAT ATTACH TO OBJECTS.

Important: That I, as Consciousness, aware of bodies, am not conditioned by the limitation of the body. Without any external development in states of consciousness, but by taking the ordinary material, and by acute analysis of it, one can answer for himself, and without doubt, the most fundamental problems. You see the purpose in my method?

A. Primordial Substance and Primordial Consciousness refer to a nameless something of which those two are facets.

We found a pretty close balance here and in Los Angeles between introversion and extroversion. I anticipated a greater balance. It seems to come out pretty clearly the common denominator is intuition. Very marked. ...

Introverts have no special advantage as compared with the extraverts, in that kind of penetration. That was an induced state of consciousness, because a certain field was produced here, in that room, and individuals entered it to the extent that they were able, towards depths in consciousness that they were able, in many cases to a state that had the earmarks of formless consciousness. The question comes up, How does that come about? We know that actually bears the impress of introversion, and yet extraverts succeeded as well. Here is the answer that comes out immediately. We have two attitudes - conscious and unconscious. If you are extraverted in the conscious attitude then there is a balance for that in the unconscious, in the hidden part, the psychic, so that attitude there is introverted, and in the case of introverts the other way round; and the road to an interior or introverted consciousness, in the case of an extrovert would be through the unconscious, and in the case of a strongly developed introvert it would through the conscious side. That would mean that in the case of an extrovert it would tend to be something that happens spontaneously.

Now we know, through the history of the cases known in the West, of which we have record, sufficient so that we can analyze - we find practically unanimously that their awakening was spontaneous - didn't know it was going to happen - came unexpectedly - wasn't result of going through discipline, Yoga practice or seeking results. Just as case of Whitman (?) going on boat between two towns, into Philadelphia, and all of a sudden the world for him made that particular turnover - close to the stars, as unreal, when any desirable consciousness flows in,

he might have thought that he was losing his mind; but a friend who was with him and recognized what had happened said "No, you're not crazy. At last your sane." Of course, it determined his life course. Throughout history there will be more extrovert consciousness in the West - these events happen just like that. Go through Indian history, you will find them going through a definite devotion to achieve just that approach - they have the introvert phase. Another point cleared up that increases the action of this psychology.

The persistence of the ... world is the persistence of the psychical form in consciousness; that a common world for different human beings is evidence of a common psychical base that has a certain uniformity and persistence in it. We don't need therefore to posit anything outside the structure of consciousness of itself by using that principle. Look at what we know of objects; I mean of ordinary objects. They appear to be through the eye as having certain shapes and colors. They appear through the sense of sound, in connection with sound vibrations, form. They appear to our sense of touch ..., to our sense of taste, and as in case of food, some organism ... Our experience we may say is actually an experience of muscular tension, and that is for all a conscious state. Put an individual into an empty room and by a subjective means produce all of the sensations that go with an object, and he will have the complete experience of an object; in the more complete powers of hypnosis, would be that. ... We have developed in the West technique, but the Orient has developed more. Apparently experiences involving years ... experiences that don't correspond with the object world. It all leads to this: that we don't need to ... account for that which science is studying as physics, chemistry, etc. In other words, physics and chemistry would become a part of psychology, and in that way we avoid introducing something that never can be

verified into our ... because we never could verify an existence ..

Dr. Yung has challenged metaphysical realities. He says there are psychological realities, but he discredits the hypothesizing of the psychological states in metaphysical terms. Well, I say that the same thing applies to hypothesizing of sensation and saying it corresponds to an external unconscious existence; that we can have just as good proof of the reality of the unseen divine as we can have of the reality of this table, and that any argument that would undermine that principle, of the unseen divine, carries out consciously any reality concerning this table, and I submit that as a matter of logic actually men don't carry those points out both ways, and they are prejudiced in favor of the belief of the objects as independent existence, and I answer 'You are superstitious in believing these objects as existing independent of consciousness.' Your uniformity there must be by ... ; that uniformity can be in basic structure of consciousness itself that is common to the race and among larger things to the whole of humanity, and among still larger things, to all creatures; then you have a theoretical basis of your consciousness - it is possible to produce effects in what we call things, yonce you have learned to dig under the roots of the psychical structure that bears those things as appearance.

Light is a symbol of consciousness - light that you may actually subjectively see. In other words, when you see the light you are in a sense looking at consciousness - not in the full sense yet, for when it is in the full sense it ceases to be sensible light, but you are beginning to look at consciousness and getting it in symbolic form when objectiveness ... consciousness beginning to turn upon itself.

In the process of perceiving you have focused your attention upon the perceiving. Your perception is upon the object, but another part of consciousness is noting the perceiving, and characteristically the object begins to fade down, and it might even fade down to the point where it drops below the threshold of apperceptive consciousness - even the I is receiving the impress. Your apperceiving I is being focused upon the perceiving. Let Ego (?) rise, but don't concentrate - isolate perceiving from the object. That is another function of consciousness that is superimposed upon the first one.

A. Consciousness-without-an-object. Sat Tao. Causeless Cause. That which is self-existent. (Must emphatically know what Christianity terms God.) It is that upon which all gods depend for their existence, that which is before gods are; that which is before worlds are; that which is before all subjects or selves are.

A. This birth, unlike one in physical bodies, we become our own mothers, as it were.

(The foregoing appear to be answers to questions.)

EXTRAVERSION

ORDINARY

INTROVERSION

LINE OF BORDER BETWEEN SLEEPING AND WAKING

OBJECT
UNIVERSE

LINE OF DEATH

(Ordinarily when an individual crosses this line it is the moment of death.)

Regarded as median line - ~~line~~ region between two zones - Subject and Object

SUBJECT

NIRVANA

NIRVANA-SULPU

SAMADHI

MOST FORMLESS STATE

Ordinary introversion (analysis) takes you beyond the place where you go asleep. Usually when you go to sleep ordinary consciousness cannot cross that barrier, and your further introversion is through dreamless sleep or a state in which primitive kind of consciousness - sometimes elaborated symbols - arises out of the unconscious, but there is no real self-consciousness in that because you don't in the dream have a real awareness of your awareness; it happens occasionally, and when it does that's an indication that you have made an important step. The dream consciousness is about like this when the illusions come up from it. In waking states introversion doesn't go back that far. That's possible for it, though.

Now when we go to sleep we don't go inward as far as at death, but we occupy a zone in the region even beyond, but then it is almost always dreamless sleep in there when self-consciousness has not gone along with you, and that is indistinguishable from unconsciousness. The zone of that consciousness covers all of this part, to and including the heaven world, including embodied consciousness, Dhyana Choyans, very lofty realms - all of them are on the lefthand side of this line. All worlds - first of all, all that are visible on this plane - all of the more subjective worlds, corresponding to the globes, ... to all heavens, purging places, bardos (?), psychic states, lies to the left of line (between Object and Subject or Universe and Nirvana), and all of that is Samsara, and all, in strict sense, manifested states of consciousness.

Now you are entering into various subtle worlds, into the heaven worlds, or into the hells, whichever one you want; is generally a process of going inward and being selfconscious (beyond the death line). Now if you are not selfconscious you wouldn't even know that you had really died. You wouldn't have the judgment that would enable

you to discriminate. Discrimination requires consciousness of consciousness, and that means the power of consciousness to be aware of itself in sufficiently far to subjective states that make the heaven worlds. Now, when you can carry consciousness in that far then you have to enter or to leave such heaven world when you are on the subtle side, but if you don't have that power, that discrimination that comes from consciousness of consciousness, you would be confined there even in that heavenly place until your karma was exhausted, and then you would have to come out. There is a place of forces over which you have no control, but with consciousness of consciousness operating, then you would have control. That is where introversion has real power at death, because it is the process of becoming conscious of consciousness.

Somewhere close to median line you may draw a line and represent by that little zone a region sometimes symbolized as "none (?)", with two shores, sometimes appearing like a haze or clouds, or a desert. It is the zone in which all the motivations are made of consciousness that belongs to the object - is losing its grip - and in Yogic penetration, when introversion is shot in sufficiently strong to tap this zone in here there comes a period when the desire to act vanishes because desire has faded out completely. Desire has been the force that has kept action going on all of the cycles out here, but when the introverting process is carried on to this point, and desire becomes no longer a driving force, but you haven't come within the range of the new type of force in the play of consciousness that belongs to the other place, (signifies wilderness or desert) - you will find that in mystical reading - it would require a will to continue, and there would seem no reason to make the crossing to sterile zone and hook into a different kind of

consciousness. When you do cross, and come into the other motivation of consciousness, the very thing that was difficult to achieve before now becomes spontaneous and easy. If we symbolize the superior consciousness by a mountain as it is when operating from below, before you cross the wilderness stage it is an effort to climb - gravity holds you down - but after passing the critical point another principal operating in consciousness takes hold and you gravitate to the supernal by native impulse without effort. In the first place you are hunting all the time for a snaghook. When you make a turnover you might find that you have need for an earthhook. Turnover in the center of consciousness value, and consciousness modes or functions outgrow on another ... that is for the most part impossible to represent except by indirect devices.

To illustrate: Ordinarily as we approach the objects of the senses, like this ... I can see it and feel it and hear it, and might be able to taste it. Our usual interpretation is that there is testimony of something. What I see is. The senses, the eye, give us evidence of presence. That's our usual view. Whenever the turnover comes the whole value is reversed, and the whole evidence of ... gives you absence of, and where the sense was of nothing you find a fullness of substance. So what we call objects or substance come to be what is like vacuum in space (?). When that happens then the whole universe takes on that quality of being Divinity, and then you get the typical mystical state. Everything then is divine, and everything is synthesized. Now you can see how it could be rationalized. There is a discontinuity on the objective plane between this table and that piano. They are discrete. But if you consider the space between the objects there is a perfect continuity of that space everywhere. It becomes a continuous space as it were, with some vacuum in it. The space has a quality

and that quality of Space multiplies and that becomes one, and that essence has a Divine quality. There is nothing that is but what is Divine, and that which appears to be there then, that is a vacuum. This shift of consciousness takes place, and you know. Of course in speaking about it I have to use philosophic statements or analytic statements to give out, but I am describing something that actually exists in consciousness valuation. The crossing of the desert stage and reaching this other side is called "reaching the other shore." It is another realm of consciousness valuation which is quite the opposite of what existed in here, and in here are immeasurable depths of richness that are not in terms of form. It is not bare homogeneity, and it is values veiled by all things; at once, in there, full unveiled. In our relative consciousness we think of that state as being homogeneous. Actually it is a state of inconceivable richness. Everything that we ordinarily think of as coming from variety in experience in there at once, but not in any terms that can be really revealed by examples of our ordinary experience. It is not something that you think, that you feel, or sense. It is something in terms of consciousness of a totally different sort, from which these functions of projections are abstractions, taken away from that which is complete and concrete. You have here of course the sheer gaining of Yoga. To reach into most mystical states, reach into Nirvikalpi-Samadhi (?) ... in that state freeing oneself from bondage, but to us it seems at first a hardship.. The actual thing is, we are freeing ourselves from a bondage, very much like a bird in a cage; when the door was opened, it flew out and felt very uncomfortable and had to fly back again. We cling to bars and have to, as long as ... ; first step involves renunciation of the bars. You have to forego pain and take bliss; then, to discover that every experience here, in the last analysis, no matter what you thought of it, had a predominant pain

pain quality; very much more so than you realized; that you didn't know really what joy was in the fullest degree.

Now there is another thing: we have been warned of it in certain of our literature, and that is, it is possible to forego that other state, that supremely desirable one, and the reason is this - that his capacity to in any way affect the worldfield would cease when entering into that profound level of subjectivity. He would no longer be embodied, would no longer have a subtle body (?), out of psychic contact with any of humanity either in the human state or heaven world, or higher logos of Samsara; while they would leave the world at the moment of entering that state they would lose all capacity to affect it after. Certain beings, very great beings, have voluntarily renounced, in order to function indefinite periods in the subtle sphere of human consciousness; sometimes appearing, but more often ... These are called Bodhisattvas - called the second renunciation. Now there is another significance goes with it. The whole story isn't told, but speaking of it as an ethical act, it also involves a certain mastery in consciousness. One can become locked in the Nirvanic state just as well as he can become locked in the Samsara or objective state. There are only a very few who are in the position where they face the decision of being forced in the Nirvanic state; would mean being locked in in unnumbered incarnations. That is known as the fixed Nirvana, but if he who stands at the threshold, with the right to enter, refuses to accept the reward, he can attain to the position of non-fixed Nirvana, where there is the power to move into and out of a degree of that state. Second renunciation, then, has broken another kind of bar. Now where is centered the consciousness that has come through the objective and subjective renunciations (?). Most of our literature on the subject is silent at that point; leave the question unanswered. Quite clearly they could no longer be centered in the

purely objective state because they had mastered ...

they had learned the derivative kind of that consciousness . They must be centered as consciousness somewhere. The answer is this, that the resultant is another movement which now, instead of being subjective, is in an objective direction, and the rise at a point that is neither subjective nor objective. Now that point is not properly Nirvana, and

in going through literature there is an indiscriminate ... and it is used to veil this deeper state of consciousness. The diagrams we have had don't adequately portray the relationship in there.

The one fact that should stand out clear to us is: that the SUBJECT IS ONE POLE OF WHICH THE OBJECT IS THE OTHER POLE; and TO ENTER THE NIRVANIC STATE, the pure state, is to enter a polar state, is to have transcended the pairs of opposites (?) that is characteristic of the sensory universe, but is not the transcending of that great pair of objects (?), Samadhi, or Subject and Object, and their transcendence is only attained when this secondary renunciation culminates in reaching the interior point that is neither subjective nor objective; that is, the point that is spoken of as Consciousness-without-an-object, and which is also Consciousness-without-a-Subject.

You cannot speak of it as a state of bliss, or a state of bondage. It is a state that is neutral. It is a state that is capable of projecting itself either in the objective or subjective; has in it all states, all worlds, even Nirvanic levels, and carries with it the command over both realms. This is the EXPLANATION that UNDERLIES THE APHORISMS on CONSCIOUSNESS-WITHOUT-AN-OBJECT, for they envisage this point with respect to which the Nirvanic levels and the Samsaric levels stand below. It is above where thought (?) being dependent upon form (?) primordial consciousness, which is neither subjective nor objective.

The yogic principles (?) involved here has characteristics that are just the reverse of this description in manuals - cover only the movement, stilling the thoughts, getting into quiescence. The background necessary is an intense activity of the kind, a very great positiveness on the part of the mind in order to hold itself in the presence of something that threatens to sweep over all things with the power of irrelevance that would wipe out cosmoses in this sea that is before time, before form, before there was any self, any subject, and before there are any gods, before there was any being, upon which all beings, the greatest and the humblest, and upon which all states of consciousness depend, and without which there could be none, and it itself is not dependent on anything - a consciousness that is neither action nor non-action, carrying however both the potentiality of .. both, infinite potentiality, while in that state of perfect balance. Organized informed consciousness standing at that point is in a position where any decision whatsoever - because all possibilities lie below - can be taken, any decision is divinely right; no other decision could be, any decision a divine blessing, any polarity of even ... ; hence from that level, any such thing, a decision made, determines the course of all; impulse might start and spread itself in the planes of form, and out in time, over eons before it completed its course, and the moment of choice ... thousand years as a day - years in the creative impulse, a new moving out of the serpent, which in the end must swallow its tail.

It is a place above bliss, superior over that and has command over it, complete equilibrium. Now we have for the first time a picture that is complete and self-sustained. Here is the synthesis that unites the dualities. I expressed it, a state .. into deeper phases; one such clearly that of Atma-Brahma - I am God - knowing immediately that I am coexistent with Divinity; and deepens further and the I drops away, and

God drops away, and only the "am" remains, the being which also is non-being, and called Be-ness - and that is consciousness that is so sweeping that it is the last point at which the apparently (?) pure human can endure. It is as though the thinking, feeling, and every other capacity in the presence ~~itself~~ dissolves out into an unmodified eternal consciousness, and yet if possess perfect ... where you can affirm all that organization, you can remain organized if you will to do so, but the trouble is you don't wish to do so. Test is to see whether you could find the wish to do it, for there one knows, there isn't the ... A creature though being eternally there - that the life of a thousand million years of time is no more than the wave of the hand, and only the value of the dream, an eye-wink long. There doesn't seem to be anything that needs to be done - any action has not ~~be~~ to be chosen as any action. Now that is the ground, the keystone of the rich consciousness-without-an-object, which is also consciousness-without-a-subject, sea of consciousness.

"All beings are the children of consciousness-without-an-object." You all think the other way - beings but consciousness objects (?) I am teaching that CONSCIOUSNESS POSSESSES BEING.

Friday, September 16, 1938

In the first set of questions, on the attitude type, there were groups of questions that someone who knew you could have answered for you. This last set of questions no one could have answered but yourself because that was interior, secret information which no one outside of you could know. Now we get very different results in the two cases. This brings us to a very interesting consideration: that we shift from incarnation to incarnation, and the shifting process would be more or less continuous, so that we might shift our position as to attitude within the same incarnation, but personality and its habits, which is that, is more ... In the first, one feels more or less the characteristics with which one was born - came out of the first - and would not reflect so quickly the attitudes that one is now developing at the present time. When we develop any one phase beyond a certain point then there is a demand in nature to shift the counter phase. This is part of the Law of Balance. We cannot shift ... The extravert attitude involves more of expression, and the introvert attitude more of the power of seeking inwardly, with a relative capacity to express when it is well developed. In very extreme cases, when not thinking of the capacity to think, they may vary greatly. Thinking in an introvert phase has better capacity than any other. Extravert has function more open and more capable of happiness with people and with the object in general, whether animate or inanimate; so in this examination we may see that we are dealing with causes, the direction of change, whereas the first one might give us the place where we were more as when we were born into this world and have more or less fixed our personalities to, because that personality doesn't shift so rapidly; so, we might say that our first picture was a number of paths - some perhaps just about standing still,

some moving rapidly - took picture just as stood. Second examination gives us the picture as in movement.

Seven persons that gave nine introvert answers, when I expected ... We seem to get in the second examination evidence of the tendencies of change in the nature, a tendency that was taking place in the attitude. You know it was harder to root this out of the consciousness in the first examination. (?) I notice you had more difficulties with the answers. That change is due to a number of different factors - an inner need, a conscious effort would operate as factors because of ... We never could stay in a long series of incarnations in one attitude. Going to two extremes, an attitude in either leads to unbalance. The extreme position has certain characteristics that are noted in pathology. In fact, all of this side of psychology has come out of the extreme cases that were brought out in psychology. ...

Now I can see the need in many cases for this shift. Some that lacked expression shift over. Evidently reflection of soul need. Now we have a general shift of the whole group. In other words, the median line is far more on the introvert side than it was in the first examination. First examination gave line probably corresponding with this.. That median line actually would be ... Our lines between introversion and extraversion are not absolute. Now remember, this line I drew here between the Subject and the Object, or between Nirvana and the Universe, is the only absolute (?) that we can draw between introvert states - that this is absolute introvert - and states that are extravert, but in the ordinary sense, since this line at death .. we have to draw a little ... but applied to groups it is the line called median, therefore the line can be shifted.

General shift of whole group towards greater introversion. Individual shifts very marked, from need; some not so marked. I have said that the need of the Western people is for greater introverted

consciousness; that the need of a particular individual, even un-Western ? may be for greater introversion. Don't get the idea that there is anything of merit or demerit in your relative state of introvert and extravert. It corresponds to two attitudes which are complimentary. Each attitude has certain peculiar powers and certain limitations. They're a complement of each other. Each one has a different code that should govern. Each has that which is relatively easy for it as well as that which is relatively difficult. Do you get the idea. Each function in different sense, somewhat like the correspondence between man and woman.

Now I will not take up you as individuals until I deal with you as individuals. When I have a general report covering each one I will probably ... You can tell from your relative position in the room just what your position is. Some have shifted from stronger extravert to less introverts; some from stronger introvert to less introvert, and vice versa.

Coming to individual questions and answers on them:

(1) Which do you prefer,

29 in favor of purity even with intolerance. You ought to see quite readily that the idea of tolerance is really extravert. The ability to meet friends, to adapt oneself to others is an extravert power; and purity which also carries the meaning of purism, like a purist in the writer, a purist in style - it doesn't carry necessarily the reference to ethical purity, but it carries the idea of being pure to the particular thing in which you are focused and excluding other elements. The purist almost invariably is intolerant. Now take an example from art. A violinist whom I knew in college days, later in San Francisco Symphony - artistic, admired Kreisler quality.... strove particularly to develop tone. Financial difficulties forced him to take up teaching,

and there he had to listen to bad tones made by his pupils, and he had to listen to inharmony, to the very thing for which he ...

He built his quality of tone by an attitude of intolerance for pure tone. That is an attitude of the purist; essentially introvert. It is expressing the thing that you value in your own consciousness. It doesn't mean the thing that you are able fully to function in, but it does indicate the direction that you are tending to go.

2. Broadmindedness with superficial vs.
depth combined with narrowness.

The ratio stood 32 on the introvert with preference for depth as against 11 for the combined broadmindedness with superficiality. This point is peculiarly a mark of difference between two attitudes. Explosively (?), reaching far, is extravert tendency Intensively, going deep, is introvert tendency and ideal. I think you could see how we couldn't get along if we didn't have both kinds of virtues represented. Let us suppose that this is a field of possibility. Any individual has a given amount of energy, energy complex, some having a total energy mass that is larger, some smaller. In the case of one like Buddha the energy mass is simply enormous. In the case of some who are near to just disappearing, the energy mass might be almost near zero. Now suppose you have eight units of energy mass, and your best possibilities would be not developing like that, but you could reach out and become important, or a depth penetration, superficially, combined with breath, and depth combined with narrowness - now that same energy goes into a greater breath or depth by concentration. This is the extravert form and this is the introvert. There are some very great beings, of which Buddha would stand as the greatest, whose picture would be more combining breath with depth. It was said of him ... have been the world's greatest ruler or the world's leader; as a man of enlightenment the

the two powers were there. Others, who were of a lesser kind are conceivable of depth penetration of similar order, or a storing of similar energy (?) but none have been able to combine the two in the same group. So far as I know none of the later incarnations or overshadowings of the Buddha, and there have been several, have ever made as great a combination of the two powers as in the case of Shankara or Jesus. Now when it comes to the preference for freedom or security - your deepest purely introvert consciousness is piercing in... It is interesting, again referring to Buddha, that he goes a step beyond the ideal of Liberation, to something that is a synthesis of that, with something else, so that it is said that the Nirvana of the Hindu is but the flowerbed (?) to the Para-Nirvana of the Buddha; that Para-Nirvana really represents in this case a level of consciousness that is neither introverted nor extraverted, but the Hindu ideal is the liberated ideal of Liberation. Freedom is desired so greatly that one will dare the greatest dangers to attain it, hence the freedom after ... sacrifice security. We may have both desires, but we may value one so much that we will forego the other. Security is rooted in practical value in the world. Security in regard to objects and possessions, therefore an extraverted interest. The class were overwhelmingly strong in preferring freedom - 37 to 6 in favor of freedom.

Q.

A. Decisions more equally divided; 24 preferred that which they think - 18 that which they feel. Now, feeling and sensation are the two most extraverted functions, hence if you have the sense of reality mostly associated with sensation and feeling, that means that you really trust the evidence of these two more extraverted functions, and that serves rather as an instrument to help you to further feeling

or further sensation that you really trust, but if you place your trust in thought, in the idea, then you are introverted more to the eternal images in the subject which constitute the source. You may view idea in two ways, either as an abstraction from experience or as the eternal base within which experience must fall. Now when Plato speaks of the eternal existing ideas, such as truth, goodness, and so on, not derived from experience, he shows the inverted point of view. When a man as John Dewey speaks of that as purely we have there manifested extraverted philosophy - idea merely abstraction - some point evolved in visible action or thought - predominant interest to thought.

Q. How do you regard death? With dread ..

A. The introverted consciousness, being centered more on the subject, naturally has a greater feeling for the consciousness that is not effected by the loss of the body. It is less dependent upon the object. Consciousness dependent ... very often has difficulty in seeing how consciousness can remain when the body is gone. Presence of dread suggests a more extraverted attitude. Of course I know when we are a long time from it in probability we are not thinking seriously of it, and when it may probably come, time not long, we may begin to think seriously of it; we may not find ourselves so cocksure of it as we are inclined to believe ourselves to be. The rule is, when you come right up on it the fear goes when the real presence of death comes - only the thought, anticipation ... and in that connection this to be noted: that judgment as thinking or feeling is the first to go in the dying process, but sensation lasts longer. We do have a perception process in dreaming; in fact introduce judgment in dreams - practically waking up when judgment drops off in ... It is an achievement to carry a judgment function (thinking and feeling) so-called, evidently later developments, not so well grounded, basis fundamental to life.

Animals have interesting equivalent to intuition. On this question the class was divided. 32 with pleasant anticipations, 4 with some dread, and several with some question.

Next question - 23 to 19 - not very much division on that.

Which kind of life would you prefer? Much happiness, brief periods ...?

Preference is for the brief ecstatic states. Figures, 26 to 14. Thus you will pay the bill perhaps of long months or years of perhaps more or less empty existence, kind of dull, indifferent, for that brief moment that is infinitely worthwhile, and when you come into that you will say "A lifetime of suffering is worth ..." The anticipated is so great that even the spread in terms of time might be very narrow. Your depth that you reach, that the product of the two, gives you an enormous value.

Q. Do you object most to a state in which there is too much unfilled space, or confined quarters?

A. Most object to confined quarters - 34 to 8. In other words, driven to ... I can't stand to be shut up - the pressure of the object is too hard. The extravert being oriented to the object doesn't feel the presence of the object as a pressure. He can adapt himself to that. The introvert wants space - where not too many objects. Now in the deserts or in the high mountaintops, above the timber line, you have a relative absence of objects, be out alone, and perhaps as far as you can see, not another human being, no trees, slight vegetation, a lot of sky above you - there is space. Many are terrified by that; those who want the help of the object, feel closer to the object. Those who love solitude find themselves quite happy. Of course, that's an extreme state. You may be in all stages of approximation of that. Gyrophobist - afraid of space.

(Lesson actually begins here.)

I am going to say something about energy tonight. I wish to remind you that with respect to inward penetration of consciousness, the possibility is not restricted to the introvert. The introvert is one whose conscious attitude is more towards the subject than the object, and the extravert more towards the object than the subject; but the unconscious attitude is reverse of this, and in the case of the extraverted consciousness the path to the subjective levels is through the unconscious, and the record shows that a number of superior mystical awakenings have been affected through that path, but it moves in a different way than it does with the introverted consciousness. The introvert is more under the necessity of conscious discipline.

Now in addition to having a good idea or a fair idea as to what the Path is, what it leads to, some of the rules that one should follow, there is a good deal that is needed. One might have, theoretically, a correct philosophy, or as nearly a correct philosophy as is possible for one to have, and yet hold it merely as an abstract idea apart from himself. He wouldn't do a great deal of good. Something more is required. That something more is the presence first of all of a large deposit or collection of psychical or light light energy, that which they have come to call in modern psychology, There must be an energetic mass before the individual can effectively break through. A person who has dissipated his forces, spread them everywhere and not conserved them, cannot pierce inward effectively because he has not got the force to do it, and there we have the rationale of that phase of the discipline which demands conservation of life force, self-restraint, going all the way up to more or less ascetic restraint. The purpose in this is to conserve the libido or psychic energy or

life energy so that a high potential can be built. The greater the potential the better, provided you can handle it, but the thing is not so simple as merely a matter of conserved libido. That energy mass must also be concentrated, because merely conserved energy could lead to the animation of the subjective deposits that are not so good. Now there are deposits that are quite good, repressions of the unconscious. This conserved libido, if purification has gone far enough, can undermine this ... and all sorts of ... must go with purification; and yet there is importance of self-examination, which several of you have already taken in the past class; that would serve to close, shall we say, doors in to inferior (?) portions of the unconscious.

I am going to picture the unconscious as though it stands above a certain line here, and that pure being as a sort of ellipsoid, that our life forces have ordinarily been coming out in various directions, in various activities and so on, as we live they have to go to some extent. But now we will say that we reduce the .. so that there is only a partial use of the life energy, that through obeying, an intensified ... Now in here is that portion of the unconscious where the undesirable portion of the deposits are, called astral light; possibly door opens, and it very often happens that that intensity goes out in ..; those doors have to be closed, because what we are seeking to do is a breaking in to some of these really superior levels, of which there are several. Now a mere conservation and building up of this potential is not enough. It must be given direction, CONCENTRATION AND FOCUSED DIRECTION. Now the philosophy, the understanding, is the instrument by which you give it direction. YOUR CONCENTRATION REPRESENTS THE INTENSITY WHICH YOU APPLY TO THIS DIRECTION, and then ~~you~~ sometime, sooner or later, there is a pressing out at some level of a superior sort.

Now let us suppose you have ~~all~~ these doors closed all around, so that there is only a relatively minimum use - it builds a potential, until finally this shell breaks, as it were, out and this enclosed consciousness finally finds an opening into the grand sea of profound subjective consciousness. When that happens, we could carry - that is illustrated by an Indian figure of speech - if you have a jar filled with air and you break the jar, what happens to the air? The air is uninjured, for it is simply one with all of the air outside. Well now, then before it happened, when you said "I" you meant yourself as distinct from others, but when this happens you mean this whole field up here, which is in continuous relationship with what was your private energy field, and the transcendent primordial energy field. Two things can happen at that point. One could permit the shell to completely dissolve. His identity isn't with the shell but with this field of energy which is inside and that field of energy spreads throughout this whole subjective space, and he finds himself in pure Nirvana; but he could retain that shell by conscious will, and still as this door opens, with all of the potential bounding (?) for action that have existed here on the physical plane, and potential may have to be broken out again on different levels - then you have a play, as it were, into the world field, and you have more than a private store of energy, but a tapping of unlimited energy. In the latter, such case, an individual in one sense still may be an individual, and in another, spread through all space, because there is continuity.

This energy, since there is ~~content~~ still content maintained by conscious effort, the organized embodied consciousness, subtle sense, primarily there is a sense in which you are acting, still, he is an individual as distinct from others. Either statement is ... He is an individual, and also a Universal, at the same time.

Now is that case a new store of psychic or consciousness energy can flow in from the subjective level into this field. Now that particular event doesn't happen so often, but what can happen is, that energy drawn down in some such means can fill or illumine other centers. So, we have other centers here, are asleep, haven't broken through, become revitalized and take on something of the quality of that original primordial consciousness, modified, of course, and you get then the phenomena of induction, but the induction is not the breaking through the shell. It is a foretaste of future possibilities if one will steadfastly strive toward that goal, but everyone has to himself achieve the point where he can break through, and no one else can do it for him. Everyone has to travel his own Path. He can have a foretaste that indicates to him something of the value of the ternal consciousness.

Now how do we get that intensity of energy directed through the right channel? Through such knowledge as we can garner we can get direction. But, the energy that one puts into it is proportional to the valuation he gives it; so, VALUATION IS THE MEASURE OF PSYCHICAL ENERGY we are sending in any direction. If our interest is only casual, or ... the amount of psychical energy we send in such a direction is correspondingly small. Now a person may have a twenty-five cent interest in awakening his consciousness and he will get ... proportionate return.

In the case of the story of Milarepa we have an example of one who did in one incarnation what ordinarily takes seven, and he did it with a bad start. His start was so bad, as this: When practically no more than a boy, due to the urging of his mother, but against his own inclination he took up the seriously for the purpose of punishing. Had become successful as sorcerer, astonishingly so, but

it seems he realized ... even teacher in sorcery realized same thing; they had a talk and they agreed that one of them should go and seek the light, seek enlightenment, and then bring back that enlightenment to the other; ... well, Milarepa started out to hunt for a Guru, and he presently found somebody who told him something about where he should go; a man who was a Guru, but told him "I cannot teach you."; he went on. Finally one day he went to a man who was plowing in a field - at the moment plowing. Now he attracted Milarepa, recognized (?) man known as great translator - gone down to field where Milarepa found him - one of the great Indian sages who helped in the recovery of fundamental mysteries etc. Faced great hardships, fight for everything he had, confident, students, received initiation, and the manuals which he translated, known as The Great Tibet; had great number of disciples; since been known as founder of one of the reforms in Tibet; lived about XIVth or XVth Century; man named Marpa, one of the married Gurus, had a family. Contrary to his ordinary custom he ordered his wife to get out a couple of kine; wife protested, you always had ... not right for you to be seen plowing, and he was there when his new disciple came. Chapt had been directed to him, and asked to be taken on. Marpa told him to take horse and finish plowing; told him to come up afterwards, eat supper and talk over plans. Milarepa came, finished meal .. Marpa said "I can take you - you have no money, any other possessions that you could offer; I can do one of two things. I can either supply you with the material means to make an offering ... or you go out and get ... and I will be your Guru." Decided that he wanted Marpa as his Guru, and he took the oxen over .. managed to get equivalent of sack or two of grain. Carried it up and laid sack down beside Marpa's grain. Marpa came in little later; pretended to be very indignant at his disciple for putting that in his room; acted like a man in a rage. You will notice - he is beginning his

training right here, testing the various qualities of his disciple. Milarepa of course was a little upset, sort of thought he ought to get praise for his offering - treated so roughly, harshly, didn't know what to think; however, he had the Oriental sense of obedience to Guru, never questioned (2) ... presumed that Guru had purpose even though he couldn't understand it. Well, presently his Guru told him he would have to do some preparatory work before he could receive his instruction. Now, he said, "I want to build a building for my son, and I want you to build it, and that will constitute your offering, and when you are through with it I will give you the initiation you seek." So he took him out on a certain rocky point. "Now build the building here." As I remember, it was just a circle. He said "You will have to gather the stones and mud to put it together with." So Milarepa quite happily went to work. He got up about one story with the building. ... "I must have been too hasty in my judgment take them back, all the stones and the mud." Milarepa did that, not very much bothered yet. And after it was all down, Marpa said "Now we will go out to the other place." This day Marpa seemed tipsy. When he got there he drew a design like this: for the house, and he said "Build it there." Milarepa proceeded "What in the world do you mean building it ... Milarepa said, "Well, you told me to." Marpa then said "Well, I must have been drunk. Tear it down, take all the stones back where you got them ..." Milarepa was beginning to feel it was not such satisfactory work after all. He did it. The third time Marpa came along he said "Well, now I will take you out to the place where we want it, and he built a triangle." Milarepa said "Are you sure that's the design you want?" So he built it up one story again, and Marpa came along and he said "What, you building a house in the sign that means sorcery (?) ... Milarepa said, "Well you told me to. (?) " And Marpa said "Have you got any witnesses

that I told you?" "Well, tear it down, take all the stones back to the place where you got them." And Milarepa by this time was beginning to worry. All the time he didn't get any instruction .. merely got fed. In fact, he got greater sympathy from Marpa's wife; "... even to an animal, and you have done all this work, building, and then tearing them down, and ..." Milarepa was feeling sorry for himself - pretty well played out when he had to tear ~~it~~ down the third one. The Guru said, "Now I will take you to the real place," and he drew an outline of a square, and said "I want you to build here for my son a house ten stories high, out of mud and rock, and when it is done I will surely give you the instruction you seek." Milarepa was getting foxy. Last time Marpa had asked him if he had any witnesses, so he said, "I would like to have your wife to come as witness." "All right, call her out." She witness it. She was inclined to rebuke Marpa .. but he answered "Your judgment is not asked for on things that you don't understand." So Milarepa starts in building the house. And after he gets started along came a group of Marpo's other disciples, apparently in sport, and apparently ... rolling big stone (?) ... fine stone for corner stone - out around - two stories. Around comes Marpo and he kicks it. "What do you mean by ..." "Your disciples ..." "Who gave you permission to make sport of my disciples." "You promised that you wouldn't tear it down." "Only take that stone out." Well, he had to take out a big area - awfully hard for one. When finished, Marpo said "Now you take it and put it back in the same place." Well meanwhile he was thinking he was never going to get initiated. And when you are building buildings with blueprints ... Milarepa had to do everything by himself, and he was getting discouraged, and every time a disciple would come along for an initiation he tried to work-out some scheme so he could get in the initiation. First time he didn't know ... Marpa immediately said,

What have you brought as an offering for initiation." He hadn't brought anything, so Marpa said "You can't have it. ...When you can bring an offering then I will initiate you." Next time he and Mrs. Marpa get together and she said "Now here's a precious stone that I have from my own family. Next time ..." --- Marpa asked "Where did you get it?" Milarepa said "I got it from your wife." Marpa said "It is part of my family inheritance. What belongs to my wife belongs to me." Milarepa couldn't get his initiation through that. Each time he gets in a bit of despair, each time he recognizes ... Getting up about fifth story, was getting pretty sore from carrying boulders - back got pretty sore; to protect back put cloths on shoulders; after that Milarepa devised means of carrying stones. Marpa said to himself "Yes, I have got a good disciple." Meanwhile he did get some help from the other side of the family. He got it up about seven stories. Marpa came along and said "I want to make an addition to this. I wish you would put ... an elaborate sort of portico." It looked as though he wasn't going to get the initiation after all. Despaired several times. Mrs. Marpo also thinks "Not much hope - all these years gone on -" so she connives, "You Guru has a Chief Lama (?). I will make a letter in the name of my husband, and I will fix up a present for you to give to him." You know in Tibet there is a type of drink, chang, which is supposed to be .. strong for her husband, extremely weak for herself and Milarepa; presently his consciousness was not any the better for it. Then she persisted- proceeded to steel certain things, fixed up letter, gave it to Milarepa, told him to give it to the head lama. Milarepa arrived at the monastery, he was known, and met the lama; was enormously pleased; thought it was First of all he submitted Milarepa to a test. Also, I forgot that, Milarepa previously was known as a great sorcerer (?). The very first thing he faced was a demand by his new Guru to go forth to a certain

place where there were some bandits who interfered with pilgrims. He said "I wish you would go there and produce a hailstorm." He goes, and produces heavy hailstorms that destroy crops and animals. He is upset. "Here I have to do this in obedience to the Guru, and I hate to kill. Why did I ever learn? ... He came back to his Guru and picked up some birds and other small creatures. Said, "Look at these. And the Guru said "That is only an illusion. All that is only an illusion. Now in some future life it will be your karma to become the teacher and the Guru of these creatures, and to prove to you that death and life is only an illusion I will breathe life into them." He learned the non-reality of the state we call life. Given certain initiation, put away in certain ... revealed little orifice where food is to put in ... been in there several days, not getting any results. "Are you sure that you have the proper authority of Marpa?" Lied about it. (?) A bit later a messenger came from Marpa to his head lama, about some affairs, and asked him if that miserable fellow Milarepa was anywhere around there. Then the head lama said "This is serious." Milarepa told him the whole story. "I am going there for a major initiation, and I will represent your cause as best I can. For this initiation he was taking up all his possessions, his flocks, except one she goat that was lame; went to Marpa. When he arrived Marpa said "Is Milarepa ..." First of all Marpa refused his old chela, the lama who is seeking this initiation and the lama said, "I brought to you all my possessions except one old sheep which is lame." Marpa said "Go back and get that sheep and bring it here on your back." Well, meanwhile Marpa learns of the desertion that has been played upon him and then he does get indignant, flying around - the collected chelas upset, put cloth over head, pay no attention; wife scared to death. Milarepa in such a serious state that he was even thinking of committing suicide. This

head lama conferred with him - no matter what happens there is no justification in taking life." Goes and gets old she goat (?) and brings it back on shoulders, and then Marpo comes out with forgiveness for everybody. To his wife he said, "You erred because of the kind intent of your woman's heart, and therefore you are forgiven": and to the head lama, "You did not know that the letter was not genuine, and therefore you were not to blame, and to the offerings which were taken to you without my consent, you may have them." And to Milarepa, "You sinned and erred because of the intensity of your desire for the realization, and he that desires the realization does well if he does anything to attain it and to seek it, and therefore, because of your objective and motive, you are forgiven, but because of your great sin as a sorcerer it was necessary that you be brought through despair nine times. Eight times you were brought to despair, but the ninth time was not(?) completed, hence there will be left in you a degree of impurity that you will have to ..; " and then to the head lama he said, "Relative to the old she goat that was lame, I have indeed little use for an old she goat, but it was necessary for you to understand and properly evaluate the importance of this initiation. For it you should bring all you possess. He said, "I did likewise when I attained this."

Indeed, you cannot properly realize its value until you give all that you have for it. Well, those men that make the grade don't go at it in any halfhearted way. Milarepa finally won to the highest regard in his particular branch of the Tibetan mystics; a man who attained clear to the Buddhist adept in one lifetime. After that the sufferings (?) were selfimposed. He attained a lofty level of spirituality; That reveals its importance, centuries later ... not to enter in until every other creature was also brought in too — that was Milarepa.

Q. Intravert

A. Favorable to musical sense; favorable to more subjective type of poetry, literary; opens the door to understanding certain kinds of art that are not understandable. All a question of what the purpose is. Each equipment has its advantages and disadvantages. It is not the equipment for the go-getter in the objective world. Extraverts have it all over the intraverts. Probably wouldn't be so good for impressing the public, but better for holding the lines subjectively. We need both.

The extravert is the best mixer, the best for company. He is more quickly understood, generally more easily liked by people. On the other hand, the intravert may stand up better on long acquaintance, as a general rule. The general statement about the extravert is that ... the preferable - particularly well impressed by the intravert. Those who watch him from a distance say he is an altruist, a figure seeking world good; those close to him would be more likely to consider him contrary, a crank. Weakness stand out, makes very slight impression upon those who have merely slight contact. The two types are just the reverse there. The person who can know thousands of names and can call them by first name, is clearly an extravert; hale fellow, well met, is a very strong extravert type. You can see that the powers are complimentary, and the intravert is in turn inaccessible, hidden.

I am going to read an abstract of characteristics during tonight and some of the following nights, and I want you to listen to those abstracts and see which seem to fit you. It may take two or three evenings. You make a notation how much fits you very well, really well, slightly, or not at all.

Suppose we have a man who is a combine of extravert thinking,

that is:

- | | | |
|-----|------------------------|----------------------|
| (1) | for primary attitude | - Extravert Thinking |
| (2) | for secondary attitude | |
| | would be | - Sensation |

Now can you identify that combination among human beings in society? and the particular outstanding quality this man has is practical intellectual; the engineers as a class, a great number of business men, men who handle things on this plane in what we call commonly the practical sense, would be represented very strongly in just that combination. Being oriented to thinking, thought has the power of remaining - controlling, directing. Sensation involves the power of observation. Take Sherlock Holmes: just that combination carried to extreme. Remember how he emphasized the character of observation? He said "How many steps are there between this floor and the next?" You don't observe. You know exactly how many steps there are." He had a good deal of disgust with the person who didn't observe. Strong observing power means good development of sensation; doesn't mean merely being sensitive. A lover of food and drink is one aspect of it. It includes the power to observe the ... Engineers in majority of cases would have that kind of combination. Now then, the unconscious attitude consists of those particular functions and attitudes that are repressed. Remember, the extravert represses the intravert side, and I have said that thinking involves a repression of certain other functions, and sensation involves repression of certain other functions. What then would be the most strongly repressed combinations? Intuition would be one, emotion, feeling. What then would be first? Feeling. In which attitude? In intravert attitude. Therefore his unconscious attitude would be, through the unconscious that man would be susceptible to a distinctly mystical quality. Through the unconscious he would tend to be attracted by one with feeling and intuition. Now you see here would

be an influence that would act upon this individual that he would never accept through his conscious attitude, yet it would still influence him. He would be attracted to it in spite of himself.

Intellectually he would never admit it. Very apt to be drawn to a person of that quality; sometimes marriages do take place; may not be very easy, conscious attitude being reverse of each other, but the effect is balancing upon the whole nature of both.

Now let's take just the reverse of this, where a person is oriented first of all to sensation. In that case it wouldn't be sensation serving thinking, but it would be thinking serving sensation. That might be a combination of a great lover of table, .. to help himself on to greater, richer sensations. First combination would give you the engineer. Second combination you might get a very good cook, chef, out of it; certain kinds of artists. Probably the greatest bulk of art involves a very superior place to sensation. Then there is the art that has a superior place to intuition, but I suppose the greater part of art that one sees just presently, involves primarily sensation but it is not necessary therefore that the second function is thinking. The second may be feeling. Feeling sensation is much more likely to be an artistic sense, one that you can get hold of.

Let us just take up that:

- (1) E. Feeling
- (2) E. Sensation

Apparently where the feeling acts in extrovert phase, almost always, unless feeling might get little bit out of hand, go little too far, it is a combination that can be artistic too; could be quite poetic, but it would not be the mystical poetry at all. It would be poetry that deals with nature studies. I think that would particularly represent actresses. You have the intellectual type of actor like Lionel

Barrymore. I imagine a great many movie picture stars, particularly feminine, would have this combination, and you might have male actors in reverse. What would be the Unconscious:

Thinking I.

Intuition I.

There is a combination that we would get, in most marked, developed cases, say, the metaphysician; it is the reverse combination, speculative thinker ... Emanuel Kahn (?) is an example of this. Now look how ... they are, and yet the conscious attitude of one is the unconscious attitude of the other and vice versa, and yet while there wouldn't be understanding of each other, there would be attraction across.

Take this combination: Suppose we had introvert intuition -

1. I Intuition

2. I Thinking

and suppose thinking very vigorous and highly developed. Intuition is first. More apt to be the metaphysical philosopher. Intuition leading there would be insight into metaphysical element ... Hagle.?

Now your mystic, in the narrow sense of mysticism, you would have:

1. I. Intuition

2. I. Feeling

There you would have mystical quality combined with feeling - mystical poetry. The Vashti

The other four attitudes and functions, introvert thinking and introvert feeling, and introvert thinking and sensation are never much developed - repressed - sort of standing on side lines. Now here is what is possible. If that person could have radical turnover, in crisis such as those we call conversion, or still more so in mystical awakening, then another function takes the ascendant position,

One might shift from thinking to intuition as his predominant function, or some other shift. That apparently doesn't happen as a shift from introvert to extrovert attitude, but it does happen where the man becomes different afterwards from what he was before. Whenever we have gone to an extreme there is a tendency for a shift in nature. Evil to better. You get far in extreme instances - complementary - then this comes up in opposition and fights you; then you begin to have the various forms of psychosis, intense or weak. In the normal case that doesn't happen. They are supplementary. So it is always well to cultivate something that belongs to the opposite of what you normally are in your attitude. If your normal attitude is introvert, cultivate the extravert part, and vice versa. That keeps one from getting too onesided. If one is too much developed toward thinking it is a harder problem to cultivate the complement of that - feeling - because all of thinking is an attraction to all of feeling (?) but he often can get, through the perception function like sensation or intuition, and shifting the emphasis over there, he can get an indirect or through feeling... This becomes in its ramifications a pretty complex chess game.

Extravert Intuition
Introvert Intuition
Extravert Sensation

I was talking about a point that is rather important. I want you to be sure to get it rather clearly, that it doesn't isn't enough to have a reasonably clear understanding if there is not in addition a psychical or life energy to back it up, and concentrated in the direction of the understanding. In other words, if one

listens to a mystical philosophy and views it merely as an intellectual curiosity, and scholars often do, it will not help him towards the Yoga. If we suppose that the candidate is intellectually bright, to the point where he says "Yes, that appears sound, more reasonable than the alternative philosophy." But then he just stands apart from that judgment, it still doesn't do him much good. It is a question of how much of the libido is committed to going along. If there is interned back of the understanding a lot of libido, or psychical energy, then that is the power that can produce results. One can break through to the other shore without a great mass of ideas when an intense concentration is backed up by a well-developed supply of this energy. It is that intensity that is the important thing provided it is directed in the right way, and that is where the understanding is important, because that gives one direction. If you don't have the understanding, and you did the meditation, even though you have energy behind it, or are truly in earnest, what is apt to result is that you arrive simply at unconsciousness; so meditation without understanding can be said to lead to the unconscious.

To arrive at that inner state of consciousness we are seeking, the meditation must be supplemented by understanding as far as you can develop it. The understanding becomes the quality that will guide you to the Light, when you arrive there. So by knowing the philosophy, and building up one's vital energy, then concentrating that energy—those three are the important things to accomplish. It is an interesting question to consider how we build up our reserves of energy which the psychologists call the libido. The store that different people have of it is quite variable. We know about certain strong, commanding individuals that have been able to energize whole nations. There is a world of difference between say a drunkard who is at the

very last stages of a life that has been all wasted and depleted and Napoleon, who could practically dominate a whole nation of people. There is an enormous field of this stored libido in the case of a great man like Napoleon. We have got to pronounce men great whether we agree with them or not, and this being great lies (?) in the accumulation of this psychical energy. Great men can move nations, and the very little man can influence practically nothing at all. Some of us are very poorly rooted in the grand streams of this energy, for it pours in very slowly in the course of things, and a certain portion is used up as rapidly as it comes in, and no store is built up. If you wish to build a store then it is necessary to stop the process of wasting life uselessly; in other words, a reasonable ascetism, reasonable restraint, non-wastage. I will show, presently, why it is not wise to go into extreme ascetism; to render unto the different phases of life what is their due - but not to go further, to repress, in other words, to build up the store, because with this store one ultimately has the means for breaking through to the extreme goal. Now extreme ascetism has dangers. I most emphatically do not recommend it. We have quite a history in the Christian church in medieval times, and quite an Oriental history, and we have good examples of what the result is when we go to extreme ascetism. Libido is designed to go to certain activities - satisfy hunger, interest in food, interest in sex, which continues the race and so in other phases of life. In extreme ascetism in medieval church there was a violent repression, of particularly the sexual phase, and denying even to nature that which was her due. When that is done you don't get pure

You get a portion that carried it in the first place, taken up and determining the character of the condensation, inner experience. In other words, it

is not a free, interchangeable libido in the case of extreme ascetism, hence we had, through the middle ages, mystical experiences when you submit to psychological ... that was decidedly ... Some of the reading is astonishing, where the nuns find themselves in the relationship to what we would ordinarily regard as ... , simply the ordinary romantic relationships of rather immature levels, and that was valued as the mystical experience. Now the mystical experience is not simply something like that, an inner romanticism, but that something that can happen from extreme ascetism, so I will say as Buddha, stay the middle way of moderation, not the path of flagellation. So, it's all right to eat a meal, but it's not all right to spend a lot of energy in imagination, dwelling on meals, if you wish to conserve the libido. It's all right to go occasionally to a show. It's not all right to spend a lot of time imaging and thinking about the show if it's not your business, so expression for that is wasting libido that should go to other uses.

To live this life with the minimum of waste, and rendering to Caesar that which is Caesars but no more, and conserving the rest; to build up a store so that you are strong, so that you have power that in its day can reach through to the real depths that are far beyond mere psychicism. I think that ought to make rational of all scientific ascetism. There is unreasonable and irrational ascetism that takes the point that everything that belongs to sensation belongs to the devil. Sensation isn't of the devil. Sensation is a servant when held in place and strictly the place of the servant is to be given subordination, not allowed to lead - always to follow.

Seek only Realization. Seek no power until realization is attained. It doesn't mean that you refuse any power that happens to come as a special gift. I would say, fruit of past Karma. I don't

encourage the seeking. .. You are buying silver with that which should be buying jewels, and when you get perhaps the jewel, then in principle these other powers will all ... psychometry and clairvoyance. ... Occult faculty is guided by Prahna, it is a different matter. Prahna is abstract, so I like to emphasize that - conserve not merely upon external ways, but conserve with respect to psychic ways of the libido. Aim at transcendal wisdom, that's the Hall of Wisdom again, and then you when that supremely valuable goal is won, then you are in a position to turn to lower or lesser wisdom.

A. Response to a need, altruistic service, comes under different law. May be even backed up here. Gross world puzzles. Sometimes you can waste a lot of libido. All activities that save, protect, save libido.

"I am glad to be with you once more. It is always a pleasure to meet these faces that I am beginning to know, and new faces. I suppose most of you have heard sometime or another of the phrase "The Sea of Consciousness." I suspect a very few of you have a very clear idea of just what that phrase implies, and there are indeed few in this world who at any time have of their own knowledge realized this Sea of Consciousness, and those who have realized it are helpless in trying to convey by word of mouth or in any other manner to another consciousness; only symbolic statements that may suggest it can be evolved. Sometimes that is quite difficult.

Tonight I am going to try to introduce what we mean or point to through this phrase, by taking and portraying briefly an opposite point of view; one that is much more common to our Western scientific consciousness. I will sketch briefly one of the interpretations of how man came into world and consciousness with . The view starts this way, based upon certain scientific facts and a number of scientific . First there was space with a tenuous matter all through it, homogeneously spread. Then by some means or other, centers of concretions or condensations began to appear, producing great whirls of this tenuous matter, thus forming what are now known as the extra Gaellic Nebulae, the process going on, condensation proceeding further, in the passage of great time there formed within these nebulae, stars, bodies, ... on the order of our sun in size but varying over considerable range, and as time passed - time, now, which is on the order of millions and millions of years, once in a great while these bodies that were untold distance apart happened to come, through chance, sufficiently close together so that the gravitation by them caused tides to and mass of matter was drawn off from

these tides, which in turn began whirling around one or other of the stars, and these were the planets. Since chance (?) merely governed these actions, and as a matter of probability it was a chance when two planets came together, it is conceived that very few stars have family of such (?). Now some extreme cases, the simple star, as in our case, Mercury - does thrust out a great distance - and Jupiter. Closer to world, hotter, the farther apart, colder. Distance, ranging from stars .. water would be liquid, not frozen and not a gas. (?) In this region there some peculiar property of the element of carbon molecules began to build up, that required the medium of water for their development, and generated something of life. This life could only exist on such a range of temperature where water is liquid. Only covered range from 32° Fahrenheit to 212°. Most of the temperatures are either much lower or much higher. That apparently happened something on the order of a billion years ago on this particular planet, and then a process of mechanical evolution set in whereby life developed until finally consciousness was evolved, purely, instantly: even goes so far, and scientific evidence ... removal of the planets and stars (?) of inorganic matter, consciousness goes on as matter of indifference, seemed like great machine that operates purely by chance and mechanical force, and out of one of the rare chances, planet in position where life could grow, and out of another planet consciousness rose, consciousness developed into plant and man .. to where he can develop something of the solar universe around him.

Now on the whole the view of the stars that we have from the scientific standpoint is that they are a form of nature that is distinctly unfriendly to man, and that doesn't play any particular part for his aspirations. It is so colossal, for he is a bare speck - hopeless for him to change any of the courses of the stars, or the course

of the universe in any way. There is no hope, no premise or assurance for any of the aspirations that apply to life beyond limited cycle, because that life is the product of process that has happened, forced (?) from matter. His religious beliefs and yearnings are therefore subject to disillusionment. A rather gloomy picture. Isn't it? And yet if one science without sufficient criticism, in a philosophical sense, he may feel that he is forced to such a conclusion. There are many scientific men think that is so, and that the heroic thing to do is to forego the hopes and aspirations that spring up. We may some that go beyond the limited possibility of achievement here in this life. They cannot see any other way.

Now let us examine and see if we cannot undermine it by just being a little more acute in our examination. First of all I merely outline a theory that exists; not something that was discovered on an external universe; outline something that ... exists in consciousness. Then if we are going to ask how sound it may be, how true it may be, we have got to go further than merely attack the scientific facts and hypotheses, but we have to go into the study of the nature of consciousness itself, the laws that govern it, the forms in which it works, and then if we find that those laws are such that they determine our way of viewing the universe, we at once raise the quest "Just how much of the universe is there apart from this consciousness that we bring to determine it? " I put this question to you, and I want you to think about it:

"Would there be any universe if there were
no being to be conscious of it?"

the universe I have outlined just now - the picture that I drew - the picture that exists in your mind of conscious beings? Where else does it exist. We haven't gotten in any place, any consciousness, with something outside of consciousness. Perhaps you might say the experience

of the worlds as we view them through the telescope. Ah, but that has been an impression to your eye through your convictions, and that impression exists only as it is an element in your consciousness. If we assume that something exists outside of consciousness, something that is totally independent of consciousness in every sense, then it is an assumption that we can never prove to be true, because the moment we succeeded in proving it, at that moment it be within consciousness and the case would fall down because we have to prove something concerning that which is always outside of consciousness. Where consciousness goes unconscious vanishes, so, in other terms, where the light goes darkness disappears. Light therefore never comprehends the darkness, for darkness is not where light is, and consciousness never, anywhere, in any form, in the last analysis, is non-conscious, for where consciousness is non-consciousness has disappeared, and no scientist ever studied anything save to become a material within consciousness. If the universe being as it is, physically speaking, it is still comprehended within the consciousness of the scientist as far as that consciousness goes. So when we, as we do oftentimes as a matter of habit, assume existence entirely independent of consciousness, we are assuming something that we can never verify, and furthermore, something this is not necessary to the ... ; because, we can restate the whole problem of a discovery in terms of an external world in other words that would leave the door entirely free for every possible discovery of the future and yet it will never imply an existence independent of consciousness in every sense as a substratum of the universe.

Now within man there are deepseated yearnings, there are voices that speak in terms that are not clear. We call this voice often Faith. If we once grasp the premise of consciousness perhaps we then can see how the presence of faith in this deeper sense is an evidence

of things unseen. It is a voice speaking through the unconscious part, human soul, speaking dimly and indistinctly, in terms purely defined, only in language that involves a misinterpretation, but nevertheless it is there and whenever man comes to the point where he really profoundly finds there is underlying faith, something hatters in him. It is something that we find that, when shattered, it tends to lead to unbalance - not merely an unhappiness - a deep unbalance in the psychical structure of the man. It means that we have got to take this faith, I am speaking of course of it as an abstract consciousness; now we have got to take this faith as a fact within the field of human consciousness just as much as we take these things that the senses perceive as facts in human consciousness and we are giving it the unprejudiced benefit (?) of the whole of consciousness until we admit these subtler elements for their worth.

The scientist pictured man as a consciousness that was the effect of unconscious forces, great massive force working around him. He proposed the view that the consciousness is first and that these things which we study, be they ever so great or ever so small, are existences that depend upon a prior consciousness.

Now I must present this phase to you as an idea that it may become reasonable; then I will ask you to understand it, and to see then if many things that were difficult before don't become clear in principle, or at least clearer. All we need to be able to show to satisfy ourselves scientifically is that there is some structure in consciousness that gives evidence of permanence, so that different individuals may observe the same facts with certain that that structure may be a psychical permanence, not merely a physical one, and then it becomes a constant object that we can study. If now we have the dominant creative source of all things with which we deal resting in an original con-

consciousness, we don't have to ask ourselves the question "How did consciousness evolve out of the evolution of the material universe?" We have simply to ask ourselves the reverse question, "How did a universe evolve out of consciousness?" A simple question, and one which when you follow it up, is much more fruitful in satisfactory answer. Just assume, then, consciousness as original, and the universe as something that follows from it. Now, of course, it is quite obvious when I speak of such a consciousness that I don't mean just this ordinary human consciousness with which we are familiar. One could hardly think of a limited human consciousness as that which sustains the whole universe. Rather, it is a different kind of consciousness, that in addition to sustaining the universe sustains these human forms of consciousness, and animal forms of consciousness, and all of the forms of hierarchy of consciousness that exists. We would then view all things as manifestations of forms of consciousness; at their base, of the same nature as that which is consciousness within us. Now in our ordinary view of consciousness we think of it as a relationship. We have got to get away from that. We think of it as a relationship between me, myself, whatever that may be, and an experienced world outside. Usually when a person thinks that way and he refers to himself, he refers to a personality or to an ego which is distinct from others and the outside world, of a mass of things of which he is aware - stands in relationship - he to it. ... Habitually our view of consciousness is that, even though we have gotten away from it theoretically.

I want ~~you~~ to give you another view. Consciousness is not a relationship. It is substantial. It is original; and that it ~~exists~~ exists before not only a universe but before any being exists.

It is a revolutionary idea. This is not the first time it has been formulated. It's also very ancient, but it is revolutionary to our present state of consciousness here now. Then instead of beings in some way generating consciousness, or matter in some way generating consciousness, it is a case of consciousness generating beings and objects of which the beings are conscious.

Of course, I know the question might come up "What is this consciousness like? How can you define it?" I cannot tell you - no one can define it; it is like if I were to ask you to define matter - perhaps if you were not very experienced you might attempt it, but if you thought or had something of the experiences of the profounder scientist, you would say right away, "indefinable." The most fundamental things, upon which we place most dependence, we cannot define. We use them in defining other things. We know then, not by our ordinary methods of knowing, but in some other way; so, I say to you, take first, without definition, without trying to understand would it would be in its own nature, just as an idea, for the present, that there is a SEA OF CONSCIOUSNESS - not even spreading in space, because it contains space - space which exists for our peculiar way of consciousness - not contained in time, because it contains time, before Time, before a Universe - so we cannot say that this consciousness fills anything. It is simply there. Formless; capable of every potentiality, every possibility that could ever be imagined, but incapable of any limitation that any conscious being could impose upon it. And, isn't it obviously so, that IF THE CONSCIOUS BEING IS THE CREATOR OF THAT DEPENDENT ON IT FOR ITS EXISTENCE, THAT CONSCIOUS BEING CANNOT TURN UPON IT AND LIMIT THE SOURCE THAT CONTAINED HIM?

Now within this we have formed a kind of consciousness which we call relative, and out of the various possibilities of relative consciousness the particular kind that is human, and out of the different possibilities of human consciousness the particular kind that belongs to the Western consciousness, to America, and we get over to another race, Hindu, and Chinese, we very soon find that there are important differences between our consciousness and theirs, and differences which we cannot translate across by word or by art. Some things we can, others we cannot. As we deal with primitive people there is also the same ... so we find that within the field of consciousness as a unit there are many divergences, and many differences, and while there are groups that have common ground there are other groups that have varied differences. We often find that our individual consciousness differs from theirs and that there are some things we cannot communicate by word or by art to others.

So we may say that the consciousness of all beings is like the tones of a grand symphony played within the hall of the great Sea of Consciousness, and these tones weave back and forth in various combinations, but producing in the end a harmonious totality; ever weaving on and on into new forms and new combinations, but never departing from the Hall of Primordial Consciousness. Within this music there is a grand ... which produces what we call the Universe, with its stars and its systems, and the little worlds of the atoms with their systems which in turn go through various unfoldments and recessions, but still all a theme within the Hall of Consciousness, because ALL OF THIS IS MADE OF THE STUFF AND CONSCIOUSNESS, AND THE SAME STUFF OF WHICH MAN'S CONSCIOUSNESS IS MADE, so when he seeks to understand it is possible there is a link between him and the sun.

The sun is not totally strange and totally different, and that is why he can commune with the sun, through his various instruments such as the telescope and his thought, and gain knowledge. Yes, when we study the various units (?) we are communing with them; one way of communing. There are other ways of communing that will come through knowledge. We touch the stars. The light of the stars spreads out to us. The light of the star is part of the star. We touch the stars here; our consciousness to a degree fuses with them, with their consciousness, and so we know something about them. We don't have a problem of something like consciousness trying to understand something else that is totally unlike consciousness. .. This still is a discovery because while all is contained within Primordial Consciousness, not all is known. It is this other kind of consciousness which evolves within that Sea, and which we call relative consciousness. In fact,

THIS RELATIVE CONSCIOUSNESS HAS A CAPACITY OF BECOMING
CONSCIOUS OF ITSELF;

and because there is a difference between Primordial Consciousness and consciousness that becomes conscious of itself, thus there arises a distinction between that which we ordinarily call unconscious and what we ordinarily call conscious.

Then the question "What possible difference could there be between unconsciousness and consciousness which was not conscious of itself?" Consciousness which was not conscious of itself wouldn't know that it was conscious. When we go to sleep we are in a state, generally, of being not conscious of our consciousness. We don't become unconscious. We become merely unconscious of our consciousness, since then we cannot remember, because we remember only that which takes place in the awakened state (?).

There is something that relative consciousness adds but it is still something of the various substance of consciousness itself. Nowhere in our problem have we had to introduce something that is totally unlike consciousness. I say to you, even though you are not convinced of the validity of this view that CONSCIOUSNESS IS-PRIMARY AND ORIGINAL, AND SELF-EXISTENT - it can never be scientifically proved - it is a different kind of proof that is required - assume it to be true; just as we always assume a base that we don't prove in any view that we have of anything. Assume this thing, and then look at the universe, and then act within the universe as if it were true, and see what happens. In that way you can get the beginning of a principle. You can never check it from the outside by saying "I will stand apart and listen to the others." You can't get at it that way, but, consider it as true, and act within the world and in all your relations with that as a base, and see if then the verification doesn't begin to grow within your consciousness. Some have ... but of course, testimony is not proof to the one who hears; it is merely a presumption that it is true.

That Consciousness has been known, not as we know ordinary things, not as an I aware of something outside of him, but by a very strange state where I AND THAT OF WHICH I AM AWARE BECOMES IDENTICAL, and then still deeper, a state with the whole notion of AN I AND OF SOMETHING OF WHICH I AM AWARE VANISHES IN THE GRAND SEA OF AN ALL-EMBRACING CONSCIOUSNESS, and then one can know it is but he can never describe it. The very words he uses to describe it imply in their nature an "I" dealing with an objective world and all of worlds together, in one way or another, and then when you try to describe that which is neither subjective nor objective, words become deceivers unless they are used simply as symbols to describe,

suggest that which cannot be imagined; realized only by observing, becoming, ... , where consciousness spreads everywhere. Again a figure of speech, because when I say 'spreading everywhere' it implies space, and IT IS BEFORE SPACE IS. See the impossibility of true expressions? But, it suggests an idea. We can use Space to symbolize; then we think of Space that is before objects are, and that out of that Space objects come. Now we have got to do a very interesting mysterious (?) thing. This happens to ones consciousness too. These very objects that seem so very important to us throughout most of our lives, that seem to be the evidence of reality — we think of the Space between the-objects as something empty, perhaps with a molecule here and there, a yard or so between them, and we think of the SPACE AS A VACUUM and we have discovered that that isn't so, but that which we thought of as a vacuum vanishes, and that which we thought was an actual thing, a planet, a sun, a table, a body, instead is a relative vacuum in that fullness, and so the reality spreads everywhere, everywhere conscious, but not everywhere self-conscious, and within that a drama of objects is played; a drama that is significant of awakening in man the power to become progressively conscious of consciousness, so that he, in his turn, may come some day to be an evolver of future worlds through the mystic power of his ideation so that he can play that new drama which he envisages, when his day is coming, for this time he has become more than a man for just the reason that no longer is he fooled by the drama of creation into believing that the ... or the reality, but he knows that that which produced the drama is eternally inconceivable, is the reality, and that he is that. That is the Sea, the Eternal Sea — that is that which, deep in every human heart, that poorly defined, poorly understood, that to which this of which I spoke stands as the witness, and he who knows this knows there is no death, for in reality there is no birth, no beginning

nor end save for the drama of itself.

The class entering would work toward this objective. We use what we can of that as an aid, but it is to effect actual transformation toward that realization where the consciousness changes in its base, which means that the man himself becomes different, not merely a knower of more information but a different man, and it is only so that the great heart yearning can be satisfied.