

Wisdom's Goldenrod Class at American Brahman Bookstore, Ithaca NY

with Anthony Damiani (AD) May 5, 1971

Paul Brunton (PB) Books, *Wisdom of the Overself*

* * *

Contents: Conceiving Mind as infinite possibilities (universes) simultaneously; karma as some of the infinite possibilities; twin function of ideation - energy and image; possibilities (karma) as energy; karma as law that govern manifestation – continuity and accountability; karma as kinetic memory of nature coupled with its imaginative power; memory as archetype; karma - general and specific; how karma affects a sage; sages don't operate with ego; individuality – how can the totality of mind operate in each individual separately

Books read from or referenced:

Paul Brunton, *The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”

Paul Brunton, *The Spiritual Crisis of Man*

Diagrams referred to (not with this transcript version). This was transcribed from audio. Note: [diagram] means the speaker is referencing a diagram as they speak, and [drawing] means someone is drawing or writing, with audible sounds of chalk on a blackboard.

* * *

AD: --infinite possibilities which it contains and which the Hindus often refer to as mulaprakriti, which I think in the beginning of the chapter goes something like this.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (AD reading)] “There is no moment at which it has not existed, either latently or actively, and consequently there will be no moment when it will not continue to exist, either latently or actively.”

AD: And what did that refer to? That referred to the universes, right? The whole procession. *Inconceivable* to the mind. You can only stagger back and say, “That’s enough, let’s go on to the next sentence.” Mulaprakriti, infinite possibility, the totality of all the universes that could ever be. Ok? You see something here now?

S: But as a possibility, as infinite possibility.

AD: What do you mean as impossibility, as in-- For Parabrahman it's as possibility!?

S: You said all the universes that are--

AD: Here's one universe, another one, another one, and another one, right? Pralaya in between. They come and they go. They're all contained within this [diagram], right? Can you conceive of a universe outside of that?

S: No, not outside of that [diagram] but inside of that [diagram].

AD: Inside of what, infinite possibilities? Would it be a possibility in the Infinite?

S: When you speak of the root of Nature or infinite possibility, you're not speaking of an actualization of these possibilities, are you? Or are you?

AD: I'm speaking of them, of course they cannot be actual for me. But insofar that we refer them to Parabrahman, they're all actual. There's no such thing as "possibly real" with the Infinite. Whatever It thinks, is.

S: I'm confused now.

AD: Why are you confused? It's so straightforward.

S: I guess in terminology. [AD: All right, we--] Because I thought we were equating infinite possibility with Mind.

AD: Infinite possibility is out there [diagram], right? In other words, if you consider Supreme Mind, Parabrahman, and you want to try to define it, the only way you can define it is in terms of its productions or manifestations. But as soon as you're dealing with its productions or manifestations, you are considering all the possibilities. Now these possibilities are all actual for the Supreme. You follow that? [S: Yes.]

They're actual for the Supreme, there's nothing-- the Supreme doesn't have to plan, lay it out and then build it and do it. On the other hand, over there [diagram], in the series of manifested universes, one after the other, this one, the one that comes, and the pralaya periods and all that in between. All these have to be conceived as contained within the Mind Itself.

Now where's your confusion? [S: I'm not sure.] Well, that's a good start.

S: That's why I'm so confused.

AD: Yes?

S: Are we to understand [AD: Think about it.] Parabrahman as the World-Mind?

S: No, I don't think so, no.

AD: This is the World-Mind, this is Mind in Itself, and those are the world [diagram], the world that arises within the World-Mind, the manifested cosmos; of which there are innumerable numbers, it's indefinite.

Doesn't he say at the very beginning, doesn't he say precisely that? No moment when this universe didn't exist, this one, the next one, the one after? Then they're all contained as possibilities as far as we're concerned. I'm trying to make you aware of another way of trying to understand the notion of Mind.

If you try to understand the nature of mental substance itself-- Well, let's use an analogy. You have a dream, and the whole scene is laid out, you go through the dream and you wake up, chapter one is over. You go back to sleep, chapter two starts and chapter three, chapter four. And imagine an innumerable series.

Now this is the way I want you to think now for a minute. All the scenes that are played out in the dream are different universes coming into manifestation. These are all possibilities that are contained within the mind. When they're actualized of course then you can see them. Can you see what I mean by infinite possibilities?

S: The thing that's difficult is I keep making the infinite possibilities (in Mind/combined). Now, a possibility, *a* possibility, is a principle of manifestation.

AD: A possibility is a *principle*?

S: With respect to the diagram you had before, it's a different point of view than universal automatic (destiny) from this manifestation.

AD: Yes. I'm taking you up a wrong end. Let's back off and come back another way.

S: I thought that mulaprakriti was sort of like the receptive principle and-- [AD: The what?] The gift of receptivity.

S: You mean pure potential?

S: Yes. And it doesn't seem the same as infinite possibilities for the [inaudible].

AD: You think of prakriti as infinite receptivity, pure potentiality. Is that what you're saying? Well then why can't you think of the correlate?

S: I can, but where would you put it?

AD: You can't put it anywhere. That would be Mind. If you can think of Mind in its receptivity or pure potentiality, of which it will manifest every one of these possibilities, then you're getting close to what the notion of Parabrahman means.

Otherwise, you're trying to do this. I ask you to consider, you remember the example we use, think of a pinhead, and you think of a pinhead. Now think of a large city, and you think of a large city. Now I ask you, was the totality-- was your mind involved in the creation of this pinhead and this city and you say yes. The totality of the mind was involved in it, right? The totality of the mind was involved in understanding or, that is, picturing a city as a pin.

Now see if you can get to this point. Conceive of all the things that the mind could imagine. You can't, right? Infinite possibilities. I didn't use the word *indefinite*. I used the word *infinite*. [break in audio]

Read the next paragraph. The whole paragraph.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 3 (AD reading)] "The cosmos, being a thought-formation, can never really disappear any more than a human idea can really disappear when it is put aside from attention. We may understand this point better by considering how thoughts exist in a man's mind."

AD: Now listen to this analogy, try to follow it.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 3 (AD reading)] "What happens to them when they vanish? Where do they come from when they appear? At any time he can call them up again even though during the interval they have seemingly been nonexistent. His ideas are manifestations of his own mind, not creations out of some external stuff. In the same way the World-Mind manifests something of its own self in the cosmos. And its own self, as will be shown later, being uniquely eternal and undying, it is inevitable that the world- ideas which have arisen within it are eternal and undying too."

AD: Now, let's see if this paragraph helps us. If we take the analogy that he gives us here, a human idea, idea after idea drops into the unconscious. And, we lose awareness of an idea, it vanishes, and then we could recall it and it comes back again. Now evidently what's postulated here is the existence of an overwhelming superior kind of consciousness-- now I'm going to disown the Buddhists for a while, you don't mind, do you?-- that can be relied on, if you think about it, to pick it out, say, "Ah, 28 years ago on a Monday morning I had ketchup put on my grapefruit."

Now there's some kind of overwhelming functioning intelligence and awareness operating here. You can imagine, so to speak, now this is only for a picture, an entity behind you that records everything you've ever done, every thought you've ever had. In deep hypnosis they could do that too. They could make you remember things you did when you were three years old.

So evidently there's some kind of action going on, there's some kind of mirroring going on underneath. All these ideas drop there and they're all available to this superior kind of consciousness. Now to this superior kind of consciousness, we can't say that these ideas which vanish for us are in a latent state for it. We cannot say that they're not actual. Here, do you follow what I'm trying to get at it?

All I'm trying to do is get this notion out of what we're really talking about. So it sends a shudder up and down your spine when you realize that this kind of superior intelligence, which symbolically is represented in a fragmentary way by the World-Mind, that the *entirety* of these infinite possibilities lie like an open book to the Absolute, which by the way the Egyptians always regarded in the form of Thrice Great Darkness.

I guess you're beginning to realize that you cannot know it. There's no possibility of knowing Parabrahman. Never.

S: Could I try an analogy with that?

AD: Yes, sure, if you've got an analogy, swell.

S: It would be like a dream character having a dream of the dreamer's mind.

AD: It'd be like a-- [laughter]

S: [amidst laughter] I go to sleep tonight, instead of having a dream that consists of a series of events and people and objects I have a dream about my mind. It's an impossibility.

S: You dream that you're dreaming about your own mind?

S: No, the dream I have is of that which makes possible dreams.

AD: Yes. Or the analogy I like to give about the image in the mirror. This is our situation when we meditate and we're going to try to become aware of that image in the mirror, so we want to step out of the mirror, but if we do there's no image there to look at. Maybe we can dissolve in the process and just leave the mirror there. But then again, Hui-Neng would not accept this analogy, would he?

S: No.

S: You have to take away the mirror too. Can't do that.

AD: Then the analogy becomes useless. [laughter] Now don't misunderstand. I'm not trying to compete with Hui-Neng. But there is a point beyond which you don't drive an analogy, otherwise it loses all value.

S: No, Wouldn't it be-- [break in audio]

AD: --subject or the object or the mirror. Now I'm only pulling them out of the mirror to give an analogy. You've got to leave them back in the mirror there. Let's try again, come on.

S: Would it be correct to say then that mulaprakriti is a revelation of Mind by the World-Mind?

AD: It's hard to answer yes or no to that.

S: I was trying to put Ishvara in there because when you're speaking of the manifestation of these possibilities, you have to somehow refer to the principle which actualizes them in the relative sense.

AD: Hit me again. You know like when you go to the bar, hit me again. [laughter]

S: The analogy he gives here, like it has its own memory contents, and me as an individual would be an analogy for Ishvara. And, my act of beholding all the memory contents, if I could behold them all, I would be at the same time creating them. That's what we call Ishvara or the World-Mind. [AD: Yes.] But what I'm revealing, those memory contents, is a revelation of Mind, what they are. [AD: Once more?] That mental substance--

AD: Once more and I'll question you now.

S: The act of the World-Mind in beholding the world, it's revealing Mind or it's reveal--

AD: It's revealing Mind? In what way is it revealing Mind? I'm not trying to criticize. I'm trying to understand, please.

S: Insofar as it's able to be revealed at all and that's-- is that veil of manifestation.

AD: Insofar that it is trying to reveal the manifestation?

S: No, insofar that Mind's able to be known at all, is active, the World-Mind in creating-- create.

AD: Here let's see if you're saying something like this. This is Mind-in-Itself [drawing]. Now you've got World-Mind here, and then its act of contemplation-- the cosmos springs into order [diagram]. Now, in springing to order-- you're trying to say that it's springing into order, it reveals the World-Mind --it reveals Mind?

S: The very substance of that world is Mind.

AD: The very substance of this cosmos-- [S: --is Mind.] Yes. [drawing]

S: I was showing you that to help understand that sentence when you say--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (S reading)] “...it is brought into being by the World-Mind out of *itself*, out of its own mental ‘substance’...”

AD: Yes.

S: And that’s what I was trying to say there, that Mind is that substance in itself.

S: In that case, could you substitute the word “essence” for substance?

AD: Let’s go over this again slowly because we’re getting at something worthwhile now. There’s also something else being revealed but start with the way you go there, go ahead.

Here’s Mind [diagram] which represents infinite possibilities, and this is one being actualized. This is the World-Mind coming into operation and here’s a cosmos that springs up [diagram]. The cosmos springs up when the World-Mind directs its gaze or contemplates. And then all these ideas get clothed like my coffee, ok? It springs up, ok? Now, what did you add to that?

S: In this act of beholding, the substance of these images is Mind or the being of the World-Mind, this essence. That very substance, which is there all the time, its essence, is the substance of the cosmos.

AD: Now, on the one hand you say the substance is revealed as soon as the cosmos springs up. On the other hand, what else is revealed? Come on, just one step further and you’ll see something very important here. Isn’t one of the possibilities revealed?

S: The negation of itself?

AD: No. Aren’t possibilities being revealed? What is karma, [drawing] what the hell do you think karma is that you’re so frightened of it? [laughter] Isn’t that so? Isn’t karma really in here somewhere [diagram]? What do you think?

S: Karma would be some way-- Give me one minute, I’m going to tell you in a second. [laughter]

AD: [amidst laughter] All right. Go ahead, take your time.

S: Isn't karma that thing that "chooses," in quotes, among the infinite possibilities, and it sort of determines what's being manifest on [inaudible] in some sense?

AD: You mean karma actualizes a certain possibility, don't you?

S: Yes, but it also has I think to do with the choices that you--

AD: Well, that's what you think. Yes, that's what you think.

S: But PB cannot be differentiated, so all that can be differentiated is say mulaprakriti.

AD: Whoa, whoa, whoa, slow, slow. This is not engineering.

S: Yes. PB cannot be differentiated so what is differentiable is mulaprakriti, and if the infinite possibilities you have all that system of possibility individual. And in the individual possibilities there would be karma which would be-- [AD: One--] will operate the individual level and that has to be only at mulaprakriti, it can't go anywhere past that.

AD: Can't go anywhere past that. Well what do you think of that? You worked it out all by yourself and-- what? What do you think of that?

S: I've missed the point--

AD: You missed the point of karma? [S: Yes.] But look, here's a dream, you have a dream, right, and in the dream there is a manifestation of a certain sequence of events. Now this, you could say for instance, you could see the imagery, and that represents the twin function of ideation, right? And you can see the karma, the energy behind it, right?

And isn't it a mind manifesting itself to itself? Actualizing one of the possibilities within it? Now we're speaking at an individual, you know, dream level as an analogy. Why do you think I keep telling you, fall back on that analogy of the dream personality dreaming? Look, you remember the sentence he uses there about twin function is that of ideation? Read the sentence, would you?

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 21 (S reading)] "The rise, abiding and dissolution of karma is indeed a twin-function to that of its ideation."

AD: Be a good meditation theme, wouldn't it? Rise, abiding, dissolution of karma is twin function to that of ideation. Apply that *to* the universe, or to an individual, to a plant, to *anything*.

S: It's a cosmos and not a chaos and in that sense you're using the word "karma" there?

AD: Well, naturally, it's a *cosmos*, it's this particular cosmos. It has a certain content. This content is decided by its karma from the previous universe, and that one in turn by the previous universe. Now you're looking in terms of linear succession. But think also at the same time that this represents a manifestation of the Mind to itself. But what is it going to manifest, anything else besides the possibilities within it? Which you call karma. Are we getting any closer to the notion of mental substance? What do you think?

S: Is the manifestation karma?

S: Everything disappears as soon as you step into that.

S: I don't see how you could say "Are we getting any closer?" [laughter]

AD: Thank you. [S: You're welcome.] But anyway, this part come out to you or is it a little too thick yet?

S: So then is what the body has that-- each law of karma, in that karma is the law of one individual's own being or a separate center of continuity, that each one of those would be a possibility which the World- Mind would--

AD: Well, isn't that so? Aren't you actualizing the possibility which is contained within your Overself? Otherwise, would it make any sense to say--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 1 (AD reading)] "Certain thoughts will come naturally to the student's mind at this stage."

AD: We pointed out three weeks ago, when we hit that sentence, that there were three or four different parts to this sentence. "Certain thoughts" immediately makes it obvious that we're dealing with stages of development on the way and these stages are archetypal. Secondly, we pointed out that the thoughts that come at that particular stage depend upon the archetypal stage that a person is operating at.

S: That's an analogy to that sentence, "The rise, abiding, dissolution..."

AD: Yes. And then the next point we made, you remember? Otherwise, don't you see, we would be more or less saying that our evolution is haphazard and left to guess and chance?

S: I can't conceive of how anything can be indefinite given that-- PB also mentions that the cosmos is ordered and that-- a spaced and timed and an ordered universe is a numbered one, or the nature of that sentence. So what would we get (the Mind)?

AD: I don't know what you're talking about. I don't want to discourage you from asking your questions, but I want you to try to be a little more precise when you formulate a question. Yes?

S: Back to the sentence, "the rise, abiding, dissolution". He seems to be talking about karma, and with respect to karma there are two options, its rise, abiding, and dissolution-- and ideation. Now, he's not saying that these are the same thing.

AD: No, he called them twin functions. They're always simultaneously present.

S: It seems like the rise, abiding, and dissolution-- this seems to be the process of manifestation, rise, abiding, and dissolution. It seems to be the process of making an image, can we say? I'm trying to relate it to the image-making faculty he uses.

AD: I'm not trying to relate it to that, I'm trying to get to something else. And that was what we were talking about before, just before we got off the track. Do you mind if I return to this?

We were speaking of karma, and I like to also use the word "possibilities". Because it just becomes another pet word, "karma". If I use the word "power" you look at me askance. If I use the word "energy" you look at me peculiarly. I hate to depend on pet words all the time because I don't know if we're saying anything, if we're explaining anything.

You know how like a robot our mind is. I just gave you the example about that little chick who sees a hawk. Our thinking is the same way, soon as we hear a word we think in a certain way. So we have to try to find different words every now and then.

Now "karma" was a word that I suddenly say, let's think of possibilities, ok? Let's say the Overself has this in mind for you. This archetypal idea that the Overself has is going to be deployed and lived out through a hundred series of lives, so that it can achieve this idea.

I think somewhere in the *Spiritual Crisis* PB points out that there is a celestial idea which the Higher Self has that we have to reach out towards. Ok, so you're developing along a certain line to reach that point. Now wouldn't you say that this is the deployment of certain possibilities contained within the World-Mind?

S: Certainly the possibilities have to be principle of development.

AD: Now from our point of view it looks like development. Of course from the point of view of the other, it is completely actualized. There's no doubt. Can you see *karma* as that way?

S: As the actualization of possibility?

AD: Yes, can you see karma as that?

S: You mean the possibilities being the energy?

AD: No, the possibility that's going to be realized is going to employ as a means, this twin function, ideation and energy. Only you call it "karma". Go ahead.

S: Does that sort of imply that the World-Mind would have a purpose in manifesting a particular cosmos?

AD: No. Because if we say that this has a purpose, then what we're saying is that it's working towards it and that the simultaneous view of the *entire* manifestation isn't present to it at a single glance.

S: No but for *us* it's the divine purpose, it's the ultimate purpose. [AD: Well--] If we can get some idea of the possibilities of being which appear to *us*, (plus) it's a possibility that's being actualized in a sequence of [inaudible]. [AD: Yes.] That would be an ultimate purpose as far as we're concerned.

AD: As far as we're concerned, yes. Of course I know some people say that God needs us to get His purpose realized.

S: Then we'd really have-- that would be the only way we could really understand the nature of karma.

AD: Well, that's one way of understanding karma.

S: Because when you say the karma is the energy, it would seem that it would be more like the *pattern* of energy.

AD: Yes, the pattern, the power. It's a power which is operating in a certain way, and it's very closely associated with certain imagery.

Now suppose we get back to the other point that somebody had wanted to make about the characteristic, the prime characteristic of the World-Mind is its image-making activity. Now, would you like to tie in karma here? [S: Yes.] I must have had a very exceptional meditation tonight. Let's try this here, this paragraph.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 3 (AD reading)] "The cosmos, being a thought-formation, can never really disappear any more than a human idea..."

AD: Let's go down to the last sentence.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 3 (AD reading)] “And its own self...”

AD: Whose self?

S: World-Mind’s self.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 3 (AD reading)] “...as will be shown later, being uniquely eternal and undying, it is inevitable that the world-ideas which have arisen within it are eternal and undying too.”

AD: How about that sentence? Can we talk about that sentence a little bit?

S: What are the world-ideas?

AD: Well ask them, don’t ask me.

S: It sounds like the principles of various universes.

S: Ok, the ideas are eternal and undying. It can’t be the manifestations because they can go.

AD: Then we’ll wipe out the content. So what would be left?

S: Certainly we can’t equate Mind with ideas, the only thing that could be left would have to be eternal. Or the principle cannot dissolve.

AD: Good for a start [inaudible].

S: Can’t be the creatures either because they also come and go, right?

AD: Yes, but they’re content, like this body will be here and then you get another one, just like within this lifetime.

S: Yes, but is there an essence of each creature which is eternal and undying?

AD: Is there an essence to each creature which is eternal and undying?

S: Yes, because it seems that we have three orders that we could talk of here: we've got manifest things which obviously come and go, we've got creatures about which there's some question, and then we've got certain ideas which persist. What does he mean by the world-ideas which are uniquely eternal and undying? Does he mean only that third category of which I can only say I don't even know what it is?

AD: That sounds like a good start. [drawing] He says here we have manifested beings [diagram]. And like your body, my body. Then the next thing in the series rising up was what?

S: Say their essences, souls, I don't know how to--

AD: Anything you want to use.

S: Well just say something like that.

AD: Essences. [drawing]

S: Essences? The essence, yes, ok.

AD: Soul?

S: Soul. Yes, that's good. Whatever it is that reincarnates, that's kind of the sort of order of thing that--

AD: Whatever it is that reincarnates.

S: Yes, the order of thing I'm referring to.

AD: Oh good. What is it that reincarnates?

S: I don't know! But then there's a third category above that.

AD: See, he's using the word here quite different than the way PB uses it. For PB it's always in the singular, right? "Essence". Never uses "essences". He (doesn't) equate them-- you know, Westerners.

S: With the Platonists.

AD: Yes, ok? What makes a thing to be what it is?

S: It's like some [inaudible].

AD: What was the third thing?

S: There seems a higher category too.

S: Like the archetypal Ideas?

S: I don't know how to say it. I don't have a good word for it.

AD: You're very lucky, then you've got to make one up. Anybody?

S: I thought that the laws which govern the way the essence is manifested, aren't they higher or--

AD: The laws that govern the manifestation--

S: Of these essences.

AD: Want to use that?

S: Well principles like memory-- no, you're speaking of principles like memory--

AD: Well, look into your own self right now. You get rid of the body-idea. What's there behind it?

S: There's an "I", a soul--

AD: Yes, an "I", a soul. Now, what brings that "I" or soul into being?

S: How about the word "Essence," capitalized. Is that higher?

AD: What does that mean? [S: I don't know.] See because-- we're trying to understand this sentence.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 3 (AD reading)] “And its own self, as will be shown later, being uniquely eternal and undying, it is inevitable that the world-ideas which have arisen within it are eternal and undying too.”

AD: And so we’re falling back on the old law of correspondence “as above so below”. What applies to the microcosm applies to the macrocosm. So let’s try to work back that way. So we got to the soul. We got to the soul.

S: How about the laws that govern the manifestation of all these things, that’s [inaudible].

AD: Well that’s what he said.

S: Yes, that’s on the higher level. [S: That’s karma.] Well karma’s just one of them.

S: That’s why there’s a thing above that line. How about the celestial idea of this “I” or soul that you spoke of before?
[break in audio]

AD: Would this help? Instead of using this word “soul” which might frighten some of us, suppose we use the word “ego” or “psyche” or something like that, so that we feel more familiar with it. Now, what structures that?

S: Karmic tendencies.

S: Samskaras.

AD: Yes, karmic tendencies. Samskaras, tendencies. Well, it seems that we’re talking about some pretty abstract things, aren’t we?

S: Yes [inaudible] the intelligible laws governing the manifestation of the universe.

AD: Oh, intelligible law [inaudible] Laws. [drawing] I don’t know if this’ll do it, we’re getting a lot of air. [S: Yes we are.] Governing the manifestation. [drawing]

S: Yes, but what does that mean?

S: What do you think, are you equating ego with--

AD: Well, that's what we're going to find out. She said it, you ask her.

S: How about an example of one of them?

S: Tony, did you say ego is the essences of the soul?

AD: Yes, I'm equating that, sure. Yes, I don't think of the soul as fondly as you do.

S: What are the intelligible laws governing the manifestation of the universe, what does that mean?

S: One thing, they have to regulate the way that the ego is structured through its experience.

AD: What would be a primary law then-- one or two primary laws that govern the manifestation of this ego?

S: Anything manifested and can't do-- something in time and space is not really manifested.

AD: Well didn't you say karma before? [S: Yes.] All right, karma. Karma? [drawing]

S: Memory?

S: How about time?

AD: We left that down here [diagram] somewhere. [S: Call it karma.] Karma? You say karma? Now in what way would karma be an intelligible law that governs manifestation? Let's try to be a little more-- Here's an ego coming into birth, and then into manifestation [diagram].

S: Continuity of it? [AD: The continuity?] Would be the first part of the law and the second part is the responsibility that's come in on every ego [inaudible]?

S: The consciousness.

AD: So, you're speaking about the two laws of karma. Aren't you? [S: The self-consciousness.] You remember the two laws of karma? On the next page I think he has them somewhere. The general and special law.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 15 (S reading)] “Karma is a twofold law, one being general and the other special. The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity’s own continuity.”

AD: Now, repeat that *slowly*. [quote reread] And the second one?

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 15 (S reading)] “The second is immediate, and applicable only to individuals who have attained self- consciousness, thus limiting the start of its operations to human entities. This makes the individual accountable for thoughts and for the deeds born of his thoughts.”

AD: Now, how about that, would you say that that’s required in order for this [diagram] to operate? So we’ve got (this--)

S: It’s one of the conditions for these to operate, yes.

AD: So, any others? Yes?

S: There are two important things in that special law: one is self-consciousness and the other is the accountability that comes from when individual has reached that--

AD: Isn’t that the definition of ego? [S: Self-consciousness?] Sure, what separates you from the animal?

S: Ok, put the (law).

AD: Well, just imagine it’s there. Got no room for it.

S: What about the categories, like similar and dissimilar?

S: When you say the continuity of something, what maintains the continuity of something? It’s not just a principle that is going to maintain the operation of this possibility, just like PB says (through)-- There’s something which indicates the initiation of this possibility, so which will bring this essence into existence.

AD: Now, wait a minute. Read that part first, the first part of the notion of karma.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 15 (S reading)] “The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity’s own continuity.”

AD: Now what were you saying?

S: When we say an individual entity's continuity, in a being's maintaining itself, I see principles memory involved. In order to perpetuate a similar [AD: Yes.] existence, memory is essential.

AD: Yes, I'll agree with that, but I didn't follow the point you were getting at.

S: I'm just saying that karma, there's a multiplicity of laws in that term then.

AD: Oh sure! That's a fantastic word, "karma". That word is so loaded. I'm telling you, you can play-- any game you want. Suppose we think about memory for a minute. Can't you see that memory is a special application of this law?

S: It's the kinetic aspect.

AD: You want to get that quotation from *The Wisdom*, the kinetic--

S: The one about karma being the kinetic memory?

AD: Yes, read that out loud.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 29 (S reading)] "...karma, being the kinetic memory of Nature, is necessarily coupled with the imaginative power of Nature."

AD: Stop there. Say it about a half a dozen times. Because I don't trust you people, you don't read these books. I don't know what you do. It must be that that education that you've got is the same thing, like the hawk. Read it again.

S: Do you want the sentence before that too?

AD: No, just this sentence.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 29 (S reading)] "...karma, being the kinetic memory of Nature, is necessarily..." [break in audio]

AD: This is an archetype. In what way is it an archetype? Well we can apply it to the function of memory, we can apply it to almost every and any incident, so to speak, of the manifested universe. In that sense, you mean?

S: No. Yes that would (correspond), it doesn't--

AD: Well this is an archetype, for instance. Here's Nature [diagram]. Nature has a memory of everything that's gone on in its domain. You're a human being. You have a memory of everything that's gone on in your life. You don't have a memory of everything that's gone on in the universe but certainly you have, as far as you're concerned, what's gone on in you. Now, that law is archetypal, it applies at all these different realms. In that sense? [S: Yes.] Yes, sure, you can use it in that sense. [break in audio]

S: Using karma as an archetype, as one of the intelligible laws governing manifestation, then all sense- knowledge would be considered as a particularization within that. It would be included within karma.

AD: I don't know what you mean.

S: Well, like in this paragraph, "Karma..." [break in audio]

AD: Just read the next part.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 15 (S reading)] "...and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity's own continuity."

AD: Now what does that mean?

S: That given any particular manifestation, any unfoldment of possibilities within mind on--

AD: Read the second part of that again. Read it out loud.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 15 (S reading)] "Whether... The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity's own continuity."

AD: Individual--

S: "...entity's own continuity." Now, it would seem--

AD: That's ultimate now. Now what would that be?

S: It seems to me that the answer to that's in the first part where he says-- What did he say? What's the very first part of that?

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 15 (S reading)] "The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe"?

AD: Yes, now what does that mean?

S: It would seem that continuity there refers to the individual's almost placement in the universe. The continuity is continuity of every individual piece fitting into the whole.

AD: Read that again. Try, you try, will you? Now, this is a point of such profound importance that I will not answer it. Yes, go ahead, read it.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 15 (S reading)] "Karma is a twofold law, one being general and the other special. The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity's own continuity."

AD: Stop there. What happens to words like "self-realization," "enlightenment," "illumination," "moksha," "liberation"?

[AD claps and says the following very intensely] Come on, what?!? For three years you're obsessed with liberation, what does that mean? *Who* could get liberated!? *How* could you get liberated!? Liberated from *what*!? From your own continuity!? Did you ever hear a Sage saying, "I'm liberated"? Did you ever *read* it anywhere? Boy! I'm glad I'm going to work tonight. You sit down, and you pray, and you meditate. For what? Read that again. You want to try? Yes?

S: I wanted to ask a question. When we say that the karma is sort of like the archetype, it seems to me that doesn't jive with the way I conceive it. In each individual's own continuity, perhaps the individual passing through a series of archetypes, rather-- and that is the law which governs that passing through rather than-- or of being those archetypes themselves.

AD: No, it was just referring to karma as-- we can employ it archetypally when we're thinking about the functioning of an individual, a cosmos, a planet. So as soon as we say that this planet has a certain karma, we're thinking archetypally. Actually what we're referring to is the possibilities inherent in its manifestation back and forth, and I'm just trying to get away from that stinking word "karma".

Now you try reading that paragraph, you read that sentence. If you take it home and you read it twenty times you'll understand because that's what you're here for. Yes read it out loud, would you? Read that law. Read it as though you all have septiles.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 15 (S reading)] “Karma is a twofold law, one being general and the other special. The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity’s own continuity.” [break in audio]

AD: Read the second part, go ahead.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 15 (S reading)] “The second is immediate, and applicable only to individuals who have attained self-consciousness, thus limiting the start of its operations to human entities. This makes the individual accountable for thoughts and for the deeds born of his thoughts.”

AD: Now, you’ve heard it said by someone, I think PB mentions it somewhere and others have mentioned it, that when a person gets “enlightened”, quote unquote, that all his past “sins”, quote unquote, are forgiven him, quote, ok?

S: What an example. [laughter]

AD: So we got rid of the second part of that sentence. Let’s go back to the first part now. Now what does that first part mean?

S: The word “continuity” seems to imply something which is other than the individual, something which is a part of the individual and a part of *every* individual piece and therefore makes every entity attached to every other entity.

AD: No, that’s not the point. You’ve got to see that what’s here is the eternal bedrock of your being. Yes?

S: It seems to me that karma is that which governs the becoming aspect of [inaudible] rather (than) the Being aspect would be in this.

AD: Which is really beyond Being. We’ll put that-- we’ll throw that in for-- Say that again.

S: It would seem to me that karma governs the becoming aspect, the continuity of that becoming, but I don’t know.

S: But that becoming could never cease.

AD: Becoming could never cease.

S: He says on the page before that--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 10 (S reading)] “...that the process of ever-becoming is an eternal one and is the very law of the universe’s own being.”

AD: Yes.

S: I always equated that with the general karma statement, that the general law of karma was this law of ever-becoming.

AD: Yes. And within it is the special law. Because within total equilibrium you could have elements of disorder, so to speak, which are part of that equilibrium. Let’s try slowly to go over this. Yes?

S: What in this [inaudible]?

AD: What do we come back to, is that what you’re asking me?

S: And do we come back.

AD: That’s what we’re coming back to, isn’t it? Now--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (AD reading)] “For being a vast thought and not a vast thing, it is brought into being by the World-Mind out of *itself*, out of its own mental “substance”, and not out of any extraneous stuff such as matter is supposed to be by materialists...”

AD: Now we pick up that sentence again. Now let’s see if we can see a little more into it.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (AD reading)] “For being a vast thought and not a vast thing, it is brought into being...”

AD: “*Brought into being*”, remember that. Evidently we’ve got something big here.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (AD reading)] “...out of *itself*...”

AD: Evidently World-Mind here is the principle of being.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, “The Birth of the Universe”, par. 2 (AD reading)] “...out of its own mental ‘substance’ ...”

AD: And again we're faced with that. Read that second part on karma.

S: General or the special?

AD: The general.

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 15 (S reading)] "The first is ultimate, and applicable to everything in the universe for it is simply the law of every individual entity's own continuity."

AD: Own continuity, yes.

S: Would this be what Wang Yang-ming calls the principle of Nature?

AD: Yes but in a very peculiar sense. In Chinese we have to really steer right off of this.

S: So the law of every individual's *own* continuity lies outside of becoming, so that when we sit down and meditate and we're trying to get rid of the karma that applies to becoming but we don't sit down thinking that we're going to destroy the order of the universe. Is this what you were trying to get at before?

AD: Yes, I'm trying to get you to be very realistic about this whole path, this whole quest. Because you know that instinct that a lot of people have, union with the Divine, "Why, I get swallowed up, I disappear. Boom! everything's gone." Like God is some powerful devouring Deity that gobbles up all his devotees. You want to say?

S: So, is the general law-- I've just got a chart, is that the prarabdha karma, and that's the karma that remains for the Sage?

AD: The general law?

S: The general law of the continuity of each individual is the karma that remains for the Sage too, it's the prarabdha karma, (isn't it)?

AD: Well, let's look at it this way. Suppose you become a Sage. You achieve, without the use of any means, liberation-- direct contact, no intermediaries. Does this mean that you disappear, that you annihilate, that you're dissolved? What happens? I mean do you go on, does the continuity go on?

S: It's that you are more able to fulfill that continuity. [AD: Yes.] Able to be it, bring it from Being into your life.

AD: Do you understand what the Zen Masters are saying when they say, “There’s no sense in putting a head on top of the one you already have”?

S: There’s no sense in putting a head on top of the one you already have?

AD: Yes, why wear another one?

S: What about that second law, does that still operate in the same way or is that--

AD: PB I think makes a reference to that, doesn’t he? He says the adept is forgiven all his past sins, all his past karma.

S: Yes, but that second law still has to operate for him or else he’d never be able to help us, how else-- unless he could-- his thoughts could operate causally. But he operates transcending it rather than getting all caught up in it the way we do.

AD: I lost you at the beginning--

S: But how else could he help us unless his thoughts were creative and causal?

S: He could also get his hand caught in the door.

AD: I’m sorry, I don’t follow the point. [laughter]

S: [amidst laughter] The proverb is like everyday life still operates.

S: Yes but the point of that second law is that he’s *accountable* for his thoughts, not that they’re creative.

S: How else can he be accountable [AD: I don’t follow you.] if they’re never creative?

S: It’s the body that’s the same.

AD: Say it again.

S: They still could create a special karma which has the result-- accidentally do something which might have-- drop a knife on his hand, is that what you’re saying? [AD: Yes.] That’s all I meant. The special karma still operates.

S: That would be general karma. A tree can get chopped down too (then).

S: This second law just says he's accountable for thoughts and for deeds part of those thoughts.

S: Accountable to deeds, right, he drops a knife by accident, and he cuts himself.

S: Every human being.

AD: Well-- yes, let's think this one out. Go ahead.

S: The first is the law of each individual's own continuity. Now, individual. They mean like law-- so this just seems to be the thing here, for me anyway. What is this individual of the individuality that is continuing-- or on what level the body is born so it eventually dies. You know what I mean?

AD: You're trying to get a definition of individuality?

S: Yes, something like that-- that's for instance [inaudible].

AD: Well that's legitimate, sure. Shall we answer that or continue with you?

S: All I would want to say is that it seems the Sage could still make petty little mistakes. He may not make big mistakes, and it seems the petty little mistake probably gets answered right away. He doesn't wait ten years.

S: He doesn't make them, they're not a part of his (habit).

S: He's really liberated, and he no longer acts on behalf of himself-- in the sense that most of us are accountable for all our actions, he's not accountable for any actions done on behalf of himself. Is there a sense in which he still can say that he's accountable for his actions?

S: What I don't understand when you talk about a Sage you say "he". [break in audio]

AD: --don't run away from that. I don't want to run away from that, but I do want to answer that before we go to the notion of individuality.

S: It seemed to be implying though, you have to have an individual if you're going to have special karma. So what are you talking about when you say a Sage as a [inaudible]?

AD: Yes. I know what you're trying to get at.

S: Yes, you can't really understand that word "accountable" unless you answer that also.

S: That's [inaudible] meaning there.

S: But we're interpreting it as if it's a sort of punishment rather than something that has to do with that individual entity.

AD: So then, why don't we stick to his question? Could you repeat it? The statement really, not a question.

S: Just pointing certain things out. Another, for example, is the story told of Pythagoras that he spoke roughly to a disciple and the disciple committed suicide, so from that point on Pythagoras knew not to speak roughly to disciples.

AD: Well, let's get the question, the statement.

S: My question is, what does it mean to say that an individual is accountable for his own actions, and does that have meaning in the case of the Sage?

AD: Ok, let's try.

S: Being a self-conscious entity he knows what he's doing, and it would seem to me that it would apply to any self-conscious entity, that being a human being. So in this creative act you're held responsible for things that you have been doing. In other words, an animal or something like that has no idea of this, he just goes through. But a self-conscious entity would. He's responsible because he knows what he's doing.

S: I remember the story of Bhagavan when he steps into the bee's hive and (says something), and (the boss) was there when they all start biting his leg, he says, "Well serves the leg right. What goes--" [laughter] He went and ruined these peoples' homes, is his psychology. In other words, there was a karma there, like the leg did perform an accident and sort of-- but Ramana was not identifying with the leg and he saw the justice of what was happening, the leg deserved to be punished for its [inaudible].

S: But is that an example of [inaudible] special or the general?

AD: So we've got an--

S: There was special karma operating as far as the leg was concerned. As far as his body wants this--

S: Didn't he also speak of taking up the karma of his disciples and that's sort of what crystallized that cancer that he got?

AD: Bhagavan? I never heard him say that.

S: Didn't he talk someplace in Osborne's biography about him taking up the karma of his disciples?

S: I remember that somebody said that that was why he got it [inaudible].

S: Tony, remember the story of the Zen master who was turned into a fox because the disciple asked him-- [AD: The difference.] he said if the Sage felt the law of karma and he said "Yes," and he kept coming back [inaudible].

AD: He had to keep coming back as a fox because he misrepresented the law of karma. Got to be careful.

S: And the fox incarnation-- he was reincarnated a thousand times or something and then another Zen master was having a class in the woods and he would notice an old man would come to him and he told him the story of how he had been turned into a fox. Anyway the Zen master (experienced) with the question [inaudible] karmic law.

S: That he didn't obscure it.

AD: He did not *obscure* the law of karma. Yes.

S: So would that imply that someone who was not a Sage is in the process of obscuring karma?

AD: Well, what do you do?

S: What do I do? The best I can. [laughter]

AD: [amidst laughter] No. I mean when you're operating, how you operated, isn't it from the basis always of the *doership*? [S: Yes.] You ever see a Sage operate like that, *doership*, "I'm doing this"?

S: Or else having a question of will.

S: There's no "I" doing anything, there's no--

S: The special law, isn't that obscuring?

AD: What? [S: There's no "I".] Wait, wait, go ahead.

S: Insofar as we will, then we receive the consequences, like a [inaudible] of the will. We've discussed this before, a Sage wills, but the will is always in accord with universal law. So the recoil has to be that which the universe of-- which has born him anyway, which is probably [inaudible]. So in a sense viewing him as an individual I suppose you would say that the law is still operating. But insofar as his will is in absolute agreement with the universal will, then it's probably meaningless to speak of individual consequences for his actions.

S: He would have no will to coincide with the universal will. He just doesn't obscure karma, so therefore it appears that he has a will that's [inaudible].

S: There is no universal will, his will is the universal will. But it sounds like he doesn't contradict special [inaudible] as far as-- the World-Mind has no reason to be.

AD: Isn't his will identified with the Self?

S: He is the *agency* for the expression of universal will [inaudible] otherwise--

AD: Yes, isn't his will identified with the Self?

S: Yes, it's what I mean.

AD: Now, the Self that we were talking about, the individual Self that you were referring to-- let me ask you-- what about your individual Self, could you point it out to me?

S: I could point to the body but now that's not really it.

AD: Is that the individual Self?

S: I don't think that's the [inaudible].

AD: You have to point out to every instant in time to show me the individual Self.

S: Are you talking about self with a capital "S" or a little "s"?

AD: Yes, I'm talking about the Self.

S: If it's capital "S" I surely can't locate it in time and space and say, "Here it is".

AD: Well, let me ask you this then. When you refer to yourself, what self are you referring to? Are you referring to the empirical psychological ego?

S: Most of the time, yes, most of the time [inaudible].

AD: Now if you're referring to the empirical psychological ego, we'll have to fall back either on the physical body, the mental, or the emotional, right? Now, these things have no consciousness.

S: The consciousness-- they're sort of illuminated by a consciousness above or below (this).

AD: Well then who is this Self you're talking about? Is it the thoughts, is it the emotion, is it the body?

S: That's the question I try to answer when I'm saying, "Who am I?" And I can't. Can't seem I really answered it.

AD: Now, you have a Self and I have a Self. Ok?

S: We're not using "self" in the sense that--

AD: With a capital "S", with a capital "S"!

S: Not like Jung uses it but say like Bhagavan uses it, the Self--

AD: Yes, like Bhagavan uses it. You have a Self, right? I mean otherwise, this whole panorama, thoughts, emotions, feelings are absolutely meaningless. In themselves they're dead. There's nothing there. You can't say of a thought that it's self-conscious. Now, your Self and my Self-- they're the same?

S: Maybe we're trying to [inaudible]--

AD: They're different?

S: --but I certainly don't feel like that.

AD: Come on, you were so fond of Mookerji. He was talking about this Self of knowledge. Are you going to try applying some categories to that Self? What this individual you're talking about?

S: That's the question.

S: He's asking you.

AD: What individual is he talking about? Now look--

S: Is this the one that has the continuity that we're talking about? Is this the one that reincarnates [inaudible] and reborn?

S: Did you just disappear right out of the world? [several students talking at once]

AD: I'm sorry, well I can't hear five at a time. Yes?

S: You walk right out of this world. [laughter] The Self of Bhagavan isn't subject to continuity and change. We're not speaking in the same world anymore.

AD: Well start again.

S: That the Self, in the sense of Bhagavan, cannot at all be subject to any laws. It's the ground. [break in audio]

AD: The Self is not subject to any laws. It is the ground for these laws.

S: Yes, and so-- you're running [inaudible] (around me).

AD: And then what about this idea over here--

PB [*The Wisdom of the Overself*, "The Birth of the Universe", par. 3 (AD reading)] "And its own self, as will be shown later, being uniquely eternal and undying, it is inevitable that the world-ideas which have arisen within it are eternal and undying, too."

AD: What about that? But you just said I walked out of the world.

S: No. I can't (handle everything).

S: Would you say something like what the self, small “s” or capital-- “S” doesn’t really matter because all the attributes we normally attribute to small “s” are really attributes we should be giving to something else, but it’s not the Self, it’s what we call the ego. Maybe that’s what PB means by self-consciousness here.

S: I lost the question (right there).

AD: You lost the question?

S: Are you trying to say what is the Self-- but it seems to me that the Self is kind of another one of these attribute-less sort of absolute kind of things that [inaudible]-- that you realize but you can’t really talk about, I mean your aim to realize but you can’t really speak (about it).

AD: But in order for this Self to manifest, it has to manifest through certain laws.

S: It manifests itself through a personal--

AD: Now, are these laws disjunct?

S: No, nothing would make sense then, there’s the continuity coming [inaudible]. [AD: Yes.] The continuity of my own existence from lifetime to lifetime, when I go to sleep, when I get up. [AD: Yes. Go on.] I don’t know where to go.

S: Tony? [AD: Yes?] When you talk about individuality, seems that-- [break in audio]

AD: -- we have to bring in something about this notion of individuality because certainly we all claim to have it, even when we get rid of the whole empirical organism, which is basically-- Yes?

S: When he talks about the world-ideas and the self is one of them. Is that the point you’re trying to make? And the Sage is then an incarnation of a world-idea, divine idea.

S: But so that you are though, why aren’t you just as equally as much an incarnation of the world-idea?

AD: Well, let me try to put it to you this way. The example we used before about imagining the pinhead and the city. The total act of the mind is required in both of them. Now, the idea that has to somehow be communicated here is that you are *totally* involved in that pinhead, you are *totally* involved in that city, and you are totally involved in anything else that the mind imagines.

Now I *too* imagine the pinhead and the city, and the *total* mind is involved in that act *and* in the other act and in the other act, and yet we can speak about your mind being utterly distinct from my mind. How could that be? How could a totality of the mind operate in you and the *totality* of the mind operate in me?

S: Then how could you say that they're distinct?

AD: Isn't it a kind of Aristotelian bias to say that "A" can only be "A" and not "B"?

S: It certainly seems like you're pushing it up against that.

S: Those laws-- with the archetypes, could individuality be an archetype? [AD: Yes.] That would explain how it could--

AD: Well if you do say it's an archetype, would it help you to try to understand what we're faced with here? Basically we're faced with the meaning of substance. Aren't we? Aren't we faced here with the meaning of substance?

[passionately:] When I say the substance of my mind is involved in this creation of a pinhead, the substance, the *totality* of my mind is involved in the creation of the city I imagine, what does substance mean now?

S: Are you saying that the question of substance is basically the same as the question of Self?

S: Because it's that to which it is revealed, that's--

AD: All right.

S: Somehow it's the static part of the relation.

AD: All our categories are quite inadequate here and at the very most I've got to do like they do in Japan and China, you know, the language has no syntax, you've got to learn to *see the meaning* even though it's not there, and on top of that I have Chinese importations, well-- Not all languages are built like ours. For instance, in Hinduism, it isn't that you get old, but *you go to old-ness*. Is that right-- [S: That seems to be right.] Oh, the Hindus.

S: I missed the connection.

AD: Well the connection I'm trying to make here is the same diversity that you will find in all these languages, like the way the Japanese speak, and the way is spoken Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek, and you will see that there are a half a dozen different approaches. In Sanskrit they do not say, "I am getting old." They say, "*I am going towards old-ness.*" Now notice the entirely different approach here.

S: Subjectivity's (rooted to the) tradition rather than to the person.

AD: You see? Would you like to undertake a really interesting study? See the way different people think in different cultures and your hair will stand on your head and you will come over and say to me, "My mind, the totality of my mind, is in the creation of that pinhead. And the totality is also beyond that creation." I'm just trying to worm into that meaning of substance. Yes?

S: PB talks about the individual as being a diffraction of the World-Mind, of being diffracted into millions of individual entities, and so from that it would follow that if World-Mind would be the substance of the individual, in other words--

AD: Yes, and the only thing we have to keep in mind, of course, is that the individual never transcends that relationship, nor does he ever have or express the power that's inherent in the World-Mind.

S: Yes, and it's just that this beginningless series from time immemorial in the past-- ad infinitum, just continues on, but that individual's always--

AD: I have to end now but-- I know it seems like a waste of time but if you get one thing out of tonight, ask yourself questions like "What is self-realization?" See if it *means* anything in the face of these kind of laws you're trying to understand. "Liberation," "illumination," "moksha," ok? Any word you want to use. See what kind of meaning you can come up with.

S: That's not easy.

AD: Yes.

S: I get the impression that the self -- or individuality is just something which takes some set of tendencies, emotions, feelings, the body, whatever, and says "mine, they're mine." And that this individual self, as it were, is creating this second law of karma because he's just saying that the things that happen to him, he's saying, "They're happening to me."

If there wasn't this thing that called feelings, thoughts, etc. "mine", then there really isn't any special law of karma operating, at least-- it's only other people who are going to say "him", but-- there's just nothing that takes this set of thoughts and that and says "mine" to them if--

AD: You know how big that word "mine" is? Did you ever stop to think about it?

S: Well yes, it's what's involved in this whole class, just figuring out what "mine" is.

AD: M-i-n-e? Mine-ness? [S: Yes, m-i-n-e.] You get rid of that, it might be quite a surprise because that's all they're trying to do is to get rid of this notion of doership, of mine-ness.

S: That's what I'm saying, but I'm saying that if you got rid of it, I don't see how there's any special law of karma operating because there isn't anyone to say--

AD: There wouldn't be anyone to say there "It was me."

S: But is that true?

AD: Well, isn't that what was pointed out when-- [S: Yes with the leg.] when he stepped in there it-- No?

S: Are we trying to say that a Sage is not subject to the special law of karma?

AD: Do you think so?

S: I can see that it would operate, I could see that it's almost--

AD: Would that be the special law of karma if he puts his [hand] accidentally in a doorway and gets it smashed? Would that be a special law?

S: What I'm trying to say is that it seems to [inaudible].

AD: Please answer the question.

S: Ok, start over. Ask it?

AD: He puts his finger in the doorway, it gets smashed. Is this a special law of karma? [S: Yes.] It is?

S: Isn't it?

AD: Ok. Class is over. What do you think?

S: It isn't happening to him. Nothing's happening to him.

AD: Nothing happened to him, there's no "him" there. [break in audio] I keep turning.

S [in background]: I don't know what's going on.

THE END