

Dialogue with Brugh Joy

Part 5 of 21*

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
September 7, 1978

Brugh: I think [it's] worthwhile looking at the emphasis that Raymond Moody makes and deletes at the same time. You were talking about meeting the light being.

Franklin: Yes.

Brugh: [The Light Being] is always presented in the very positive sense and the loving, [warm] and radiant sense—I've never decided in my own consciousness whether it's the mothering principle or whether it really represents the true heart level, which is that unconditional love.

Franklin: I would suspect the latter.

Brugh: I would hope. That would be my ideal, but I don't know. Of course, if a person has had any experience of that luminosity they can only describe it with that part of their consciousness that is capable of conceiving it. I wish I had a tape of the discussion that Elizabeth Ross gave one time about her own [experience]: in one evening's time, she had to undergo the pain of the exploration of all the people that she had helped to die—really the big deep level pathos of [her] work—and then she had to surmount it and not be overwhelmed and crushed by it, but recognize that even this was sort of a labor of love in her own growth process. In other words, not only did it help the people as they were transpiring—even though it was painful—she also grew to understand that [her personal anguish] was not to be ignored [nor] shunned [nor] pushed under the carpet, so to speak, but to be brought out and openly shared. So her work, to me, was a step further than Raymond Moody's, which just presents this love and light state. She brought more of the balance: that there is a pain but also there is something on the other side of that pain. [No doubt it was the same kind of pain] that you shared in your discussion at the conference—[asserting that there exists a] path through hell. The pain indeed was real, but there was something that came after it. That's exactly what Elizabeth Ross shares in her experience as she discusses her work on death: there is a passage through that hell that leads to a greater illumination or luminosity.

Then, as I say, *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* very clearly states—and I think it's interesting that there are forty-two good demons and fifty-six bad demons. It's interesting that they would pick up a few more on the negative side than on the positive side.

Franklin: Yes, I wonder why.

Brugh: Numerologically, we're dealing with six and nine, and perhaps it was fifty-two, so we are dealing with a six and a seven; perhaps there is some sort of a progression for us to understand that the negative pole is not to be misinterpreted. I suspect that there is an understanding of numbers there for some reason, I don't know.

Franklin: That may be. I didn't know that—what's her first name?

*This discussion has been edited for readability.

Brugh: Elizabeth . . . Ross.

Franklin: Elizabeth Ross dealt with the after-death states?

Brugh: Very much so.

Franklin: I thought she dealt with the processes here before.

Brugh: No, interestingly, Dr. Wolff, she's had experiences where discarnates that she has known have manifested to her after their death process—many months afterwards—to help her understand that her work was on both levels: to help the dying patient understand that death is merely the last stage of growth and also [about] the continuity of life following death. She stated to me personally one day that if people knew the process of what was before them in death, she feared that exposing this to the public would cause a rash of suicides, because the description of life after death sounds pretty good.

Franklin: That is right. I know what you said about Gertrude, and what Erma said about Gertrude. And what, of course, Moody says about his cases—most of his cases, not the suicides. It's a much more wonderful life than this. And you know [that] Robert Johnson had an experience when he was eleven years old. He was on the sidewalk and a car came up and hit him, and broke—mashed, in fact—his leg, and in the hospital they had to place it in a cast. Later he began bleeding inside, and he felt himself being pulled over to the other side. He resisted it as best he could, but finally he got over “the hump,” as he put it, and he liked what he had found there. Later, they found him, and transfused him and brought him back to life, but he felt a pull pulling him back, but he resisted [this] just as hard. Now he said he knows that it's fine over on that side. He also had what he calls “the Golden World,” which is of the cosmic-conscious type. He told us about [it] the time when my stepson, Jim Briggs, was about to die. He was over here and he offered to drive us over there, and we took him up on that offer. [We] spent one night at Parker [where he] told us of his experience, which he had not even told Dr. Jung, and it was of the cosmic-conscious type. It's been with him right along.

Brugh: I think anybody dealing with the death process, or particularly the ability to work with somebody in either realm, must have that experience. I think your experience in 1936 was followed several months later with an even deeper experience.

Franklin: It wasn't months; it was days—thirty-three.

Brugh: Thirty-three days. It's funny how the rational mind will erode the significance of the immortality—it must serve some function. I suppose we wouldn't stay here if we continually maintained the concept or the content within our consciousness of our fullness of beingness on all levels.

Franklin: No. I think if we knew, we probably wouldn't linger here.

Brugh: The question is: you would hope that we would finally reach a state where we would do it volitionally, and not have to play the game that we don't know.

Franklin: Yes, yes—ultimately yes—but that's an adult stage.

Brugh: Yes, I understand, it's also an adept stage—either one. I have often thought of the term ‘adult’ and ‘adulterated’; it's interesting that the two words seem to be derived from the same stem. And, as I tell my people at the conferences, I think as children we had far greater chance of enjoying this plane before we became adulterated.

Participant: Quite true.

Participant: By the way Brugh, I had a dream about Gertrude not too long ago that I shared with Dr. Wolff, and it seemed much more than a dream. It was a delightful experience, on her level of consciousness, at that point.

Franklin: Tell it, come here and tell it.

Participant: I don't really recall a thing, except that she was there—her physical form wasn't there, but her form was there as an entity; it was just very plastic and childlike, the expression was of beauty and freedom—and it was delightful, it was a nice communication.

Franklin: Do you know whether she has gone beyond the further border or not?

Brugh: No, she hasn't. Then again, you see, just because we get confused about the physical death doesn't mean that the deeper essence of consciousness gets confused. As I say, the only thing [that gets] confused in this whole reality system is the external mind. The rest of it seems to function quite harmoniously and seems to know exactly what to do, and how to do it. Just as you pointed out, the deeper overlap and the eternal aspects [don't] change even [when] we discuss going beyond the other frontier; but, the process of time is very different in that reality system.

Franklin: Yes, of course.

Brugh: Carolyn was going to do a workshop—for teenagers, not for adults—on time, because she has an unbelievable and uncanny experience within her own states of consciousness on the plasticity and the illusion of time, and that it is a construct which we manipulate almost without mercy. We think in terms of absolutes, and yet there isn't anything absolute about time—just as Einstein's theory shows, time is quite relative.

Franklin: Well, how about reversing it?

Brugh: All there, all there! Just because we happen to be on a differentiated reality where it seems to be going in one direction doesn't mean, or at all preclude, an opposite going on. But she was going to work with children and teenagers, because teenagers and children understand this, whereas the adult has been [too] fixated and crystallized into a certain conceptual framework of time. It's like the old story of Lot and his wife leaving the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, which I consider [as] sort of ordinary reality, and the injunction "don't look back" and she does and she gets turned into a pillar of salt. That's that constant looking back into these old systems rather than evolving on into the potential of what we wrest into. So by the time the adults reach me in conference I have an enormous amount of work ahead of me breaking down [their] reality system, whereas the children and teenagers are more than happy to let go of certain reality systems because it [has] interfered with their concepts of what reality is in the first place. Know what I mean?

Franklin: Or what they brought with them.

Brugh: At the same time I think they must understand this reality, they're here to understand it and learn and grow from it, but somehow we've overdone it; we somehow get them so involved with it that there's a loss of that connection with a deeper understanding of reality, if I can put it into those terms.

Franklin: Chronological time is not the only time there is.

Brugh: Exactly. Chronological time is the same mechanism that forms structure and space. Whatever the mechanism [is] that forms structure and space [it also] forms chronological time, and somehow, just as you pointed out, there [are] other ways of thinking, of conceiving in consciousness, other than in form and [visually]. There are other ways of experiencing time, with all validity in a non-chronological sense, having nothing to do with chronicity. And somehow it took me a long time to divorce and find that space in the experience of the “now moment,” which was divorced of chronicity.

Franklin: By the way, on that question of whether Sherifa came, which Erma did not verify, you spoke of it as being only a part of Sherifa. I wonder if it could have been the shell.

Brugh: At settings such as the convention here it's only the form that's invoked. You know what I mean?

Franklin: What do you mean?

Brugh: Well, it's a thought-form level; it's a portion and only a segment, a manifestation but not really the essence of the being. And it's given in service to the other. So, in other words, from that essence are templated many thought-forms that can be simultaneously in many places. You see what I mean? One can always give an unlimited supply of love because it's constantly templated from an original—you don't give your love to somebody and therefore you're without it; you have an infinite source. Well, the templating of one's beingness is the same way. It's like a template or a portion; a fraction of Sherifa was present. It was merely, because Sherifa is part of the whole, and Gertrude, and many people which surround you now—both incarnate and discarnate—were all part of a plan. The plan is still in operation; it hasn't ceased because these people have gone in. Nor will it cease when you go in.

Franklin: I certainly hope not.

Brugh: The plan is much more durational than ninety-one years; the plan that you're involved with is of the order of millennia.

Franklin: That would be something.

Participant: You know when I came back here, in '66, '67, different ones said “Oh, the Assembly is dead.” I said “Oh, no! It is [in] the life of the inner plane, it's still there.”

Brugh: Well you see, the external had to change because the next step or phase of evolution was coming in. Each of us must be willing to relinquish each past tense, so that the current tense becomes vivified. If we hang on too much to the past we pull this huge stone behind us rather than recognizing that each step [is] an opportunity to manifest, which is part of a much greater plan. There will be cycles where you have a greater externalization and then there will be cycles where there is an internalization, and this has been demonstrated in the history of man. We have been in a vast externalization process, but we've also experienced—in the history of man—internalization. Yes, maybe we were driven through plague and various other things, where we were separated and isolated from each other where there was more internalization; and we developed more monastic levels within the West. But still I feel that was in preparation for the next cycle, which was an external manifestation. Dr. Wolff deeply understands periodicity and the cycles of manifestation of the externalization and internalization.

Participant: I meant the inner aspects of it were still there.

Brugh: Well, you see, the plan is way beyond just the material that has been brought through thus far.

Participant: Tom couldn't handle the change.

Brugh: The work was brought through, which acts as the seed for deeper thought, which carries it even further, which carries it even further. It's like an initiation where somebody who was into what it was; [now] what it was isn't what it is. You know what I mean? There is something deeper beyond all that. It's painful for the human side of us to let the change come, you know.

Participant: If we identify the inner side with inner reality then it is hard to lose that intensity.

Brugh: That is never disturbed by the external.

Participant: That's what I meant.

Brugh: There is nothing that the external can do that will ever disturb the internal plan. It's whether or not we ever become conscious of the actual manifestation of what is going on. To me, our only function is to help ourselves and others become more aware of a deeper facet, or a deeper essence; a more valid essence of beingness than that which we have been lost in for thousands and thousands of years except for masters. Somehow your work, and the Assembly of Man [has really been] saying is that that particular phase that they were involved with may be dead. Just as an idea evolves, you don't go back to the original erroneous idea; you let it evolve and validate each one. In the context of when the original idea came, that's valid; when we have new experiences that bring through a greater insight, that's valid, and that doesn't negate this in the context of when it came through. What we often do later on is reach back and say "That was all invalid because this is what we're finding now," not recognizing that in the contextual framework it is still valid, you see. [We're creating bridges] and just as Dr. Wolff says, we're not at the ideal yet; we're far from it. Therefore, one would be foolish to state we were at the ideal level and reaching the ideal; but we're in the process of building the bridges towards the ideal that is held within the collective consciousness at the deepest level. It's there. And somehow increment by increment, step by step, painful journey by painful journey, bliss state by bliss state, experience by experience, we are creating the bridge that connects our beingness; not just our own individual [beingness], but what it means to be an assembly.

What a name! When you think that you called yourself "The Assembly of Man," you didn't say the individual man, or self-realization, or something else; you talked about [it] as an assembly, a collective, or a grouping of man; so, there is something very significant about the name.

Gene: Yeah, it's the third condition of Buddhahood.

Brugh: It's a collective.

Gene: It's the fraternity, brotherhood—that's the real essence of the Assembly, [it] is the brotherhood.

Brugh: And hopefully [we can relate] that to the unified recognition of the brotherhood of one's entire psyche, you know. It's just like Dr. Wolff right now—inside of his consciousness, awarely he knows that he's holding two diametrically opposite thoughts. All I have to do is to say [to him], in all honesty, "you want to die?" And he'll say "yes"; in all honesty, "I'm ready.

There's nothing holding me here. Why should I stay here?" and so on. And then diametrically, in the same consciousness in this man, is one that says "If I could see and do my work, I could do some other things. I have other plans, and I wouldn't mind sticking around for a while if I had my eyesight." So here are two, what appear to be, opposing thoughts within the same consciousness. Well, how does one unify the assembly within Dr. Wolff's consciousness? You see, it's not the task of making us brotherhood, sisterhood, but the task is how do we assemble our own psyche? How do we bring our own psyche into unification? Then we can start talking about the brotherhood and sisterhood of man, externally, but not until we understand how to unify our own psyches. [But] we usually don't even see our own dichotomy, because we don't want to admit that we hold one thought opposed to another thought, equally pulling us—

[Break for reloading the tape]

Brugh [continues]: If Dr. Wolff hadn't had the dynamic tension of orthodox science and mathematics—as it was brought through to him when he studied at Stanford then Harvard, and then teaching at Stanford again—as opposed to this experience that Sherifa and [the] whole group was bringing him to—without that dynamic tension, there's no [creativity], there's no potential difference of energy flow; there's no dynamic tension for creativity. So, it's as if we have to have these opposing actions for creativity. But still, within this process—when we talked earlier this evening about the idea that form and formless were not mutually exclusive states, but merely different perceptions of the same reality—I said we're both form and formless, and the linear mind doesn't understand it, yet Dr. Wolff said "Well of course it's the same thing, it's just a different perspective of a oneness." Well somehow we have to understand that your idea, [Dr. Wolff, to] be in life and your idea not to be in life, somehow you must find a state of consciousness that . . .

Franklin: Embraces that . . .

Brugh: . . . utilizes that, just as you found. You've already hit it. You hit [it] when you hit that *ananda* state where [you] found that it didn't make any difference—they were the same thing—[if you] lived it was the same thing, if [you] died it was the same thing. So, that state of equanimity, of balance, you see, leads to what we're talking about as the luminosity; about meeting the luminosity in the people who are suddenly thrown out of their bodies by accident and then are brought back, and they describe these experiences (or as Raymond Moody describes them). Somehow I feel that each of these are always reflecting back to us that we must own the luminosity of our own beingness—not egocentrically, of course—but from a level of natural beingness, so that there's never a confusion between clarity and luminosity and what we are versus what is simply the ego level. And I really feel that the only thing we're dealing with here is the familiar portion of life that really is sort of frightened about the idea of death. [I believe] there is a portion of you, Dr. Wolff, that is frightened by the possibility of death.

Franklin: Oh yes, I know, I know that's true.

Brugh: It's like when you wanted somebody around all the time because you were afraid you might stop breathing and go off on the other side. There was a sense of fear and fright, and that's the terror that [the Rinpoche] is talking about [in the commentary that] comes through as one is approaching a change—a major change—in one's life. And here, simultaneously, is another level inside—and we all have to own these—but inside is one that says "If I were to drop in the next moment," and there's a portion of Dr. Wolff that says "that's fine, I can embrace that."

Franklin: Right, right.

Brugh: So now we've got another one that we look at and see: Which way is this pulling and what is the deeper course of action? Is this all just a game we play? The conceptual framework and the attempt to understand, or does it have significance in the process of life in the greater sense? And I would hope that it does. I would hope that this isn't just some sort of a mind game that one gets involved with that detracts from the real living experience.

There was a wonderful quotation by Rudolf Steiner where he said—I wish I had brought it with me because I'm using it in my book—but he said, “One never,” and I am going to paraphrase slightly but, he was saying “One doesn't accept something blindly or through blind faith,” and he said, “at the same time, never substitute a blind faith for a living impression.” Meaning that experience must lead to structure and belief system, never belief system creating experience; and that's deep and very important, to me. That's the pivotal key in my own consciousness. That experience must then lead to propositions, hypotheses, scaffolding, structure and concept; never the opposite, concept leading to experience. And some people attempt to make their life meet their concept rather than letting life be as it is, and allowing it to manifest through us creatively and then we can use this fantastic function that we have, of conceptualization, to be able to articulate it and share it with another person. But that must never be substituted for the living impression. The living impression “is”—we must not distort it.

He said that back in 1901, or thereabouts. Let's see, yes, he was born in 1869 or thereabouts—Rudolph Steiner, a very interesting man.

Gene: His “freshly commuted” is really something to reckon with isn't it? He really thought he gave the true Christian belief.

Brugh: Well, you know, he was Germanic, and in that Germanic there was a certain amount of rigidity of thought. There are always the personal levels and then the transcendent levels of any human—any incarnate, I don't care who's in the pot. But at the same time there were a few things that I think that the man thought through that are just astonishing. I would never send my children, if I had any, to the Waldorf schools because I think they're too rigid and too narrow in their approach, rather than—as they claim—much more in tune with natural order. It's more Germanic natural order, which I find pretty rigid. But at the same time, it doesn't negate some of his brilliancy that came through—these flashes [of insight.]

Gene: You see, the thing of it [is that] we have these two religious attitudes: the Germanic which is portrayed by Luther, versus the Popes, which were Latins. You always get that rigidity with the Germanic way, even the Reformation by Luther was narrower than the Church dogma in many respects.

Brugh: Well, I've often thought that, and the reason why I've come to be with Dr. Wolff, is that a living impression of whatever is going on in the life process beyond our usual concepts of life and death, is of far greater value than is any concept ever created or written by anybody. In other words, it is the experience; and when a man is having an experience and can articulate it, it is worth listening to, and I feel that what's happening in the deepest level. The timing isn't important to me, the process is.

Gene: Especially [when] the essence of the experience is identity. That is your yoga right then and there! The identity can't waver, whereas the concept is always a postulator of that thing out there.

Brugh: But once again, Gene, you know the concept, okay, and you know it well in your mind. But experientially you do not live it. You know what I mean? And so you have, just as we all do, and if we're really honest with ourselves, we could say we know what the concept is, but now what is my experience of this, and what am I doing? If I'm stating this as an ideal, and I expect somebody to be it, why am I not doing that also? You see what I mean? Dr. Wolff is sharing with us very deeply that it's not the ideal, it's the building of the bridges and the opening of the honesty of all of this, that begins to bring in clarification rather than these awful things where we set up an ideal situation which is impossible, and not yet really possible for the human consciousness at the level of which the collective is working, the assembly is working. Now there may be individuals that can reach certain levels and then reach back to show the aspect of the human portion of our beingness. I really feel that part of why Dr. Wolff is still here is to show that reaching back and show the human side that is not yet ready for that ideal. And we mustn't project an ideal onto it; we must see the beauty of the living impression, and we are [now] seeing [that] living impression. But then we put our ideas on top of it, and that's what confuses, and distorts, and eventually destroys something of great beauty.

Participant: Do we have to give consent before we die?

Brugh: Well, the consent may or may not take place on the conscious level. I really truly believe—

Participant: But I may not want to give [that consent.]

Brugh: Right, but you know I believe that we're reaching a point that it is potentially possible for a greater number of people to consent to their death process because they recognize that they are passing through a birth. In other words, it's like being in the womb where they actually are feeling the contractions and the pressure for the change on through and God knows where we're going, but one is being pushed through the birth canal. It's painful, it's not easy; you're being disrupted, and yet somehow one eventually, finally, has to trust the process, and trust that there is a deeper underlying principle happening here. Just because it's uncomfortable, or just because we happen to have to leave a certain comfortable situation, the transformation [or] the death process is really analogous to the birth process.

I believe we're in a cycle. It's the uroboros; it's the serpent swallowing the tail; it's the same process in reverse order. It may not even be reverse order. [It could] be a continuation, another extrusion into another potential. However, it's not easy [because] at the same time we have so many beliefs, taboos, hurts, personality components, and poles that no wonder it's such a clouded state. And it's only been in the past five years that orthodox medicine has even begun to approach what the church left off a long time ago and really failed to carry out, and that is the clarification of the death process. [The church] got lost in their dogma and got lost in their creeds. They got lost in belief systems, and they lost the vitality of the living impression of what does happen when somebody dies. We say that "death ensues at exactly 10:32" on whatever date it is. That's ridiculous—the physical form dies over years.

Participant: "It's our dying days."

Brugh: Well, not only that. But even after one is "dead," there are cells in the body that merrily are moving along, and they go on for a long period of time. The cornea of the eye goes on for months and months and months after somebody's been declared dead. There are certain tissues, the fingernails, and the hair continues to grow for years after the death process. So you

see that we don't just die suddenly; that's an illusion. The physical form goes through its slow death process just as the psyche prepares, usually years ahead of time, and is undergoing a process. We don't even know the point at which it has reached the midway; we just arbitrarily say, when the body dies, "We've died." Well I know people that died a long time ago and they're still running a body. They're zombies—but they're dead. You know, they're dead. And there are other people who are very much alive and they're in the process of invaginating in this plane. They're not partitioned off and preparing for any other level; they're here, they're fully present.

My feeling [about] Dr. Wolff is that he's been gradually taking portions and a greater and greater amount of his consciousness and placing it in another dimension, or returning it to—I feel—the monad. He is being reabsorbed gradually and that's the reason why nothing could be done with the eyesight at that time. I think that if he wants to go ahead with the surgery, there's nothing to preclude it. Carolyn, when she looked at it, felt that there would be some improvement with his eyes. It's not going to be an astounding improvement, but there would be an improvement if he went through the surgery. But my question still is, why? Are we dealing with the fear of death and we are going to ourselves occupied? Or is there still some work to do? But you know that there isn't too much further that you really want to work on.

Franklin: No, there isn't. It is simple as this, I'd say, it would be more comfortable, while I'm still here, to be able to see.

Brugh: And I think that's an honest statement. I mean what else can one say to that? That's just an honest statement; it's so simple that it almost bowls me over. It doesn't have any complexity to it; it's a simple statement of truth. But the eyesight is seductive.

Franklin: Oh yes, it is.

Gene: Well, Yogi. You've got to be here until November. Do you know why?

Franklin: Yes.

Gene: November will mark the fiftieth year of Lillian's and my association.

Franklin: November 13.

Gene: November 13, 1928, you're right. Fifty years ago.

Franklin: You know that discussion of November 13, no it was December.

Gene: Was it December? I thought it was November.

Franklin: No, January.

Gene: Oh no, Yogi, we attended your lectures; it was the fall of '28.

Franklin: I know—you're talking about one thing, and I'm talking about another. It was January 13—don't you remember? Helen brought that up. That was part of a dream that Wes Young had. What Helen told me was this: I was dressed like one of these yogins in loincloth, and they put me on some sort of carrier and carried me away. She didn't tell it all that night.

Brugh: But the one and the thirteen to me signal, the one as the new beginning; the thirteen is an initiation number—it's an ancient number, whether we go into the Talmud or into ancient numerology, whether it be through the Eastern or the Western. I've never known which way it came anyway. But it's interesting; my immediate impression of that would be initiation.

Lillian: I think was around December 21 that we first met in Chicago at the lectures because you and Sherifa came to my apartment for Christmas dinner. You were still giving lectures.

Gene: But the lectures started in October.

Franklin: Yes, that's right.

Gene: Right, October, I know it. I remember it was a fall day, it was a fall evening.

Lillian: Well maybe you went before I did.

Franklin: Yes, it started then—it was the founding of the Assembly of Man that . . .

Gene: That took place just a little later.

Franklin: It took place on the December 21, 1928.

Brugh: That marks fifty years, the 21st—that's the solstice you picked?

Gene: Very important, it is the solstice.

Brugh: At midnight, you founded it.

Franklin: Right.

Lillian: I think the program was going before I was informed of it.

Franklin: Sherifa was very fond of ritual, and I was a bit bored by it.

Gene: It adds up.

Participant: There is a certain power in it.

Franklin: She had me stand in the center here, and had all of that crowd, all of that audience, moving in a circle around me.

Brugh: And yet the significance of your ritual for Gertrude was not, you know, without power.

Franklin: No, true.

Brugh: And the ritual of the formation of your assembly—evoking the forces somehow, ritual to me, it's not the ritual itself, it's the energies that it evokes that are far more important the external.

For a man that doesn't believe very much in ritual, your ritual in your conferences are moving; when you have everybody face the east.

Franklin: Well, yes, we do have a few rituals. Not elaborate.

Brugh: No, they're simple, but meaningful.

Gene: What about the basic one: standard time, there is no daylight savings time.

Brugh: There is not even time, I mean, let's face it. After all, I think you're going to reach the other side before I do, Dr. Wolff, and I have a feeling your sense of humor is going to come into play when you get there. And I hope you let me know, to tell me if there really isn't any further to work on, from the standpoint of all the concepts, I hope somehow you let me know.

Franklin: Yes, I'll . . .

Franklin: Well if you got over to see Gertrude, why couldn't you get over to see me?

Brugh: Well I don't think there's going to be any problem because, as I've told you very honestly, there's both a personal and impersonal commitment with you. Carolyn doesn't have the personal [commitment], and therefore, she would probably be the one [to communicate], just like Sherifa had the ability that you didn't have, in her ability to communicate and channel.

Franklin: Sure she did, Yes, she had abilities I didn't have.

Brugh: Carolyn has a very similar process, and it's very interesting. Carolyn remains in the background, and I have the ability to move ahead, and it's often fascinated me how that works and why. Of course the French always say that the woman is always behind the man, anyway. I have a feeling that after we have the woman's lib in, you know, it'll be *cherché l'homme* or something like that—look for the man behind the woman.

Gene: Right.

Brugh: After we finished this last sweep through the males.

Lillian: Why does there have to be any behind, why not side-by-side?

Brugh: Well, I been trying to promote that for a long time, but I don't know, nobody seems to want it. They either want one or the other.

Gene: Do you mean to tell me chauvinism is bad?

Brugh: I don't know. You keep talking about balance and harmony and love, and fulcrum points, and so on and so forth, and somebody gets it, you know, and they say "Well, it's light isn't it, well what about the dark, I mean how can you possibly understand balance without understanding darkness?" Over and over again, and yet we get caught in these unbelievable teeter-totters because we fail to be inclusive. The portion that I was reading to him, which was just the commentary by this Tibetan . . .

Lillian: Evans-Wentz?

Brugh: No, this is another version, one that I consider a little broader in scope. But, he's discussing the fact that our problem is that we distort duality, we know there's duality, and he is making the profound statement by saying if we would only embrace the totality of it, we would resolve it. But our problem is that we only embrace a portion of it and therefore confusion results and distortion of reality occurs because we fail to embrace its totality. Once again it's sort of like letting the whole thing embrace us rather than just the portions we want to come in.

Lillian: We could be in the middle way, and realize that they're both.

Brugh: Somehow that has to become experiential. You know up at my conferences people you have studied Alice Bailey, who have studied *The Secret Doctrine*, who can quote back-and-forth, and when Dr. Wolff mentioned this other man who could always quote things, and then, the dichotomy between the informational system, where they know it informationally but they don't know it experientially, they don't really represent the integration of that in their physical beingness and presence. They represent these ideas; well somehow we have to amalgamate those ideas into a physical presence, otherwise we have maintained these partitions, and somehow the painful part is to have to own all of the facets in order to allow the thing to

coalesce some way or another. And I trust that the coalescing or the process of unification eventuates in luminosity, but not luminosity in a polarized as opposed to darkness, but luminosity that includes light and dark as we understand it; in other words, my definition of luminosity is clarity, which does not have to divide itself between light and dark, but somehow encompasses light and dark. Maybe that's a distortion of the word, but that's how I envision the resolution and why we are light beings, not light as opposed to dark, but we are light beings—we are clear beings—because of our inclusiveness. Somehow that's never been clarified, and to get into that feeling state of knowing the validity of that is part of an enlightenment.

And why it was so difficult for many people of the assembly here the last time to see facets that ordinarily are excluded from, that they don't want to look at, it's painful to look at, it represents a flaw to the consciousness, rather than representing honesty, which then gives clarity, which then gives a person seeing it an opportunity to grow and say "Oh, I see, it's not this fantasy that I'm moving towards, it's the living evolution that I'm working on, and I must never have a credibility gap between a fantasy and a living experience. And we were having a living experience, I felt. Maybe not one that was comfortable for people, but then again that's just a portion that is ephemeral anyway.

Lillian: It was a truth.

Brugh: A very deep truth. One that's rarely, rarely exposed to human consciousness, mainly because the human consciousness usually cannot take it; it will either reject it or it feel a failure, or it will feel a flaw, rather than what it really is, which is an honesty. An honesty. What can a man share with another man or woman, or a woman share, other than honesty? I mean otherwise what we do is we lead ourselves—it's like the blind leading the blind—and pretty soon we've got an awful, we've got a concoction that doesn't even exist, you know.

Lillian: And sometimes when you are honest, maybe it's not faith in your honesty, but then you are afraid to be honest with him.

Franklin: Is this working?

Brugh: Yes. Do you want off for the moment?

Franklin: No, no, I want all of this.

Brugh: Well, the honesty to me represents if one knows that one is being honest, then it's not a consideration of another person because an honesty, even though it may be painful, not only to oneself, but painful to another person, it is our only opportunity of growth. Otherwise what we do is we continue to lead the life of deception and distortion, and that's really what has created much of the *maya* as I interpret it; that is, we refuse to see the beauty in all aspects of evolution—we tend to get into value systems, and they're all conditioned. If we could only move to that clear point and you can understand that no matter what was presented at that assembly this last time, we were seeing a rare phenomenon. And a lot of people, you know, as I said, that one conference probably will be the most talked about of any of them because it was truth and it wasn't just talking about things that everybody was used to hearing over and over again; you are bringing through things that were just shaking them up from the foundation up, you know. And a lot of people were shaken.

Franklin: Yeah, I was astonished. They seemed to be so curiously and deeply interested.

Brugh: Well you also had, as you may or may not be aware of, but you had a polarization occur within the group: some of them were deeply moved and understood at levels way beyond what they had come to before about what you were doing, and you also had people who were very angry and felt that you were off on an ego trip and into self-pity, not recognizing that you were really working way beyond the ego level as you were sharing the personal and yet the impersonal; you were simultaneously both, which was a razor's edge to walk for that conference. And some people interpreted it as nothing but a gigantic day of self-pity and others saw it as what it was—an honest laying of oneself open and vulnerable as you were reporting a process within your own beingness of death. Eventually it will be seen as the pattern, not as a specific of Franklin Wolff and Gertrude, but as—it will be seen in its pattern form that's being worked through rather than as the specific individuation of that; but you are reflecting it in the individual pattern, eventually the deeper, the more fundamental pattern will be seen and brought forth. Just as Dr. Johnson said to you that what you are experiencing foreshadows what others will work through also.

Franklin: We had two examples of that that evening.

Brugh: And the superficial mind interpreted that as less than what it was. And once again, whenever one raises and has the courage to stand up and state it as one is feeling it, one will always have the opposites come towards one; the ones that reject and must move into their own camp for a period of time and those that recognize the depth to you're taking them. Some can see and some cannot see. But you can only be honest to your own process. What else can a man or woman do? It's when we deceive those that are around us, in trying to be what they want us to be, their expectation, that we, I feel, do the greatest disservice to those around us; because what we do is promulgate and propagate a deception rather than what really is, which helps that person to say "Oh, I see, I'm not, there is something very human and yet divine about this process, and that's within me also." And within you, and within you, and within Gene. And somehow this opens the bridge. Instead of saying here I am appear up here and all of you mortals down here, and I'm beyond all of this, it's saying there is no differentiation, it's all part of an evolutionary process, and whether I reach down. It reminds me of my teacher Eunice, who was in the hospital with cancer and cancer everywhere I could find it, and she looked at me and she said I want to go home. And I said, you can't go home, you're just riddled with cancer. So what she did is, she made all the cancer go away in her neck, within twelve hours, and I came into examine her the next morning and it was gone, and she looked at me and said, "I want to go home!" She said "I don't want to die here in the hospital; I want to die at home." And she says if this is what will convince that I can get rid of this if I want to, that's fine, but I'm doing something else, so let me out of here. So I released her to go home, at which time all the masses came back, and everything else; it wasn't a question of trying to cure her cancer, she understood, she had a very interesting thing: one level of her understood completely that she was preparing for death because she already was preparing for an incarnation for later on in this century, and she knew that, and she'd already completed her work, even though she died at the age of forty-seven, she completed what this lifetime was for, and she knew it. Her outer mind, her personality, screamed in agony that she was dying, and said no I don't want to die, why do I have to die now, I'm only forty-seven years old and I'm just getting started. OK, that's the personality Eunice. The divine or the portion that was wise, the wisdom portion of her, knew perfectly well, could make the cancer go away, her personality couldn't make the cancer go away, she could scream from the rooftops, and say I want this cancer out of my body, and it wouldn't do

anything. Her divine portion could make it appear or disappear at will. And she made me look like a gnat compared to an elephant as far as her abilities of controlling her body. Here I was the academic physician who could supposedly work the magic; well, you know I had a big lesson brought to me, that there's something far vaster than medicine involved here, and she demonstrated it. She literally rended my consciousness as far as the potential of science versus the potential of human consciousness. She showed me very clearly that human consciousness transcends science, you know what I mean.

Gene: Brugh. What was the cause or why did she have the cancer in her apparently highly advanced, evolved state?

Brugh: She stated to me in her clarity that very often people, that it is a pattern within the collective, it's like in the bodhisattva vow, there is a certain order within that that has a belief that by taking on one of the plagues of mankind through death, that it is a service to mankind. In other words, it is like stating I will carry it on out and take it through death; I will take myself out and it with me through death to transform it. So she said, and she quoted a number of great sages, Ramana Maharishi took cancer with him when he died; many great sages took a very painful process through death. It doesn't always, it isn't always a factor. But she said this is her, even before she knew what her death process was going be, she had discussed this with us, and it's interesting, she did just that. Now whether or not that's a rationalization, who is to say? All I know is that she was a woman of unbelievable ability on many, many levels. She had the ability, it wasn't her teaching, or even though she had a razor's edge mind, and she had the kind of mind that you would have loved, you would have been astounded for a woman, you know what I mean? She had that ability, and at the same time, she could be very much the woman. And she could, her phenomena that she could create around her were astounding, and she was an awakener, she had that ability to awaken somebody to their potential; she didn't do it through, even though her words were there, that wasn't her function, whereas quite to the contrary, Dr. Wolff elected to take it through articulation, the illumined mind.

Are you tiring, Dr. Wolff?

Franklin: Somewhat, yes.

Brugh: Because what I was thinking is, what I will do is, there's been a lot that we've discussed tonight, and I thought what I would do is, if you tell me your time that you would like to have me return tomorrow morning, we will maybe read a little bit further out of the book and then generate a conversation.

Franklin: All right.

Brugh: And if you feel that we want to pursue this for the day, I will call my secretary tomorrow morning and have her cancel some appointments I have in Los Angeles tomorrow, and we'll spend another day together and just sort of explore.

Franklin: All right, that'll be fine.

Brugh: And see what happens, that won't be hard and I can always make those appointments at other times.

Franklin: How about 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock?

Brugh: Your time? 8:00 o'clock your time, which would be 9:00 o'clock my time?

Franklin: Yes.

Brugh: I wonder what time it is for God. OK, 9:00 o'clock will be fine.

Franklin: All times at once.

Brugh: That's right, now if we can only get to that experientially we'll be in good shape.