

1970s-Lecture-in-Los-Angeles-commercial-recording

[Return to list of all Recordings](#) [See all Categories](#) [Spreadsheet: Recordings-Source-List](#)

Metadata repository: <https://data.direct-mind.org/>

Contents

- 1 To check
- 2 Notes
- 3 CD Cover
- 4 Youtube
- 5 Transcription
 - 5.1 CD1 track 1 Intro
 - 5.2 CD1 track 1 Lecture
 - 5.3 CD1 track 2
 - 5.4 CD2 track 1
 - 5.5 CD2 track 2
- 6 Footnotes
- 7 End

To check

Need to compare with other Los Angeles lectures and identify which this is.

Notes

Description from Rose Publications

Los Angeles, 2nd Edition

Lecture by Richard Rose

Lecture Series Single CD

The second edition of “Los Angeles” lecture CD has been greatly improved using the latest in digital audio editing. The lecture was originally presented to students and newcomers around the mid to late 1970’s where Rose addressed such topics as the interior and exterior mind, political correctness as an obstacle to enlightenment, the pitfalls of psychology and psychiatry, a definition of wisdom: foolishness or a Real perspective? CD also includes a question and answer session.

CD Cover

Available from Richard Rose Teachings: <https://richardroseteachings.com/audio-video/>



Youtube

The CD was posted to Youtube. See : [Los-Angeles-lecture-series-CD-on-Youtube](#)

Transcription

CD1 track 1 Intro

Time 31:19 including Introduction (min)

Introduction: cd1-1-00:07

Good afternoon. I'd like to say a few words about the organization that brings Mr. Rose in here, and a few words about Mr. Rose himself. This organization is called the Philosopher Stone, and it's been around the area here for I would say about three years. And it was founded by a number of people, about three people who came from Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania area, who had gotten together as a result, as a direct result of having run across Mr. Rose by one way or another. And the philosopher Stone meets here in Los Angeles, actually in Culver City on a weekly basis, but the public meetings are now to be about every two weeks or so. But the way to find out when the meetings are is to call either the numbers that you see on the poster and I think we have some extra posters that we can hand out afterwards. We also have a information sheet on the philosopher stone, which will give you more detail on the organization. We will also have two more lectures and one will be this Tuesday and that will be at the new, what is that bookstore? David?

Speaker 2 cd1-1-01:37

Chelsea,

Introduction cd1-1-01:38

Chelsea bookstore in Long Beach on Thursday the 22nd, which will be at the United California Bank, the Brentwood branch. About five, six years ago, I had done a little bit of reading into the subject of Zen and Eastern philosophy and it sparked my interest, but I hadn't done anything about it for about a year. And finally I saw a little handwritten notice at a university, university of Pittsburgh back east, and I didn't know what to make of it, but some little boys kept hounding me and say, you better go to that. You ought to go to there. There's

something very important going to happen as a result of going there. So I went and I walked into the room and there was about 20 people seated around the room and they didn't seem to be doing anything much except talking among themselves, and they're apparently waiting for somebody.

cd1-1-02:44

About 20 minutes later, the door flies open, there's this Russian looking guy walks in and right behind him is this short fellow he is got a little beard on and he doesn't have much hair on top of his head, but there was something just like a jolt of electricity went through the room at that time and everyone just hushed up. And this was Mr. Rose. And I said, okay. But the first thing he did is he asked people to just say a little bit about themselves, what they'd been into, what they'd been reading, that sort of thing. And we went around the room one by one and the first one would say, oh, I've been reading a little bit of cap, and another one's been reading some of the Christian mystics, et cetera. Anyway, we went around the room and not much was said by Mr. Rose, but then he pointed to the first guy and he said, well, you've been reading this, but actually one of the reasons you're reading this is such and such. And he went around the room and he not only remembered, this was very impressionable to me because he remembered what each individual had said, but most importantly, he heard what they were saying behind the words. It wasn't the words he was saying, it was what each individual was saying right here.

cd1-1-04:14

This was astounding to me and this is actually the way we ought to approach what he's going to talk about today. Don't listen so much to the words, but listen, what's coming from what's behind the words? He's been on a long path himself. He's been in this field for a long time. He started, well, it depends when you want to say he started at age 12 when he went into a Catholic seminary, or you might say he started when he was 21 when he started doing yoga. Who's to say when it all started? He might've started before he was born, but he reached a point of conviction as a result of his years of effort, and it's this conviction that he brings here.

cd1-1-05:10

He's fulfilling a promise to himself. That's his purpose for coming here. And the promise is to maybe just impart a little bit of what he has found simply because there's so many groups and so many different people speaking so many different words. He is not promoting a theory or a social outlook or a particular kind of politics, but a kind of a conviction at this point. I'd like to give you a little bit of a warning. He's a man of conviction and this oftentimes arouses a strong response, either positive or negative. I encourage you all to listen carefully for what's behind the words. And finally, I'd like to thank the new age bookstore for providing the facilities and allowing us to meet here today. I give you Mr. Rose.

CD1 track 1 Lecture

Rose: cd1-1-06:28

Well, the thing is, anytime you communicate with a group of people, and of course quite a few of you, most of you're new to me, never met before and beyond a shadow of a doubt. Everybody comes in from a different perspective and I've given quite a few talks around over the country and came away after each one of the talks of the feeling that I only communicate with a fraction of the people because of language. Everyone talks a different language. So I've always been laboriously looking for some way to get around this difference in language. And so I like to, what I do is no point in friends. You can take a system. I have a system of thinking on psychology, which I'm very happy to share. I'm very happy to go to whatever strain is necessary to communicate it to you. It's the general diagram that's on that board there.

cd1-1-07:37

I wrote it, drew it on there so you can look at your leisure. But I also talked about this the other night, the little group, and I again came away with the feeling that unless someone had done similar thinking, similar reading, intense desire to understand psychology, not in the way it's written by what the so-called authorities, authorities or generally political and source that, I mean we have a political, psychological atmosphere. Our sociology is political. In other words, politics determines funding sometimes even determines. And when it gets down into what I consider the more sacred sciences, psychology is one of them. It's the mind. This is the sacred territory. We don't need the politics with its pressure funding pressures to call the shots. We're interested, I hope, in what the mind is and not what we should vote it to be by a democratic agreement.

cd1-1-08:48

So the thing is I've discovered is that if I were to take you through to explain me, my conviction, my findings, it is perhaps a rather complex thing which would take many, many hours of bringing our heads together. Number one, because we've got a different interpretation of the word sanity, for instance, sanity is a very loose word, which I've talked to a lot of psychiatrists never found a single one that had defined it yet he was shooting people with hypodermics and feeding them pills to get predictable results he thought on the surface. But what were the results under the surface or later on? But anyhow, what I'm getting back to is that I prefer a sort of dialogue because in a dialogue or a situation where you can talk or you can ask questions, then I get an idea where you're coming from. I'll possibly intuit a language or choice of words, reference points if possible that I can communicate with you. But for a man to get up in front of another group of people and preach, this can be monotonous and irritating as hell, but yet talk is necessary. And what we're dealing with here is perspectives, and I made a few notes on them on this business of perspectives and the hope of trying to find some, well because of the knowledge of the difference in perspectives, possibly find a way of coming together in a single perspective for a half hour, an hour or so.

cd1-1-10:43

I have some questions in regard to that. I put 'em in a question form because I'm not saying this is necessarily, it is bad when you say something definitely is in all instances because in subjective matters, especially another somebody else's opinion might get to the same point. Even though it seems to be diametrically opposite, you may ultimately come to the same point of thinking what liabilities are incurred with unavoidable states of mind? We all come here with a state of mind. You're not going to change it in five minutes. Our perspectives rooted in valid basis and definitions or in undefinable feelings which may be as meaningful as definitions. In other words, our perspectives, all of us are old enough here to have had some philosophy or developed a philosophy of life and we like to think that this is highly logical. Then you run into another fellow who has perspective or a conviction and he does it strictly from feeling and it isn't logical. He doesn't make any pretense logic, and after you suffer fellow, if you don't agree with him mean you might suffer a while. You find out that you agree with him or that you're talking the same language. I've had this happen repeatedly. And then you take this angle, what is meaning? What are these things? When we talk say about the mind, what are we talking about?

cd1-1-12:14

Everybody has a slightly different understanding and there are different understandings for the mind, and I think some of 'em are valid. I see two to three definite minds. And so when one person's using the word mind, he might be referring to Mary Baker Eddie's universal mind. Another might be referring to the objective psychologist, somatic mind. Same thing with our appreciation of things like colors or pleasure. What do you mean by high? What do you mean by green? Do we all know that people see the same color green? Only thing is we know that we all respond pretty much. But what does the fellow actually see when he sees green? Well, why do some perfumes? They have a perfume they seem to attract. Some of them irritate people and a lot of them irritate you after you've been exposed to 'em for a while. What is beauty? Everybody's talking about the ideal parts of life, deal, aspects of life, the nice things that everybody's going to get for themselves and for their

neighbor. What is beauty? I used to say it's a degree of refraction by which light comes to the eyes looking at the outside of the skin. It looks pretty good, but you peel it off and look at it from underneath. It might not be so good. See, what is goodness is goodness recognized by the cat the same as goodness recognized by the mouse.

cd1-1-13:49

How do perspectives affect science? I see this in science. We're supposed to be perfect. People come in with a different perspective on the same day on television, radio, rather, I heard a man say that our temperature was changing, that these were going to become an iceberg positive. I don't know why I need to go into the details. If we had four consecutive cold winters, we'd have a ice age of some sort and maybe the earth was swinging away from the sun or something was happening and other fall says, well, were the ice caps going to melt? And in so many years, the shores of New England, unless they stopped this smog and air pollution, Atlantic city will be underwater. The coastal Piedmont plateaus will be flooded and everything because, so these are perspectives in science by people who spend their internal lives studying meteorology or something. We go a little bit beyond that and say, what is wisdom in other? We presume that's what we're trying to do in this bit work is to get the best answer and is wisdom of foolishness. A lot of people, after living 60 or 70 years say everything's foolishness.

cd1-1-15:08

Your perspective changes. And instead of the wisdom of the 20-year-old boy becomes idiocy to a 70 or 80-year-old man, is it a wasted achievement unless it is restricted to objective or material values? In other words, we define our wisdom in terms of possibly some people do in case how many millions it'll make you. And the idiot is the guy that winds up with Nichols or is wisdom a man who gets along with these fellow men? See, some think that's wisdom, form of wisdom. Now we get this thing of authority. We talk about perspectives from authority. A man quotes, he says, he'll throw something out at you and they'll say, well, this is what they say. They and everyone shutters and remains silent. Now, when you get into psychology, I've got a dual path here that I'm talking about. As you'll notice there that diagram up at the top of it is the word absolute. And down at the bottom we have simple psychology, and I maintain that you can attain or reach an absolute objective by beginning with a simple analysis of a somatic self. So now, I was talking to one of the fellows here last night and he said, well, yeah, I saw that diagram and he says, I can't see where the thing is there. You got intuition and on up. It seems even harder to understand something about unmanifested in mind and

cd1-1-16:42

Huh, would you be preferable? Okay, sure. And I said, stay off of these upper lip steps. See, you're not supposed to be up there at all. This is a diagram of probability or possibility or something. But the first lower triangle was very apparent. Our whole life is in a relative dimension and this is where we lay not even up into the pyramid, we wallow eternally between the positives and the negatives between masculinity and femininity, between concepts of goodness or bad prop or unpro and light and darkness and all this sort of thing so that we never reach a united type of sanity. Okay? Now why am I mentioning all this? And there's that thing up at the top because where is our perspective that you run into in most of the philosophies or let's say theologies that you encounter God is postulated before proving.

cd1-1-17:59

This is what you run into and we are hushed into silence. We don't dare say anything because so many people believe, and of course this is the difference. And when Dan says I'm a rebel, that's my rebellion. I maintain that I'm ignorant. And that's where I started from ignorance, not wisdom, and by the contemplation, by the contemplation of what's in front of you, not something way up above. That's the reason I say that picture has no meaning except this is something I discovered. So it's like the cats and jammer kids, it's a cartoon, but maybe something's in it for you too. I don't know. It may have some meaning, but don't you cannot contemplate God much less legislate that you don't dare say anything contrary because what happens, you get authorities. What's

an authority? A man who sweats or wall through six or eight years of college, he may have been drunk all the time, he is in there, but when he comes out, he's a theologian and he's an authority and he says, God told me to tell you. And you say, okay, whatever you say, you see what's going on over in Iran.

cd1-1-19:18

You got a rule from possibly a subjective state or a subjective dimension. So what else do we postulate? We postulate that wisdom is decided by democratic process. We have the best system on earth. All we have to do is vote and if people vote, and this permeates, unfortunately, the study of psychology psychological findings today are the result of the acceptance of the normal curve. The normal curve is that which is 51% or more of the behavior so that when 51% of the people become murderers, it is normal or anything else. Okay? So consequently psychology has ceased in at least that decree of people, and I'm not saying Carl Young would approve of that, but I'm saying this is a trend that we have decided that the human mind, the human collective mind is infallible. Instead of saying that the truth is the truth in the year 1000, the year 1500, the year 2000 and the year 3000 or 10,000. See, truth is the truth. It doesn't change because it's unpopular at the moment. Now, in other words, the human mind, I say that what constitutes the human mind is as unchangeable as the protoplasm in that human's body. If you take a chemical analysis of it, you might have a different reading in the year, say 1800, you might have a different concept of the blood circulation or something and that may have been what I call relative truth at that time, but as you approach it, it becomes closer to absolute truth.

Speaker 2 cd1-1-21:08

How can you say truth doesn't change?

Rose cd1-1-21:12

By virtue of its definition,

Speaker 2 cd1-1-21:17

Something's true one day and not true another day.

Rose cd1-1-21:19

No, no, no. The conclusion was not true the other day. Truth itself doesn't change. Well, lemme put something this way. Maybe I'm crazy, but let me run through this little bit of craziness. If you don't approve of it, don't get anything from it. I'll apologize, but I don't really intend to try to prove to you a whole lot. I'm going to throw something out if it looks good to you, okay? If it doesn't, you've wasted your time and maybe even I have to be certain that the same thing has to do with our, some other of our concepts about attitudes and authority are concepts of love and a lot of our social study of interrelation with people, this sort of thing is not dependent upon a true understanding of people, but something perhaps that we'd prefer to have. We don't particularly want the truth. We want a certain state of things to exist. So I say, does a man love us? Are incapable of loving or does a man desire to be loved now who loves more? The lover of the tick? Does a tick love the dog or the blood?

cd1-1-22:45

He sticks pretty close and some people in their human relationships stick very close, but maybe it's parasitic is love of every in any kind, programmed. If we got any choice of this matter, we think we're doing things. Are we doing things? Is there only one dimension? Now all the reason I'm saying, the reason I'm questioning this is there seems to be in the human effort, whether it's philosophical, religious or what, there seems to be an effort for action. What is the difference in these type of actions? We have a difference in perspective. And what's the difference in the type of action is that I maintain that action without definition is foolish.

cd1-1-23:33

This is what you have. The people are acting and not defining what they're doing. In other words, to give you an example, a person says, we're going to make the world safe for democracy. That's our group. Our little group is going to make the world safe for democracy. Another group says, we're going to serve God. They haven't defined what they're going to serve. Another thing that's very important, which no one hardly thinks about them, define the seeker or the one that's trying to serve the potentials and capabilities of that person to do anything much less service. Objective, almost unattainable thing. I don't get the negating God. I'm not saying that there is done. I'm saying it's foolish to postulate. Definition should proceed action, at least some common sense template does not the possibility of multiple dimensions weaken our significance in our pretended potential for controlling our environment.

cd1-1-24:36

Now, that may not sound like too much. In other words, we're under the, we see the labor under the idea that we're in a restricted environment, that there's only one dimension. That's the material world, and all we have to do is conquer that material world. And some people go so far as to say there is no mind beyond the body, somatic mind. So all we have to do is learn to manipulate the somatic mind and possibly the somatic minds of other people. And we've got everything under control, but we're not taking into consideration the possibility of multiple dimensions, that the mind itself may be a dimension, number one, it may be something besides the body, but there may be other dimensions besides that. If there are, then we have factors, multiple factors never taken into consideration. In other words, there might be a God up there, there might be a chief engineer who draws the blueprint or changes it occasionally or something of that certain, we're down here saying, let us work our pencil on the blueprint.

cd1-1-25:40

See what is God? What are his dimensions? What's a soul? Everybody has one. You get back to Frazier's Golden Bough, you find out that man and doubted himself with a soul kind of young when the early stages, I'm not saying he doesn't have it, but he endows himself. He doesn't wait and defined it. Every man has a responsibility of finding his soul, not let me finish please. And then I'm doing this for the purpose of questions and also let me say something else. I've come here to inform and come here to share. I haven't come here to argue and I will answer until 10 o'clock tonight or until they throw us out of the building if necessary. Any questions except pointed questions and loaded questions and egoistic, egotistically inspired questions. In other words, I'm not here to deny that other people are smarter than me. They may well be smarter. Now, I'm not pointing at you just I want to say that while I'm saying it, but in other words, we can't get any place if we're going to, all of us have a battle of egos, but I do. I feel that the point of it is I do want questions say, I think the communication here will be questions and I want the dialogue, but I want run through these. Then we'll go back. If somebody can remember a point and we'll go back to that. Pick it up from there.

cd1-1-27:08

What is thought? This is something I'd like to propose to every psychiatrist. What is thought? I had one fellow tell me he had a drug for every thought, but he didn't know the definition of thought, so he didn't know the definition of sanity. What is mind, whether it's limits or it's dimensions, that sort of thing. What are we implying when we say, I think is thought a possession or an obsession? Does a man think or is he a thought? Now, these are not just idle little koan. Throw it out here. It is very possible that we're obsessed with thinking, especially if you're an alcoholic and you need a drink. You'll become obsessed with thinking and you'll still think that you're the guy that wants to drink. What is sanity? The normal curve. Somatic, healthiness.

cd1-1-28:04

Could sanity ever mean that state of mind with perfect understanding of all problems, a state of mind from which the altering lens of ego has been removed from our mental vision and perception? In other words, we see a lot of stuff through our ego, and do we incorporate ego, ego into insanity or insanity? In other words, is the egotistical person insane? To a degree, really badly, insane, but doesn't that kind of color his thinking process? Could a state of sanity ever be approached? That's the next thing. Suppose there is a state whereby we have an ability to more perfectly view all problems as we would approach engineering Problems with the slide rule. Is there a slide rule called sanity that we could approach and work problems?

cd1-1-29:00

Would such a version of sanity imply the need of perfected logic or perfected intuition? We're going to do it with logic alone. What is intuition? We were discussing this quite a bit lately. One fellow says, you know that and I say, it isn't so much. You know that simply as you have a direct mind evaluation instead of an indirect mind evaluation, how would a person who possessed, who is possessed of this version of sanity find for himself answers to such questions as God? Definitions and essence definitions. Supposing we went about it with, we postulated for the time being. That is such a thing as, and the reason I say it's possible to postulate this is from what I call a theory of progression, that if there are smarter people, there must be smarter people so that you have a progression that arrives somewhere close to the absolute.

cd1-1-30:05

They talking mathematics have taken distance. They have two inches from the baseboard of a wall and cutting it in half and keep cutting it in half, and they argue mathematically, does the man ever reach the wall? Is there always there half of something left? Have you ever heard that discussed? Well, the same thing with the approach to sanity. If there are people that are more sane than others, is it possible by progression to reach the totality? And with that slide rule, it properly evaluates such things as man's own essence. Well, now this has been the effort that has been tried and claimed. There have been claims put out this by this, that certain people have reached the answer, not necessarily that they claimed to have perfect logic or even perfect intuition. They may have had an indescribable accident. How would such sanity or sanity, potential affect peace of mind, ideal health patterns or physical security plans?

CD1 track 2

Time 31:04

Rose: cd1-2-00:05

So in other words, this is the idea that there are several movements that talk about the perfected man and the perfected man. I remember years ago as looking into the universal brotherhood and Nate had this talk of the perfected man who was supposed to wind up doing everything just right and having the proper answers. He was a successful businessman. He was a happily married man and everything. Is there possible such a sanity that would bring us to that? What is the relationship between thought and mind? Are they the same? Is thought a mind extrusion? You get into some ideas about thought. Is this an extrusion of the mind or any mission like a broadcast from a broadcasting tower, electronic broadcasting tower, or is it projected as something like a light from a lamp is thought synaptic and the reason I'm going into this is psychology. This is the basis of psychology. His thought, synaptic reaction to an electrical stimulation, meaning his thought, something like an electrical impulse. Now what even more important do we willfully think? And if you think you do, try to stop, try to stop now. Just say, I'm going to stop thinking or predict it at a certain time tomorrow you're going to wake up and start thinking, see if it's possible.

cd1-2-01:28

If we cannot start or stop thinking, how can we put it takes a much responsibility for our decisions because unless you take, are able to take something and willfully study it, not be inspired to from some event, which may already be colored. See then we don't know what viewpoint we start the investigation from. Is it possible? Another thing, another angle that the people who realize that they cannot make decisions are the ones that eventually may find ways or means to make decisions. The people who protested, they're able to make decisions always seem to me, the people who make the wrong decisions, where people who say, Hey, I'm not so sure of myself may because they don't have too much a platform to stand on. They don't have any prejudice thinking in either scientific side of the coin.

cd1-2-02:31

Another thing, if we think about thought is thought then objective and separate from the thinking self. This is a serious question because this is the process by which this thing here goes on. It becomes an objective study of the self or a study of the objective self, if you want to call it that. Whatever you see as objective. If there is a thinking self or only an awareness if witness's thoughts or is there a thinking self or only an awareness? In other words, what? Watch this thought. Is this a thinking self that watches it or is this just awareness?

cd1-2-03:13

What we're doing here is getting down to basically, like I said, not studying theology or something, but actually looking inside and say what goes on when I think is there a thinking cogitative logical self that examines our thoughts? Or is it just to boil back to an awareness of something going on out front out there which we can observe When a man asks himself a question, are there two people or cells involved? One who speaks and one who hears? Well, of course you've heard this. That may sound strange, but people like gir. If you have claimed that there were several eyes or ego egos that were sometimes in communication with each other sometimes in conflict, but that we aren't a single individual, that's not a new concept. In other words, of the different voices within man. For instance, the stomach rebels against the sex organs perhaps or the head rebels against another part of the body, but there are certain voices representative of those things.

cd1-2-04:25

If there is such a conglomerate of selves, let's suppose we take that momentarily that the Ian principle of the many selves or whatever they are the ghosts inside of us, how do we isolate then the real one, they're all taking turns talking. So which one do we encourage to talk and which one do we say, Hey, you're not real. You're a phony. The real one is really me. It is like a fellow who says, I want a drink. Suppose he's an alcoholic, he says, I want a drink, that's me, or when I can't no longer drink, let somebody shoot me because that's my real pleasure, okay? He gets drunk, he gets sick, and then he's coming. He's got a hangover and he says, I hope I never see another ball of booze. Here's an opposite philosophy coming up and you say what? You said you hope you wish you could spend your last days drinking. Oh hell, I'm crazy. Don't pay any attention to that. Meaning is another guy. That's crazy. See, so the thing is that determine of these different voices in the conglomerate, how do you go about that? What leverage, what tools do you use to pry them apart? Keep them apart. Keep reminding yourself always. Yesterday I said that was a negative self or that wasn't the real guy that I want to be in charge of my vehicle.

cd1-2-05:49

Our spiritual achievement and psychological clarity arrive simultaneously. When a person has, you hear these great spiritual experiences when they have those, are they psychologically wise or can we have a spiritually enlightened person who is manifestly wrong about the things in his head in regard to which I often never was a student of the Bible until much later in life and after I went through a lot of this stuff, I used to go back and read segments of the Bible and I got the impression. I also read other works of enlightened men or men who seemed to have the answer and I catch this echo in there. These people were psychologists. They did get some sort of, they became aware of the outer dimensions, but they also became aware of the inner dimension, so to speak,

and can one bring about the effect in the other? Can the psychological clarity bring spiritual clarity automatically? If so, then that's a path. Can spiritual clarity bring psychological clarity then, okay, let's get it down into our psychology majors if that's what it takes, if that's part of the deal.

cd1-2-07:08

Now we come to now the crux of our question, so that is direct mind cognition in relation to true sanity as such possible and spiritual realization. Is it possible to realize it by any means? I think of course that what you have to do, again, as I said, I draw diagrams and I make noises. I think each man has to find things for himself. I think it may be when you're going through a jungle, you can get somebody that knows a particular section of the jungle may save you losing some time or getting injured. But I think that the whole thing when it comes to the human mind is I don't think there's anything that's satisfying about piling up a lot of objective knowledge about what somebody else believes, some conception. Until those conceptions get a lot more, there's a lot more, let's say they have the same substance to them as an irreversible spiritual realization.

cd1-2-08:22

The man knows beyond a shadow of a doubt that he's right, and I don't think we've quite progressed that far, but I still think that the basic psychology starts with the self and without predetermined definitions, I don't think that there are some things that are evident. For instance, I don't think we have to deny our existence. We don't have to deny with standing on the ground and there are certain things that we can't deny either that there are two sides of a relative coin. We're relative people in a relative dimension trying to talk about a non-relative dimension, trying to understand when I'm talking about the mind, the mind is objective, but it's based entirely upon a relationship of the relative dimension and it's only through the observation that the mind is watching the relative earth or dimension, and I liken this to the camera analogy of Ramana Maharshi. You go back through the eye of the observer, you have to see what the observer's looking at, and you go back through that to get the interpretation and why. Then you understand or study why the decision of the somatic mind is made. You get a little insight then into your mind and then when you become more aware of the somatic mind, it's possible that you're aware of something else which is an intuitive type of thinking process.

cd1-2-09:45

In other words, the basis is the basis of what I'm getting at is as I said, I'll explain that if you wish. It doesn't have to be explained, you can just maybe draw it on a piece of paper and look at it later. The thing is, you don't go externally for knowledge if you go inside. Now, this is an old saying going inside, the methods of going inside are there are many, so you can take your pick, whatever appeals to your intuition. It may be concentrating on a nerve center or it may be self-hypnosis. There's different things that you can try for their effect. Try all of 'em, in fact, if you wish to. But I think that there's a very direct way and that is by watching your actions. Now I want to invite any questions that you might have or any comments or you can take it from there and I think maybe we can broaden out a little bit.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-10:45

Why don't you just expand on watching your action. That was your last statement.

Speaker 3 cd1-2-10:52

Can I say something? Sure. I just want to wait for someone else to say something. I didn't want to be the only one. Okay, wanted, you did ask, you mentioned something about JE having different eyes and then you said

which one you want. I'm not picking on you to say something different. That's way we make the conversation by saying something that you said, well, instead that he had say four eyes or you said so many eyes or eagle eyes and then you said, how are you to know which one you'd like to provide to steer the chariot, so to speak?

Speaker 4 cd1-2-11:34

Well,

Speaker 3 cd1-2-11:35

It could be drawn by four horses. The fact that you mentioned it was one, it is a concept or an idea you have about one driving the chariot.

Rose: cd1-2-11:44

That's true. That is true. Well, of course, because of the thing. I think most people like to believe that they're not fragmented

Speaker 3 cd1-2-11:55

Because I'm thinking there's some type of cylindrical reality and there's different ones and it's like there are different ones, but there aren't. You have to merge some. Well, cherry is right and

Rose: cd1-2-12:10

Sure, but you see, we have to start from a, I think when you finally have a realization, you realize that each individual is only part, whether he's four or five or one, even that one is only part of total mass. See what I mean? Like a universal mind or if you want to call it God or something of that sort that we lose our, as far as the hunger, the hunger for the ego, the ego of singularity, for instance. We like to believe that we have no proof that we're only one. You're right in that

Speaker 3 cd1-2-12:51

We can all get better together. This is what I'd say there. It's like there are different ones than me, but we've,

Speaker 1 cd1-2-12:59

Well incidentally,

Speaker 3 cd1-2-13:00

It's like when I get wet, I'm the wet knee when I'm not one.

Rose: cd1-2-13:04

Well, this incidentally was what Gurdjieff implied, I don't know how many you're acquainted with it, but Gurdjieff implied that the proper treatment of the egos was not the elimination so much as the effusion, the collective use or understanding of all plus the use of all or can a man use them all? And I didn't hear that properly explained in the first, I run into that In Search of the Miraculous, I think by Ouspensky. So I don't know. But the thing what I'm going at is that basically we look upon ourselves as a single body. We're only one body. So consequently we like to believe that there's a single unit of intelligence or spark of life that is identified with that single body. So sure we understand that maybe there are forces or energies or parasitic entities, let's say living within that body, but we're not too happy that the individuals are too happy. So instinctively he looks

for his individuality and his singleness, and as I said, I do believe that after many years of the pursuit of his singleness, he finds out that he's only a part of a total, you become one with God. They say, see, that's the idea. You become part of something greater.

cd1-2-14:37

Was there any other questions?

Speaker 2 cd1-2-14:38

I guess so perhaps I'm just calling into the, but earlier you mentioned the central importance of definitions, defined terms, and the only, I'll probably paraphrase incorrectly if I try, but I wonder if you could restate what you said about definitions that definitions should exist before action.

Speaker 1 cd1-2-15:07

Is

Speaker 2 cd1-2-15:07

That what you said? Yeah.

Speaker 1 cd1-2-15:08

Okay.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-15:09

Now the question I have then is, okay, taking into account that language produces

Speaker 1 cd1-2-15:19

Confusion,

Speaker 2 cd1-2-15:19

Meaning that is not agreed upon by any two people 100%, but would you concede that?

Speaker 3 cd1-2-15:29

Yeah, sure.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-15:30

Okay. Okay. Then how are we to move towards an absolute if there is no consensus reality using Sullivan?

Rose: cd1-2-15:41

Well, that's one of the first things you do, of course, is that you realize there is no consensus. I said nobody sees the color green the same. We don't know if they do. When you talk about the appreciation of beauty, nobody knows what the other fellows appreciation is. But regardless, there is a common definition. It's a dictionary and we're not, there's a science, even a psychological science, whether it's true or false. But one of the first things that happens in the pursuit of this definition is the recognition that all wisdom, including definitions and dictionaries is relative and then circular is to take you any place. So the definition is implied. There's a definition spoken when I said that there's a definition implied that man will through the incessant contemplation

of the negative and positive, which is the definition implies that which is thing is, and it also implies that which is thing is not see like an dale is a dog, but we say it's not just a dog, it's not a cat, it's not an elephant. So consequently, all of this here, incessant Walter going back and through in life of definitions is not the type of definition we're going at. We discover, for instance, in the final analysis, this is only a headache exercise and zen, they talk about confusing the mind to a point where the mind explodes. When the mind explodes. You have the definition for the first time. Now, do you follow me? Okay. Okay. Well, there is one. There's one

Speaker 2 cd1-2-17:20

I like to mention about the negative versus positive. I'm aspect, I understand all the numerous analogies that surround us every day, how a computer functions light versus

Speaker 1 cd1-2-17:31

Art,

Speaker 2 cd1-2-17:33

Thousands and pounds of metaphors that we can attribute to this polarization.

Speaker 1 cd1-2-17:37

That's a binary theory of negative and positive. The computer runs on a binary principle.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-17:42

I maintain it only on intuitive grounds. I have no empiric facts to only on two new grounds that our perception of a polarity is merely our perception. And then in actuality, if we could, for example, we only view the visible light and we cannot see the magnetic spectrum of phenomena that surrounds, and in that same way we seem to see a negative versus positive, but perhaps from a different perspective it is not a polarity.

Rose: cd1-2-18:21

You're absolutely right. You're absolutely right. You're absolutely right. I'm not arguing with you at all. Sure. I'm saying that this is the only way you can be. We got to begin, for instance, the mind of the child in my estimation is very close to being highly intuitive and possibly even in touch with an absolute dimension. And we seduce this child and take him into school and teach him the positive of the negative, and we pound that into him for years and years until he builds. He becomes an electronic technician with his binary. See, but much later, if he's really interested in definition, he's going to, someday he's going to pound himself. First of all, he's going to get up to a point where he sees that his mind isn't solving the problems as you said, and the intuition over there is necessary. See, and he thinks, oh, I got it.

cd1-2-19:13

So he has another vacillation plane that he vacillates on and this goes on, and until he starts observing what he's doing, and then he becomes in contact with awareness. Now this just looks like a point on a line, but actually this is an experience when he truly experiences awareness and is still able to remember all of this other stuff, then the definition is there. He knows for the first time in his life who he is now. That's what I meant by definition. Then after you know who you are, after you know who you are, then go out in life and act, then go out and do something. But everybody goes out, takes a shot at somebody else or destroys another man's business or pretends to sit in judgment on him. And all this sort of thing comes from people who don't know who they are.

cd1-2-20:04

See, unfortunately we can't expect them to see, but it's a protest with me that people are acting without knowledge of the essence of being. See, and I don't think it's, of course you talk to the fellow, the judge that says, Hey, I'm going to sentence you to hang. He says some judgment on you and you talk to him and he's going to hit you with some logic and you'll stagger away thinking, I can't argue the guy's right or something. But basically intuitively you know that this guy, you can just take a look at him and say, this guy's snowing himself. He's got a snow himself in order to get that job done. But this is every place you go, whether it's in psychology, I don't care what they do in the courtroom, I don't care how many people shoot and kill each other because this may be necessary part of the vegetable processes. But when they get down into what I consider the sacred sciences with this same type of thinking of acting before they define themselves, a man makes a fortune teaching people about God. He makes millions teaching people about God, and I am wondering how much he knows. See, I'm wondering why he takes this action when he doesn't have the goods, so to speak. That's all. Yes.

Speaker 5 cd1-2-21:26

Pardon me? I agree with the principle of about the man making the millions. He have the goods. Might he have the goods?

Rose: cd1-2-21:36

Well, we don't know.

Speaker 5 cd1-2-21:37

Probably not. Wait a moment, wait a moment.

Rose: cd1-2-21:39

We don't know.

Speaker 5 cd1-2-21:41

We don't know, but we don't know if the man does have the goods if we're not

Speaker 3 cd1-2-21:44

Liking this word. I saw a guy on TV last night, I'll stick anything on it. The guy don't have the goods. He's a pervert these channels, and he just sits there with his friend raising money and the other guy says, amen. And they got a little joke going on between them and I saw it. Another thousand just came in and then they talk against the country. I don't know if there's five or over all agree what you're saying.

Speaker 5 cd1-2-22:11

I agree with my question. Doesn't relate to that what I'm putting out.

Rose: cd1-2-22:17

No, you, I can't clean up the mess. I'm not saying that I'm just throwing it out here. There's nothing I can do about it.

Speaker 5 cd1-2-22:24

Well, no, basically what I want to ask you is this. You're saying, so this is the way it is, alright? There's many definitions you've defined. Are you saying that's the way it is and that's the way it is? Or are you're saying that's the way it is, but it could be different. Here I am. I'd like to read. Is that what you're saying?

Rose: cd1-2-22:40

What I'm saying is that I discovered

Speaker 5 cd1-2-22:43

Yes,

Rose: cd1-2-22:43

And I don't know how many can discover through the same procedure, but I feel compelled to pass on my discovery or insanity to somebody else. Are you helping them to

Speaker 5 cd1-2-22:55

Discover themselves?

Rose: cd1-2-22:57

Yes. Yes, yes. Not me. Forget about me. Forget I'm not going to do anything. If I'm a catalyst, it's because I said something and Aca chain reaction in the head or something like that. Got 'em thinking, got 'em moving, see, got 'em observing. Maybe say

Speaker 5 cd1-2-23:11

Something to one, those very, very rich ones up there.

Rose: cd1-2-23:15

Well, I don't think it would do much good too much to the Richs because they've got, first of all, the million or 10 million that they've got may seem like a divine a approbation. If I had been doing wrong, God wouldn't give me the 10 million or 20 million. I don't know how they justify it. Yes, I'd like to rephrase the first question, which somehow, right, okay.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-23:39

Which is

Speaker 3 cd1-2-23:40

How is it

Speaker 2 cd1-2-23:41

Possible? Watch your actions and learn without diluting yourself.

Rose: cd1-2-23:46

Good. Okay. Now I maintain that we do dilute ourselves and how we get around this is this, first of all, this whole thing is based upon a premise if you want to call it that. And I think you can understand it as soon as I state it, that the view is not the viewer, this is what it's based on. In other words, whenever you see something,

experience something. Now this goes clear through to what I call the experience that caused me consciousness, the experience of ecstasy. In other words, this is not you, this is a visit. You're visiting a dimension like heaven. But we like to, for instance, if we look at our body, I maintain the body's external. Now, a lot of people don't like to admit that at first, but if you stop to think about it, you can cut a piece of it off and keep on going.

cd1-2-24:39

And it's amazing how much of it you can lose provide. You don't lose it all at once. So this body is manifestly not us. Now, I'm not going to go into what relation, whether we have it or whether it has us, but we have also, we are able to observe our thoughts and we're able to observe after a prolonged meditational process our mind, which I as a young man refused to believe. I said, I am my mind. But after a while you're able to watch this. Now you don't watch it like you watch that blue carpet, but you're able to watch it. And this observer shows you what's going on. Now, right down here, this is the negative and positive and this is where you have to start and that's where everybody starts, whether they want to or not. And it starts with simple little things like the body and you have to make a decision, and that's what we call the umpire.

cd1-2-25:37

Up at the top, there was a fellow by the name of Benoit wrote a book on zen. He called it the supreme doctrine. And in it he had a little diagram. He had a little triangle, which life was the endless line of polarity, endless negativity, endless positivity, which would never do anything for the human being if there wasn't what he called the conciliatory principle. The conciliatory principle is the ability to judge from a detached state of being. Now, in other words, if you want examine, if you want to study material, you have to almost look at it from non-material viewpoints. In other words, material does not define materials the same way as a cat. Don't define a dog. A cat is not a dog. You look at if there were nothing but dogs or nothing with people, we wouldn't have any understanding of the same understanding of people, except that we wouldn't be rocks in. You see what I mean? Same token, if you define the person as a being on a material planet in a material galaxy, in a material universe, you still haven't defined that person because this entire galaxy person and all may not, we don't know what that substance is. But when viewed from a spiritual realm, you get an entirely different concept and you for the first time, you may get a real definition. j cd1-2-27:03

For instance, my understanding of this physical body, plane, planet galaxy is that it's a mental experience. So you view it from a mental, and then after you view it from the mental experience, you may discover that it is a projection from a unmanifested type of mind experience. See, or if supposing we have you hear talk of a flying saucer coming in or something, or I don't know how many of you seen a materialization in a seance? I have seen these years ago, I described 'em in the book of a guy that 18 of these creatures came in, talked to some people, poof. One of 'em went through the floor, one of 'em exploded. See, now of course, you can always say, Hey, you're kidding yourself, but let's apply something then more tangible like electrical, what do they call it? A cloud? These electrical clouds that they have that they work with. Electronics.

Speaker 2 cd1-2-28:11

A plasma,

Speaker 1 cd1-2-28:12

Huh? A

Speaker 2 cd1-2-28:12

Plasma,

Rose: cd1-2-28:13

Yeah. Right. This, if there is a dimension, for instance, if this entity just say, if the entity that come through that materialization, like he protests, he comes from another dimension. He says, just by accident, as you're able to see me now, if this is true, we know darn well that he doesn't have the same definition of our existence as we have. There's no two ways about it. This is the protest through all the spiritual systems that looking at life from death is an entirely different view. It isn't as important. Things aren't as important as we make them, and the coloration is different and everything. And the same thing would apply on a physical basis that we can't define the earth from it because you're dealing in terms of earths, the only way you can get a clear definition is something detached entirely from that, another type of universe.

cd1-2-29:07

Then perhaps composed of different materials. Then you would define that in the comparison of these weird materials that we cannot have in our nuclear chart and say that universe is composed of nickel iron and so on, whereas this other universe is composed of that genus and species of planets. See, or this universe is composed of projected thoughts, or as this universe is composed of essence, see something entirely different. These possibilities mean that you have to have this conciliatory principle. You have to have something watching the two extremes. Okay, so what happens? This goes on without whether you want to or not. As I said, you take an instance that goes on within the body, say, I use the term sex and hunger, that a person gets to be a certain age that they find sex. So they say, hooray, and they go out on a picnic and they lose their job and they get hungry and another voice starts stalking.

cd1-2-30:14

Say it says, Hey, you are wrong. You're going to die unless you stop playing and start working, start getting some food. So this fell up the top, this conciliate to our principles, the umpire. We notice if we observe ourselves that something up there is saying, Hey, yesterday you were wrong. Today, you're right. There's an observing process going on inside the mind, a decision-making process that has to do with the perpetuation of that body. That's all it is. It's somatic mind. It says, if you guys don't get your heads together. Now as a result of that rule, operation laws are created, laws that relate to sexual activity, which they may chop the head off for. In Arabia. I heard that the other day. They chop the guy's head off. See, I.

CD2 track 1

Time 31:19

Rose: cd2-1-00:01

So the head says, Hey, to the rest of the body, behave yourself. Or I'll get chopped off. So this is also Matt mind, but once you step up there and observe this process of the mind empowering an act, you're immediately behind it. It's automatic. As long as you can see nothing but positive and negative, you don't know there's an umpire. But as soon as you notice that just by accident perhaps you happen to see this process, you say, Hey, I'm thinking about this judgment situation. I'm thinking about this decision. Then immediately you're behind it. You're automatically observing. That becomes an anterior observer. You're watching yourself doing something and it's objective and it's outside and it's not you and you know it's not you. So that the empire is not you. So then you say, oh, well I found it. I'm beyond that, but I don't know just where I'm at.

cd2-1-00:57

And then what you're on is another line. You realize that you're operating now from a kind of logic that your body's governed by logic that says, Hey, this is life and this is death. See, and the decision making of balancing things so that you either live forever or died too soon and you notice that you identify possibly something as

intuition that helps you pick this up. But this is the opposite. The logical mind, the intuitive mind, and then all decisions, thinking processes, there's something in between that plane of recognition, all experiences. You either decide definitely that you're going to quit eating meat or start eating macrobiotics because it's logical, or you're going to get an inspiration that you should get down to a certain church and be saved. Whatever it is, this is going to be your plane of reference until you observe that what you're doing, and as soon as you observe it, you're immediately elevated above it to the point of that conciliatory principle. Again, you're judging. You're judging now you're judging your logic. And just like he said, the logic is imperfect. Then you judge the intuition. It is limited and impure at times. You have to perfect it, check it out. See? So there's another guy doing that. There's another self. Now, it doesn't go on forever because that's the last, the guy that's watching the processes, the person that's watching the processes, there is something behind the last ego, and that's awareness.

cd2-1-02:27

And the combination, the process observer in combination with awareness means the guy is not giving up yet. He's still asking questions. He's still fighting for answers. He's still wanting to know who he is. Is there anybody behind watching me? And then is there another anterior self behind that or is there nothing but pure awareness? And because you don't have any answer, nobody knows who they are, maybe at that point never expects to find out who they are. But by the persistent sticking that problem in the computer on that binary system, what is the relation between pure awareness, which I may be, I seem to be aware to pointed observer awareness, one pointed thing, problems, analyses, and so on. You continue allies on once all at once, the thing pops. Now this is the path to the satori as they call it. There's many words. So I prefer the words, the haji of money, but there's no reason or rhyme to it. But at a given time, this awareness pops and you are one with oneness. And that's the end of the trip. Yeah.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-03:45

Okay. Okay. I suppose I, my personal experience and play it safe as possible that way. What happened to me is I sort embarked this process myself. I supposedly you'd say I was all the way up to the process and observer point for a while, never satisfied, always evaluating many, many different types of feelings, including intuitive feelings that

Speaker 1 cd2-1-04:09

Negated

Speaker 2 cd2-1-04:10

All of the empirical data that I probably accumulate. But then all of these things started to overload. And what started to happen is I started to not be able to function on a everyday practical study and get the job done. That's

Speaker 1 cd2-1-04:29

Right. In

Speaker 2 cd2-1-04:30

Fact, the ability for my mind to function in an empirical linear fashion and the way that the university requires to break down. So again, what happened was instead of being able to keep going, I had to

Rose: cd2-1-04:48

Retreat.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-04:49 Retreat. And so I find myself slightly frustrated because I am at times I'd dip right back down to the bottom again.

Rose: cd2-1-04:58

Sure, sure. And if you reach the top, you'd go back down to the bottom again. You can't live without eating at the table, going to the toilet and your body functioning the same as it did before, and you're going to have to retreat to that set of values and daily compare the positive of the negative again until the day you die.

Speaker 3 cd2-1-05:18

I think it can reach another dimension or other dimensions or what else happened, what you dementia. It didn't say other dimensions because you'll still be in the same place you were and you still have to cope with what, or do I say cope,

Speaker 4 cd2-1-05:32

But

Speaker 3 cd2-1-05:33

You mentioned adding to the computer and it getting hot or something. I just pick it up what you say as you get the things working, things become easy, not hard. And it mine doesn't overload because the idea is working. It's something that makes it easier and not hard because then you're working against yourself in the first place by just thinking that way. But it should become easy. And the intuition mixes with the logic, and I don't believe in positive negative because you believe it, then you're going to look for it, but it's not positive or negative. Just gets easy. Think of the dimension, why shouldn't it?

Rose: cd2-1-06:07

Well, let me say something to him because you proposed a problem. The first thing is if you know how much your acquaint was in, but this process was so well demonstrated in the different lives of the people who reached stuff. The satori is a bad word because it's defined, but it's the maximum enlightenment of culpa, samati, soji, sati. But the thing that happens the same ways you described to each person and that they saw the foolishness of life, they intuited a path, but it didn't work. They approached a point in which their had everything, all the stuff at the fan, and they were overcome and they couldn't continue. In other words, it was either trust yourself to accident or death or get back and grab a hold of something tangible. See? Exactly. Now, strangely enough, the zen path, having so many scholars having described this to this 3000, 6,000 students and some of the monasteries in China, they devised a system deliberately of balming the head.

cd2-1-07:21

And it was the exercise of attaining no mind, which I don't approve of. I don't approve of trying to make your mind go blank. The understanding is that when you reach the point of no mind, the all mind invades it and you know everything, but you can't go about it just by simulating taking a symptom. You have to do it like you did it, but have faith regardless of in yourself, whether you go insane, drop dead, get thrown out of college, what persist, keep that computer work going. And what happens is the head explodes, not this head, but there's comprehensiveness.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-08:04

So you applying a word self-esteem, if I could use that category, is related to intuition. That the malfunction of intuition,

Rose: cd2-1-08:14

Your intuition wasn't perfected or possibly your time hadn't come. See, in other words, the thing is that I made a decision when I was 21 years of age looking ahead and reading books on the people who had got into Raj yoga and that sort of thing, and the people who had got into Christian mysticism and were written off as nuts that I very possibly could be written off as a nut, that I could get into prostate cancer or something can die from cancer. And I said, so what? I don't want to live undefined. I'll take the chance. And you walk right up to the edge and you say, Hey, my head's coming apart. And you get frightened. But that very total lonesomeness takes you away from all of your contact with relativity. That lonesomeness is your essence is separated for all time from this relative thing, including your dear relatives, your dear children that may come or may have been here already.

cd2-1-09:18

Everything, your possessions so that you may lose all that, including your degree in the university. See, but once you return now, just like he says, he's coming in from another point, which is very valid too. Once you get there, you realize there is no positive or negative, and that's part of the definition, the new definition that you have. You understand what I'm talking about. Then when a person says there is no positive or negative, he's transcended the positive or negative, which we know in chemistry is there, in mathematics, it's there. But in a spiritual realization, once you reach that, there are no, I'll say, a guy takes my short, changes me. He's a thief maybe see, but there are no bad people. I know that implicitly there are no bad people and there are no good people. But we still got to live in this good, bad world

Speaker 3 cd2-1-10:17

And it's huge that you have to look to not

Speaker 5 cd2-1-10:21

Whether someone else is bad. Do you think that we're sort of pulling ourselves, coming to these lectures, studying books, and really trying to work on ourselves, and then I have a feeling if I go to that point where my mind was tracked, I'd be frightened too and step back because there's so much holding us.

Rose: cd2-1-10:38

Alright, alright. That's the reason for the so-called monasteries and ashrams. A lot of people sense this. It didn't want to be alone at that time. So they had somebody standing close to them and then when a guy said, Hey, I'm scared stiff, or he says, well, if you die, I'll bury you. I'll tell the relatives or I'll send flowers. Or it's just like a guy taking another person through an acid trip. So you say now you're going to encounter such a little bug along the road and don't jump through the window because you'll come back and everything will be all right.

Speaker 5 cd2-1-11:12

Where do you feel the value is of doing these things that we are doing and everything that very few of us are going to really get that far? I think I've changed tremendously since I've been working on myself and doesn't seem to be the real thing.

Speaker 3 cd2-1-11:28

Why do you feel that way that you're not going to get that far? What makes you feel that way?

Speaker 5 cd2-1-11:32

I think fear. Fear of what? Fear and conditioning. Unwillingness to give up to the things that I have, right? Yeah.

Rose: cd2-1-11:40

Right.

Speaker 5 cd2-1-11:41

Really? No, I'm just trying to face it.

Speaker 3 cd2-1-11:47

Speaking. Did you feel that though? You get things back, willingness to give?

Speaker 2 cd2-1-11:53

Do

Speaker 6 cd2-1-11:53

We have

Speaker 1 cd2-1-11:54

Hearing particular time

Speaker 2 cd2-1-11:55

Up until a point, and that's what I wanted to mention. Now, the whole issue of

Speaker 1 cd2-1-12:00

Dave, maybe we going to ask you

Speaker 2 cd2-1-12:02

The realm of emotions versus non non-emotional thought. Okay. Cognitive thought. Empirical thought versus emotions versus a meditative state, which is needed. I have obtained a few very few times of a meditative awareness where I was not focused on any specific thing, and the thing that throws me is the flooding of motions actually is what caused this downfall. It stopped my cognitive, empirical powers of mind from function.

Rose: cd2-1-12:44

Well, of course that stops any of that's what they call the death. See, I always say you have to do a lot of this so-called empirical or logical thinking. I call fattening up the head before the head is cut off. The head has to be fattened up for some reason before you chop it off. You can't just say, well, I'm going to be zero. You can't just go out and dissipate and blow all your energy and say, it don't matter what happens to me, whether a guy chops off my hand or chops off part of my mentality or a drug blows part of my brains away. No, no, you have to concentrate. Buddha, Buddha, beta rebar supposedly, I don't know if he did it or not, but it's in his books. He said, first you have to learn to think of one thing. Then you have to learn to think of everything.

cd2-1-13:27

Then you have to learn to think of nothing. Now that's translated. I have another explanation for it. It's first you have to be one pointed. You have to be determined, and you have to have a single objective in the pursuit of that single objective. You have to study the universe. You can't leave a stone unturned or a book unread if that's what it takes, or an exercise unexperimented with, see? But then he says, you got to think of nothing. You can't think of nothing. What happens after you bombard yourself with possibilities, you blow the head and nothing is there. Your thinking becomes nothing, but you don't think of nothing. So this is a difference between what I call the choosing the symptom and trying to imitate the symptom. In some of the zen practice of exercising no mind or trying to have no mind as opposed to just attacking the problem and attacking the problem until the head just blows.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-14:27

I don't mean to monopolize this question specifically of that, the idea of meditation. It so happens that I've gone to a TM. I firmly believe that TM is not necessary that I could have used any damn month or I wanted to use, but the process of initiation I went through was help the vehicle.

cd2-1-14:49

When I have achieved a state of meditation a few times when I had, in my opinion, as far as I could look at myself, I had no thought. In other words, every time I thought in evaluation a need to define what happened was that tendency or that essence or whatever you want to call it, dissolved. And there was a few moments in peace or whatever. You hire everyone, however you want call it, where there was no thought, no mantra. And at that point, no sense of time because I came on this thing and 45 minutes had gone by the hospital to editing for 20 minutes. And so as far as I knew I had meditated for 20 minutes. But during that period, the sense of time and space, et cetera, et cetera, wasn't there. And that also became thriving because in terms of being a biological organism, there's certain things that we must do and I don't want to be in as in monastery for the rest of my life because there's an organism here that's here for,

Rose: cd2-1-16:00

I never spent any time in one. Yeah, I don't think it affects you that much. I don't think I studied under a zen teacher for a while, but I don't think you have to be. In fact, when there's a saying during the experience, the hills cease to be hills and the valleys cease to be valleys. But after the experience, the hills are once more hills and the valleys are once more valleys. You can't stay in that non dimension. The body can't function, the mind can't function in a non dimension, you return. There's no doubt about it.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:31

Okay? But in that non dimension is my point in that whatever during that period I word along

Speaker 1 cd2-1-16:41

It

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:41

Was

Speaker 1 cd2-1-16:42

There

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:43

Was no thought.

Speaker 1 cd2-1-16:43

Right?

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:44

And it wasn't a dream state either,

Speaker 1 cd2-1-16:46

Because,

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:47

Well, I guess I can't state that I'm not,

Rose: cd2-1-16:49

But the trouble is though, that you didn't hang on long enough or you wouldn't have had the thought of urgency to get back and save your hide.

Speaker 2 cd2-1-16:56

In fact, I didn't really want to, that's the part that was alarm fact. I didn't.

Speaker 1 cd2-1-17:01

Yeah, but you did want to or you wouldn't have. Yeah, that's a good point. Yeah, that's a good idea.

Speaker 6 cd2-1-17:08

This drawing you've given, which to me is very useful, is a very intellectual process. In other words, you're saying we watch our actions through this intellectual yoga. What in your system of watching, how in your system, of watching your actions, do you deal with the emotions, which often are the drivers and prevent the intellect from working?

Rose: cd2-1-17:44

Well, I don't know. See, you're kind of throwing me there on the dichotomy of intellect and emotions because sure, I don't think we do too much of anything unless we are emotionally impelled. I think sometimes the emotions impelled us in a direction, and then the impelled so far that we question our motives and try to work diametrically opposite or despite them. And then that in turn is only emotional in origin. See,

Speaker 6 cd2-1-18:14

I'm speaking about emotions in the sense of that constantly changing pattern, which comes as a sensory. Impulses come into the human being and associate with patterns of desire and so forth, and therefore are continually changing and preventing the mind from working.

Rose: cd2-1-18:37

How

Speaker 6 cd2-1-18:38

In your system you deal with

Rose: cd2-1-18:39

That, you watch it, you watch it. You have to be. What we're saying here when I'm talking about just simple positive and negatives, this is the whole spectrum of action. For instance, you know, have to go through such things as knowing that as I said, that what looks to you good today may be different tomorrow. And you look at say that this cup here on the eyeball, it's upside down and the mind adjusts it. And the same way with the emotions. Emotions are like colonoscopic views and you have to sort that until you get a true perspective and keep sorting it.

Speaker 6 cd2-1-19:18

Do you propose, at least at first, at using sitting, process, meditating?

Rose: cd2-1-19:25

No.

Speaker 6 cd2-1-19:26

You don't.

Rose: cd2-1-19:26

No, no, no. In fact, I can't think sitting, so I don't advise anybody else. I can think walking and I've run into just a couple other people that says, see, of course, I think some people that are highly agitated possibly should train themselves to sit. I'm hypothyroid. If I sat, I'd go to sleep. So I keep moving and I used to get Is

Speaker 6 cd2-1-19:50

That what you advocate for all the students?

Rose: cd2-1-19:52

No, no, no. I don't advocate. I say in your judgment, you have to start and look things over. And I don't say anything about diet. I don't even say anything about what books to read. I just say, no matter what books you read, you're going to be faced though with the same thing of the relative world, the empirical empire type of judgment, the understanding of an umpire mind. This will come to you and you will eventually evolve in the same way into a logical, as opposed to an intuition type of thinking. Now, as far as how you go about that, I mean, I don't believe that any two people are the same. I knew a man one time, one of the most outstanding cases of enlightenment I encountered in my entire life. And I studied under a zen master, and I know the man was enlightened, but he's unknown. [Alfred Pulyan]

cd2-1-20:44

Maybe somebody, if you know him, his name is Paul y out of Connecticut, right next to New York. But he didn't care. He didn't care particularly, he wasn't selling anything, so he didn't care to be advertised too highly. And a lot of the people, the rubber stamp were strictly, they had the authority by virtue of the rubber stamp, and they taught words, which anybody can get out of ancient books. But anyhow, the whole thing basically was that this one fellow, his name was Paul Woods out of Dallas, Texas. San Antonio, Texas, one or two was a Christian. He

was basically a Christian, and he never was interested too much in anything except the Christian religion devout believed in the church and they made an navigator out of him. So he sent him over to bomb Japan. So he bombed Japan. And when he landed plane, why he started thinking what happened?

cd2-1-21:46

He said, the Bible says that God observes the fall of the sparrow. If God observes the fall of the sparrow, was he watching that bomb and how many people had killed? So he went nuts, so to speak, in the eyes of his fellow officers, and they furloughed him back to the states where he continued to wrestle with these ideas. What's going on? My thinking has been erroneous. I depended upon a fundamentalistic approach and it isn't working out. So he just belabored himself. His wife says, Hey, you better shake yourself out of that and get back to work, or we're going to starve the death. He didn't. She divorced him. His kids wouldn't have anything to do with him. He went down and tried to get a job. He went to work and say salesman for some car agency. And he told me he was in there and everything was hitting the fed, just like he was talking about everything went wrong.

cd2-1-22:38

He was praying. He says the only thing he knew how to do, he learned from the church was to pray, and that was the Lord's prayer. So he said he took the Lord's prayer and he took it apart and he prayed it forwards backwards. He analyzed it, he studied it, and he kept on praying, but he says it wasn't getting him any place. He wasn't doing anything. So one day he says it was an especially bad day, he was sending his desk and a couple of customers came in and he had sold them a car and they were preaching at him bitching. And he says, he just prayed in front of me, lady's head down on the desk and prayed for God to kill him. He found a new prayer and he just passed out. He said when he woke up, he's in the hospital, but he said he'd been for about 10 days on a journey in which he saw the space time, picture.

cd2-1-23:23

He'd been in space time, he had traveled, he saw history, and he'd be walking down the street with you and he could describe if he happened to be in that place, he could describe Gettysburg, the battle of Gettysburg. He'd be watching him telling you what was happening. But he had come to the answer beyond all trouble. He knew what the answer was, and he had still returned. So consequently, this man didn't have anything except this persistent determination with what little tools he had in hand, his Lord's prayer, his Christian education, his sense of logic, his sense of justice, sense of injustice, and these things battled back and forth until his head popped. When I discovered I'd found that it isn't limited to any system, it isn't anybody can do it. You don't have to have a teacher even. It's good if you got somebody that if you don't want to catch leprosy, consult a leper, or if you want to be a mountain climber, well talk to a mountain. He might save you breaking your neck. Or like he says, if you're going into something and there's somebody standing beside you and your head flips out and you get ahold of the guy and say, okay, I'll stick here with you until the thing's through, maybe that helps. See, but I maintain that.

cd2-1-24:45

No, it doesn't matter whether you eat meat or eat grain or stand on your head or sit in a position. I think these are all external things that belong to an external world.

Speaker 4 cd2-1-24:59

If you give us some guidelines

Rose: cd2-1-25:01

On how to go about working with your intuition, yes, I think there are ways that you can perfect your intuition. I think this is one of the big course. There's ways of testing it. There's ways of testing it. I think even ESP experimentation, that stuff tests your intuition because intuition is something more of a direct mind experience in which they say the yogis centuries ago used to study astronomy by not using charts of stuff, but they would look at it until they became one with it. And this is a person, if you want to really, you want to be a real psychologist, there's a simple formula. You step inside the man's shoes and walk in his thoughts, then, you know, see what I mean? You don't have many words to describe what goes on, but this is possible. These things are possible. You can step inside. Lots of times this, all of you here have met somebody that you bumped up to and all once you stopped and you looked at you, you never saw that man before in your life, but you knew him beyond a shadow of a doubt and knew what to expect out of him. See, and this is intuition. So if that guy comes along and borrows \$500 off of you later and don't come back, the years's wrong. So that's the test.

cd2-1-26:24

Yeah,

Speaker 7 cd2-1-26:27

Make the assumption a little blob in every one of us is all the same stuff and this

Speaker 6 cd2-1-26:40

Similar.

Rose: cd2-1-26:43

Now, if they die, of course they can't tell you, but some come back they, but that's the process. The process of dropping ego, egos is death. We die a little. It is like St. Paul I think, said he dies die a little every day because he's getting ready. If his ego egos every day,

Speaker 2 cd2-1-27:01

You have to encounter risk to the ego and disruptions and

Rose: cd2-1-27:09

Yeah. See, there's a little thing here that you have to watch it. I used to think, well, if that's all it takes, if the ego, ego life is all that keeps us, see, in other words, you can drop your vanity or it'll be just like me, the hair falls, I change quite its vein. So that is no problem. It leaves, see some of the vanity leaves, okay, you have an intellectual vanity, intellectual ego, ego that can leave. See, but you have to have hang onto the vanity of the importance of yourself as a living creature. We look up, most people think, oh, there's other people out there. Poor devils aren't as important as I am. I'm really important. Almost everybody has that. See, after a while though, he has to maintain that what I call pride, because if he didn't, he, I will let his body organism deteriorate.

cd2-1-28:00

See, you have to have that basic pride. You can't dump all your egos so that when a guy goes through the experience of this haji samati, it's a synthetic thing in which he really goes through, it loses his body pride loses his importance in relation to the cosmos. Says, Hey, in the next few minutes, I may be zero obliterated forever. And when he does that, he drops all of his ego and boom, the light goes on. Now I'm telling you something that

I can't prove. I'm just telling you an experience. See? So then when he comes back, if he wants to live, he better get his ego back and start scrubbing his teeth and watching the diseases he catches and be proud of his appearance and his stamina and everything. Or he's going to rot while he's on his feet. See? Yes.

Speaker 7 cd2-1-28:51

It's my understanding from these moody stories and from limited experience and becoming closer to the process observer and coming back and so forth, that all of these things you do bring back something to, you may see the hills in the valleys as they were, but you relate to them in a different way,

Speaker 1 cd2-1-29:11

Right?

Speaker 7 cd2-1-29:13

So that there is something, you have some goals, that you want to learn something or you want to do something or make some kind of a contribution that does seem to be a way of operating from some other place than what you

Speaker 1 cd2-1-29:26

Started

Speaker 7 cd2-1-29:26

Doing.

Rose: cd2-1-29:26

Well, I don't know how much of, for instance, I don't know how much of a contribution I make. I often wonder, sometimes I think maybe it's all ego, but I do feel this, that I don't look at things the same. I don't see things in the same importance. The death of my relatives, for instance, I don't say now, oh, this is terrible because the previous conception was they were gone forever. Now I say they might be a hell of a sight better off it's over. See what I mean? And there's no extinction. And another thing is the idea of competition. I can't get competitive. I can't see the sense in whether what's important, whether you have three apples and I've only got two. This to me is it becomes ridiculous to me. The same thing is in relation to the appetites. And I know that some of these boys have known like he has for several years, and they joke about the way I eat. I'm not conscious of what I eat. I could care less what I eat. I just hope they've taken the feathers off of it before it gets to me. That's all. But in the same way with sex, I can't get identified. I can't this get steamed up over something else, which I know is a body that's all with a hell of a lot of problems. So sure, I'm not saying you did. I raised a family, I got married, raised a family after this happened, but it wasn't anything romantic for my wife. I'm afraid.

CD2 track 2

Time 9:14

Speaker 1 cd2-2-00:03

Yeah.

Speaker 2 cd2-2-00:04

Well, you're watching all these relative egos and slowly getting rid of the ones that you see are not very real or they're misleading and so on. Do you ever get to something that might be called a genuine relative self or even is even that?

Rose: cd2-2-00:19

Yeah, you got it. Right now, everybody's got a genuine relative self.

Speaker 2 cd2-2-00:26

I mean, where you get rid of the falses, but there is something like a real ego before you get rid of the real relative. There's even that last one. False too, then.

Rose: cd2-2-00:35

Well, no, I don't see that. They're only real in relation to their function. They're all real,

Speaker 2 cd2-2-00:42

Like the Christian notion that there's an individual soul and you've been molded into

Rose: cd2-2-00:46

Specific. Yeah. Well, the thing is, you'll never, I'm convinced that I am an individual soul and I'm convinced that I am not in any ways individual from the total absolute peas essence. That's what you find out. I am nothing and yet I'm everything.

Speaker 2 cd2-2-01:03

There's nothing like individuality where one soul is different.

Rose: cd2-2-01:07

Oh, yeah. It's like a drop of water in the ocean trying to break loose and vote. Drop is the sand drop. He might be there and he's conscious, but the ocean is one big drop. This is the paradox. In other words, you have to be prepared in philosophy for the paradox, and not that we want to or want to throw one in every time. No, but this is what you discover that first of all, when you get there too, possibly, it might be you might have more separateness than what you feel, but you'll be separate, but you'll be one because you're still observing. The drop of water is still observing the surrounding ocean, but it's boundaries that might not be the same. Yeah.

Speaker 3 cd2-2-02:01

I know that you don't want to push any system of relief or anything, and you just want to be a catalyst. So do you have any advice or any

Rose: cd2-2-02:11

Well, I wouldn't say that I don't do anything because I did write a book and that's provocative. I like to shake people's heads up and say, Hey, start thinking. I don't say everything is really kosher in there that you need to have, but at the same token, I've dedicated the rest of my life to whatever I can do to help people. I have a track to ground back home, and I turned it over to some people it used as an RA so that they'd have a place they'd

come and think, because it's very difficult to think and it's good if you live in town at least once a year, shake your head loose, shake your head loose from the, they tread what I call squirrel cage because you can't stop your thoughts and start new ones. You have to get completely away from the job.

cd2-2-02:56

So I felt that this was necessary, I felt was necessary when I was younger and I didn't have it. So when I got some land, I turned a section over for that use so that people could, and I think it's important. I think there's a number of steps here. I think I don't say there isn't an advice. For instance, I believe the first thing you have to do is you have to establish a priority on what you want in life, regardless. If it's a million dollars, go out whole hog for it. And if it's a spiritual thing, if it's a, I use the word spiritual, while you can redefine that to suit yourself, you can be philosophical if you wish to call it that, but don't do it halfway because you're only going to get halfway and halfway to eternity is nowhere.

cd2-2-03:42

You see what I mean? You can go halfway to a million and get 500,000, but halfway to eternity is nowhere. That's still ignorance because you know nothing until you know everything. That's the reason I meant about definition. I said, define yourself, and immediately the man's right. He says, Hey, you can. That's right, but you keep belabored. But once you find anything, you know everything. Once you're really defined, then you know everything. But to do that, it requires a relative setting positively to have somebody irritate you a bit now and then, and if a lecture or a book or a little Asher someplace where people peck at you and ask you questions, if that helps, okay, that's good. But I don't interfere with, I don't try to say, Hey, you are now a 32nd degree, and so no, I don't gauge.

cd2-2-04:40

I'll tell you something else. See, I believe that I don't believe I'm doing anything. I believe it'd be facetious if I was to try to take over somebody's life. I have never felt that because first of all, any experience, my experience was spontaneous. If you could predict, if you could take a system by which you would reach enlightenment, step by step and write it down in a book step by step, it would not be enlightenment because it would be the risk that you would have to take into account that this would be created by the mind. Under conditions, predicted conditions, there's nothing to be scientific and necessary matters. You have to divert diametrically opposite from scientific prediction and result. That's the basis of science, prediction and result. And a spiritual experience has to be unpredicted, spontaneous because if you go about it in such a way that you'll go say, Hey, I'm getting two degrees hotter, three degrees closer, now such and such will occur, and then tomorrow I'll have so many degrees of enlightenment, nonsense.

cd2-2-05:48

If you'll be kidding yourself, it has to pop on you like a lightning bolt. Okay? Anybody that tries to take a systematic approach to a lightning bolt, it's going to be lying to you, I think. Or it maybe killing your time for you. But I do believe that you can't do certain mundane things, collective economy. You can go on there and cook on the same stove, chop firewood together or something, and protect yourselves by your numbers. So people will let you think a little while and you get a 30 day vacation. Okay? You go think that gives you at least a new perspective. You're not going to be thinking the same treadmill thoughts 365 days out of the year. That's all. And I believe in a place like this, that's the reason there's a group here in Los Angeles is that some boys here decided that they would meet once a week or so just to say, Hey, what are you thinking? Are you still on the treadmill? Get off of the treadmill.

Speaker 3 cd2-2-06:46

What is your favorite way of capitalizing the mind of the spiritual city who comes to you?

Rose: cd2-2-06:52

Mostly attack. Mostly attack. Like he said, I'll ask people what they believe and you'd be surprised. A lot of 'em, I don't say anything too, because if they're creating themselves a heaven and out of faith and belief and fear and you leave 'em alone, that's all. There's certain, you can only help people who have ears. Only people can hear who have ears, meaning I might talk to you and you might not hear me. You may talk to somebody else and they may hear you, but I talk to that person and they won't hear me. This is a strange situation there. You waste your time if you reach too far, what I call too far down the ladder. I look upon this business of student teacher business as a ladder that we are restricted to the understanding of three rungs on the ladder. We can see the man who teaches us and vaguely maybe understand it.

cd2-2-07:54

The man on the rung below, we can see him, he can see us, and we can help him, and this is the law. We have to help him. We're supposed to learn something from somebody else. You can't learn something too much from people on your own rung. You have to work with those on your own rung. That's the relationship there, the brotherhood on your own lung. Okay? Now, if you look up too far, if you reach up too far, you won't understand that man. This is where the language comes in. The ears. You'll write him off as being crazy. You'll reject his theories or whatever, and that's a safety valve. You're not ready. You don't have the capacity. If you reach down two rungs or more to help somebody, crucifixion is the result. That's what happened to Christ. He reached down too many rungs. They pulled him down to the air of the head. You only can talk to those that have an understanding.

Excuse me, I have to leave. I enjoy coming.

Speaker 2 cd2-2-09:03

It's definitely worth my walk, but I do have, okay, sure. Refreshments over here and same touch if you're interested.

Footnotes

End

Retrieved from 'https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php?title=1970s-Lecture-in-Los-Angeles-commercial-recording&oldid=2339'