

1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus-from-DME

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

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

Contents

- 1 Data Template
- 2 Notes
- 3 Transcription from Direct-Mind Experience
- 4 end

Data Template

Also see NOTES ON BETWEENNESS here: [Notes-On-Betweenness-from-DME](#)

Title	1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus-from-DME
Recorded date	Direct-Mind Experience TOC says Columbus 1980, no month or day
Location	Columbus
Number of tapes	Need to locate tape
Other recorders audible?	
Alternate versions exist?	
Source	
No. of MP3 files	
Total time	
Transcription status	Need to compare book (this page) with tape
Working directory all versions	https://distribution.direct-mind.org/ (need password)
Latest version in PDF by title	https://www.direct-mind.org/pdf/ Finished: https://selfdefinition.org/rose/
Published in what book?	Direct-Mind Experience
Published on which website?	
Remarks	This page was erroneously dated 2/15/1981 - now changes
Audio quality	
Identifiable voices	
URL at direct-mind.org	https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php/1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus-from-DME For access to this wiki or the audio files please send an email to: editors@direct-mind.org

Notes

Note January 26, 2023. This page is not indexed properly in the Search feature. Other lecture on DME do appear, so it's not a category issue. Maybe try to rebuild index. See <https://www.mediawiki.org/wiki/Manual:Rebuildtextindex.php>

Note January 13, 2023. This lecture has tweaks (making PDF) so should be reconciled.

This page is the combination of 2 pages from the old database:

A) 351 1777 20140713224315 0 1980-Betweenness-Columbus-from-DME

B) 39 2419 20140713224315 0 1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus

Talk page is this:

C) 130 1459 20120105214937 1 1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus << Talk

This is from the html version, which included "Notes on Betweenness", moved to here: Notes-On-Betweenness-from-DME

The only date given in to book is "1980" - this is printed in the hardback edition.

Needs subheaders and formatting

Has an image - need to accommodate it somehow

Link to images:

First <http://direct-mind.org/images/1981-0215-Betweenness-Akron.jpg>

Second <http://direct-mind.org/images/1981-0215-Betweenness-Akron-2.jpg>

Transcription from Direct-Mind Experience

LECTURE ON BETWEEN-NESS

T.O.C.

Diagrams

Fig 1 - Triangulation

Fig 2 - Healing

Questions and Answers

First question

I would like to talk about Between-ness but first I would like to make a few notes. Between-ness is an art and it is also understood by some as being a high form of magic.

Since it is strictly a mental function or operation it is first necessary to know something about the mind and correct mental posture. We find that most people do not try to think straight. They are moved by emotions and beliefs rather than by selfless introspection and external observations on the results of the paradigms which mankind creates.

Paradigms, language patterns or philosophy patterns are not the result of a conspiracy. The professional conspiracy to misuse the paradigms, is the afterthought. The paradigm or pattern was for centuries, only a workable adaptation.

Regardless of the source of the paradigm, -- it has taken us a long way off course from the original intentions of simply, -- primitive language.

As civilization progressed, different paradigms appeared in different parts of the world, and these paradigms dealt with different religious, psychological and therapeutic approaches.

The paradigms in the past were so respected and trusted that wars were fought to protect ours and eliminate others. But down through the ages philosophers have gone back to those primitive life-styles, to rediscover the context of other paradigms which effected some cures more easily than did our highly "scientific" chemotherapy.

Our paradigm has even made these other paradigms illegal. We've made it illegal to heal people or cast spells by these methods without a doctor's education. Their paradigm may not affect us if we do not indulge in it, but then again it may be stronger than our own if they can think that strongly on it. Between the AMA and the barristers' association we put them out of business.

The more I look into this in the thirty or forty years since I've been in college the more I realize that psychology is failing to discover or understand phenomena in the past that can be very practical and very useful. Recently someone sent to us some books on Sufism. I previously never had much of an interest in Sufism because, I suppose, I associated it with dervishes, and dervishes were not fully understood then. Idries Shah wrote a book on Sufism from which I copied this. In the first pages of it he mentions al-Ghazali. Al-Ghazali refers to a book the al-Undinabi. The title of the book doesn't matter. The message is what matters.

"To the sick man sweet water tastes bitter in the mouth." If I would have read that at another time I would have thought, -- So what! What does that mean? A sick man can hallucinate, or whatever. I wouldn't have normally drawn the conclusion that the real meaning was that the sick man is now in a different paradigm. When he's sick his whole paradigm becomes reversed, and he's very capable of now believing the opposite of what he believed when he was well.

Shah goes on to say that this could very well be taken as Ghazali's motto. "Eight hundred years before Pavlov he pointed out and hammered home, often in engaging parables, and sometimes in startling modern words the problem of conditioning," (which we thought we had discovered and were going to execute on people to make a better world.) "In spite of Pavlov and the dozens of books and studies on human behaviorism since the Korean War, the ordinary student of the mind is unaware of the power of indocrination. One of the most striking peculiarities of contemporary man is that while he now has abundant scientific evidence to the contrary, he finds it extremely difficult to understand what his beliefs are. That his beliefs are by no means always linked with either his intelligence, his culture or his values. Therefore he is almost unreasonably vulnerable to indocrination."

We submit to an indoctrination that seems to go opposite to our intelligence and just doesn't make sense. We might go into the army. Why would you accept the indoctrination? It's because the guy says it's easier that way. If you want to do good in business, you go down and join the local church, but your intelligence tells you otherwise. I remember one time I was in San Antonio, Texas. I had gone down there to interview a witchdoctor, to see what his paradigm was. I ran into Reverend Green from Ohio who had written a thesis on telepathy and ESP. He was a minister and had written his doctorate on it. He still had his church and his parish and I talked to some of his people there. One fellow was very friendly and intelligent. He was a prominent businessman in San Antonio. I asked him, "Why do you go to church?" He said, "I go to church to take my kids to church." I said, "Well, why do you take your kids to church?" He said, "To keep them out of the penitentiary!" I don't know how many people have the same opinion, but this is a good way to keep the children out of the penitentiary.

How many people go to church to find the answer? I was amazed. At one time I thought that people who had very astute or complex thinking processes or computers, would not be able to rest until they applied that computer to the maximum problem, especially if they were in the business of theology. But they don't. They go to church and they submit to the indoctrination. There are hundreds of doctrines, hundreds of churches, hundreds of denominations and nearly everyone says they are all false except their own. They all follow the same path of indoctrination, -- a little singing, a little repetition, a bit of comfortable atmosphere with music or incense. The thing is to get people to function in "army fashion," so to speak.

Shah goes on, "Indoctrination in totalitarian societies is something that is desirable provided it furthers the beliefs of such societies. In other groupings (now, we're talking about philosophy) its presence is scarcely even suspected." This is what makes most everyone vulnerable to it. We don't suspect it. We just hope that everything goes smoothly. "Ghazali's work not only predates but exceeds the contemporary knowledge of these matters. Since the time of his writing, informed opinion is split between (1) whether indoctrination, either overt or covert, is desirable or otherwise, and (2) whether it is inescapable or not." We've got to the point where perhaps we can't escape it.

If you want a job selling insurance you have to submit to so many weeks of conditioning in which they train you to say the right things. You go through so many possible situations and will be told what to say in each situation.

Ghazali also points out that what people call a state of belief may be an obsession. He points out in Sufi terms that it is not inescapable, but that it is essential for people to be able to identify it. Now, this is the sad situation we're in, -- and that psychology is not leading us out of, but it is leading us into. We can't identify when we are snowed.

Here's noble science that looks at religion and says, "You people are as unreasonable as hell, you're dreaming!" In turn, it's using that same tactic in creating a profession, a profession with its own paradigm and almost a wall of invulnerable protection. The paradigm becoming so complex you can't even discuss it unless you get a master's degree, and by the time you get your master's degree you think like the sergeant in the army in that you'd better believe it because you're going to have to eat from that table.

The reason I'm mentioning this is not so much to point out the present situation of psychology, as to point out the miracles such as the simple Aborigine performed. He did them because his psychology was pure. His paradigm was simple. There was no doubletalk. We make fun of the guy who builds totem poles. But that's all we have in our scientific world, -- paradigms, like totem poles. And we're not going to get anywhere with our thinking. It is only after we're able to -- as Idries Shah says -- to identify, that we free ourself and we move on and we can find a conciliatory principle. And from that find some wisdom, and from that find these power mechanisms, that stop the clock... that heal people. I know this may be a little bit difficult for you to tie together.

I gave a similar lecture in Pittsburgh a week or so ago. The group arranged a radio interview to advertise the coming lecture. If you ever feel foolish, it's trying to explain a philosophic point to someone when you only have three minutes to go on the air to understand what "Between-ness" means. This lady came up to me and

said, "We're supposed to ask you some questions on the air. What is this Between-ness? Should we ask you about that?" I said, "Sure, that's all right." She said "Well what is it?" I said, "Have you got two hours? Maybe longer?"

It dawned on me that maybe I could say something. I said, "Have you ever rolled dice?" She said, "Yes." I said, "Okay, then you know what Between-ness is." Any man who has rolled dice or played poker has always had it in the back of his head that if he held his head a certain way, he'd win.

This is the instinctive feeling that every child has, that nature is perverse. That if you hold your head the right way you will come out on top. Every human being has this peculiar thing. I was living in an orphanage as a child. I was amazed at the kids who would put their noses up against the window -- it was this time of year -- winter, and they would have visions of making a snowman and watching a few flakes come down through the air. So they were kind of agonized into coaxing it to snow.

One little fellow was chanting, "Snow, snow, go away. Come again another day."

I said to him, "What's the matter? Are you crazy?! We all want it to snow!" He said, "If you want it to snow, it won't snow." If "it" knows you're indifferent, it will snow.

So you get the point? Thought. No-thought. Creation. The child's mind has it. They don't know the laws. They don't know the manipulations, but they know intuitively something is there if they work it right. And this is right down the line, -- of Between-ness.

I mentioned that this occasionally gets into the minds of people who write plays. I saw a movie. I think it was Cameron Mitchell who played the part. That's the only fellow I can remember out of the play, it was on television. I was curious to know who the author was and how he came up with this, -- this knowledge of magic. This Cameron Mitchell was a drunk who staggered into a real plush casino in the Mediterranean.

He's got a dollar and he wants to bet it on the roll of the dice. There's an old man there who is a sort of a host. He says, "You can't bet a dollar here!" Most of the people just ignored him and brushed him aside. The old man says, "You can't bet a dollar here. One chip costs a thousand dollars."

The drunk says, "Oh, excuse me." He staggers away and goes over to a slot machine and comes back with a thousand dollar chip.

He says, "Can I bet now?", and they said "Yes." So he puts his single chip down, -- but he recites a bit of doggerel. The doggerel is almost meaningless, but as the dice were rolled he would recite this doggerel and the dice would come up on a certain point. He rolls the dice again and he wins. I don't know how many times he rolled it, of course we're dealing in fiction, but he would double his money each time and before he moved away from that table, he had a million dollars.

He's still drunk and a sleek-looking lady there says, "I go with the winner." So he gets his glass full of champagne and they show him staggering off. The old fellow who advised him he couldn't bet a dollar is telling him now to take it easy, that he'd already drank a lot.... So he's going into another room, supposedly to be alone with this lady, -- if that's the proper inference to use. But he goes in there and drops dead. That was the climax of the story.

The realization finally was, -- he was not a million-dollar man. These other people were gambling hundreds of thousands a day and they could do it and it fit into their paradigm. What happened to him was that he used a paradigm that a child might use to win a million dollars and he didn't have the capacity. I was so amazed by this piece of drama, this simple show. Whoever had written it knew that there was a law someplace, that there is a law. This drunk created a very complete paradigm and the only way he could do it was to be in no-thought. He was drunk. He was just in the right degree of drunkenness.

How many people do you know have told you "I won two thousand bucks, or three hundred bucks and I don't know how I did it, I was drunk!," or that they never expected to win or under some strange circumstances they would pick this up?

The purpose of bringing up this drama was that there is a method of doing things, of changing, in changing material events. Max Freedom Long in his book on Huna mentions that the Hunas believe that the human being possesses immense amounts of voltage. I often use the term "quantum energy," which I believe in. I use the word "voltage" occasionally for the want of a better word, but I never thought that it could be measured on the electroencephalograph, but this would be in "mini-volts." Long maintains the voltage is very high but the amperage is very low and ineffective. It doesn't hurt you.

I read an article about the discovery of the "so-called" three brains of man, the neo-cortex, and the other brain, -- the sympathetic part that has emotional aspects to it, and then the final properties of the cerebrum with its logical aspects. He claims that the Hunas believed this, -- centuries ago. The histories of these peoples, both Hunas and Aborigines, may go back 16,000 years. So this is a psychological system that is tremendously old. He just states flatly and drops it that the human being produces some two to three million volts and I'm wondering if he really means some sort of low-amperage current. He goes on to say that this is proven by science.

The whole thing is that the knowledge that these peoples had of the human mind is something that we really haven't caught up to yet. Freedom Long and Brigham before him spent two entire lifetimes just investigating the language, the Hawa-iaian language, to discover their secrets. The secrets weren't written down, they were only given out in initiation. In both the Aborigines and the Hunas. Another person taught them.

There are a lot of people today claiming that they have the Huna knowledge but others claim it is lost. Long claims that when they did away with the practice of it by law, that the people then just neglected it. That it was totally lost.

What is necessary to arrive at this sort of power?... When you are facing an old paradigm that is negative or destructive, let's say one filled full of words such as "disease" or "cancer" and you're trying to supplant it with a paradigm without those terms... this is where your difficulty comes in. I think that any society that does such would have to almost do as the Hunas did. They would have to find themselves an island. They would have to find a place where they wouldn't be overrun and their whole belief-system endangered. The next thing would be to, possibly, only transmit this to a very few people. I don't think it would be written in books. This is the other thing. We like to put everything in textbooks, see, we like to say "Here's how you push the buttons."

In other words, the conditions with which you have success along these lines are first, you must have the confidence or belief of your audience. Christ couldn't perform miracles in his home town, no one would believe him. This is another thing people overlook in the Bible. The whole thing is looked at as "divine healing" but if it was divine healing it wouldn't matter if it was his home town or not.

It says, "He did not do many works in his town and he left there." He went elsewhere. The form of belief depends on your success, because if the other paradigm is real strong you're going to have an audience that pays no attention to you.

The second thing is the capacity of the students that are taught in accordance with their ability to understand. In other words, only the people with "ears" can hear. Not just students, but the people who are going to be "adepts," so to speak. The third thing is a small circle of people who will share the understanding and knowledge which is derived from direct inner experience. It goes back to the point where you are able to develop, or capture the "inside" for answers. In other words, just not specified answers, or not just any answers, which desires serve up.

When you start to look at these different movements with the new paradigms, you find that this is a common denominator in them. Christ and Buddha both came with a message. Both had to find the environment for belief. They had to leave their home town, so to speak. They had to find a larger mass of students than what they had in the inner circle. There were at least seventy disciples. There were only twelve apostles. The percentages of people who have ears still aren't the percentages of people who have the ability to act. In other words, he had seventy students who could hear but only twelve that could act, those that carried the load. This applies to anything. You can't have a single Huna-miracle man. I don't think it would be effective. You can't have a single Aborigine-shaman. They lived together in the same place in Australia, talked the same language, believed the same things, telepathically communicated, accurately, very accurately. They knew when their relatives were sick, they knew when their relatives had died and they didn't have to go and see it. They didn't have to go through the mail. They knew it immediately. If you were around them they would show it. They would say that they had a death, a cousin had died or something.

I'm going to get back to psychology and then if you have some questions....

Belief is functional to cultural survival. We like to think that psychology is above belief, that psychology is only going to deal in proof. But belief is germane to our culture. Psychology deals with all the attributes of our behavior.... Current psychology doesn't believe in the "science of the psyche." The 1930 definition of psychology in Merriam Webster dictionary was the "science of the psyche." "Psyche" and the word "logos" come from the Greek. The "logos" stands for science. In recent definitions of psychology you only have "the science of the reactions of the mind taken together" or something of that sort. I've noticed occasionally a dictionary will add the other definition also, that it is a science of the mind and not just behaviorism, not just man's actions taken collectively.

I think again that this is an attempt to change the paradigm to suit the inability of the "witchdoctor." The witchdoctor can't cure and what he can't cure he leaves out of the dictionary. You don't have a psyche, so you don't have to cure it. I maintain that belief is the tremendous functional part of life, of everybody's life. You can't apply reason to everything. To give an example, the psychologists themselves are at war with each other. If you don't believe me then read Voth, who wrote *The Castrated Family*, and Gross, who wrote *The Psychological Society*. These people come right out and say we're miles off base. That we're destroying the American family with our present psychology. On the other hand you have an author who destroyed his own daughter by putting her in a glass cage, and yet pretends to be the authority on who should monitor the behavior of everyone in the country and maybe the world.

I maintain the reason for this difficulty is the refusal to admit the subjective part of psychology, that's all. It is the refusal to accept the subjective part of man. It's possible inside your head you've got something besides spirochetes. There might be a radio set in there that picks up intuition, or messages, or something from another dimension even. Incidentally, the psychology of the Aborigine works. It works, he proves it. Our psychology doesn't work. What happens in psychology, inevitably, is that there is an attempt to blame society for an individual's erratic acts. Some individuals pick it up very avidly and say "Okay, I'm not to blame. Society is to blame." And he goes out and he commits a crime. Or maybe he just gets unemployed, fails to take interest in society. So then he gets hungry and someone tells him he better go down to the mental health depot so the people with canned answers or canned advice can tell you what to do, or get you into a mental institution and leave you stay there until you get yourself straightened out. So he goes down to the psychologist and the psychologist tells him, "You know what's wrong with you! You've got to take responsibility for your actions!" This is the first thing they will tell him. "You have to take responsibility for your actions." And this is just the opposite of what he's lead his life by. Which is that man isn't responsible for anything. Society is responsible for everything. If you feel like getting drunk, get drunk. Man shouldn't worry about anything. If you feel like being unmoral, be immoral... see? Don't worry about it because it's just an experience and you'll "broaden." Of course if you get broad enough you might terminate. If you take in too much experience, it could be fatal. The point is that there is conflict in authoritative (professional) advice.

The thing is that there are no real logical remedies in the field of psychology or psychiatry. Most of them will flatly admit it. Read Seabrook's book *Asylum*. That was about Bellevue, a famous asylum in the East. Where the therapists candidly admitted that they just allow the patients to stay there until they cured themselves. They saw certain degrees of capability and they'd move them from one ward to another. They had "seven degrees of capability." You know. If they could wash their face, they'd put them in with the others who could wash their face. They'd get closer and closer to the exit door. Incidentally, William Seabrook was an author who was committed there for alcoholism so he was able to make some pretty objective observations.

I believe by the same token that psychology has a tremendously stabilizing effect on religion, as well. For instance, somebody gave us systems like Zen where the whole spiritual search is not done by reading texts from the Bible. It's done by looking inside yourself. A system of self-analysis. And when you reach the end result of that self-analysis you've got the same answer that the person had, who followed dogmatic beliefs and also had the conviction that there was a supreme being of which he was a part. I think the main difficulty is the polarity between true psychology and religion. In too many cases, they refuse to recognize each other.

I'm not going to burden you with too many of these quotations. I read one of the oldest authorities on yoga which is Patanjali. You go back and read this and it is pure psychology. It's about correct actions. You go back to Buddha. What does Buddha talk about? Discrimination. Correct action. This is psychology. Strangely enough, I don't believe you'll find a single lunatic among the Aborigines of Australia. I don't think there's any of them that have an aberration. But, we've fitted this insanity-item very neatly into our paradigm.

To get back to this word Between-ness. I use this word because, like I said, -- there is no other. This is the key-word for the use of a magical system. There's a waiting for the mind, a waiting for events. If you take a certain turn, this is part of it. When Christ was at the wedding feast this was brought up. His mother tried to get him to serve the guests some wine and I think she implied that he could produce some by magic. He turned her down momentarily. He said, "My time hasn't come yet." This kind of stuck in my head. Why did he do this? If he had this divine power it should have been available all the time. When you get into this business of observing how people function, the Aborigine doesn't just throw a boomerang. He waits until a certain tune occurs, he calls it "dreamtime." In that dreamtime a certain thing has to occur. Of course since he lays no claim to divine help he has a very simple explanation for it. This intuition of cognition, all of us have. There is stuff in each of our lives or in our neighbors that we hear about that shows that the human mind is in touch, -- the Aborigine calls it the "elder brother" or something of that sort. We call it the "guardian angel." My idea is that the human mind has to contact something else other than its own memory bank or computer. This happens accidentally enough that we can say with validity that under certain conditions the human mind can contact other dimensions. Or another space-tune dimension, or a far region of this dimension. Another space-time episode.

In this we have *deja vu* experiences. There are a lot of experiences that are listed as *deja vu*. Where you see a wreck before it happens. You don't get on the airplane because you sense something's wrong. We were talking earlier about the bridge that collapsed in West Virginia. Certain people didn't go on, -- but others did because their time had come, so to speak. Intuitional knowledge of deaths in the family and dreams that are precognitive. These dreams that are precognitive seem to indicate that there is such a thing as space-time. Something that can be viewed in the present manifestly has to be happening then. For that person it is happening then.

There is a whole background of so-called healings and magic that has come down to us through the centuries that we have ignored. I think that when you look at these as a whole instead as isolated incidents you begin to get a picture of something.

Before I close I want to give you three factors that true psychology can produce for us. When I talk about psychology I'm not talking about current conventional psychology, I'm talking about the true analysis of things. First of all psychology can give us a better look into our daily lives and we can see where we're not harmonizing. The second thing is that psychology is a validation for metaphysics, for intuition and for religion. The intuition predicts. The intuition postulates a certain psychic condition which science or psychology as a

science later proves. I'm thinking now of ESP. ESP was pretty much frowned upon until the time J.B. Rhine did his experiments with psycho-kinetics. Here's a case where ESP became valid or scientifically acceptable as the result of science. That is, -- psyche became a science.

A third thing is the realization of tremendous psychological powers. It isn't just mind-reading. It isn't just the ability to predict the stock exchange or the lottery. There is an ability to change the condition of matter. It's a very simple method of the way you approach it with your mind. I maintain that the formula lies in this bit of triangulation. It is simply said but it's not simply done. Yet there is enough evidence to show we don't have the limit yet. It seems that you can't put a leg back on a person but, yet, there have been tremendously larger enterprises that have been carried out.

Colin Wilson mentions this thing in his *Mind Parasites*. If you ever get a chance, read it. It is a book of fiction but, again, it is a tremendous message which the author puts down in the form of a fictional story of what he supposes might be, -- preferring not to try to put it down in scientific and mathematical form. The witnessing of the minor things that people do -- if you want to call them "minor," such as the Hunas or miraculous cures -- I think are only the tip of the iceberg. I think that the individual is able to affect a tremendously wider scope. I don't know how far it could go. Nobody knows until they go there. This is my angle for the psychology department, this direction of what we call psychology today. If it could just take a turn or amend the paradigm.

Well, if you've got any questions I'd like to swing over to that...

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: You have to see it. I know that. There is a big gap here. We're talking about something that is entirely new to you. This started out for me, and for some other people, -- some of whom are present here... this started out in our philosophic group as a "rapport session" but often ended up as a healing. The healing was not intended. I don't intend to be a healer. I don't intend to get a reputation as a healer, because you can't do too many things at once. I have a message to deliver and if I can find the words for that I'll be doing my job well. I don't want to break out into many things. These things do happen. There is a way to do it which makes them effective.

Question: When is Frank going to speak?

Rose: When is Frank going to be here? Two weeks. The speaker who will be here two weeks from now. When I first began talking here in Pittsburgh, Frank and his wife would come down every weekend and we would have a sitting. They taught school and on weekends they would come down and have a sitting. We would call it a "rapport meeting." Waiting for mental realizations to occur. There is nothing "weird" about these sittings, they've been doing them for centuries. The early Pentecostal religion used to sit in this fashion for what they called "tarrying." Waiting for a message from God, if you want to call it that. The idea was sitting quietly so the "third party" would join you, which might be the spirit of the Holy Ghost or some "voltage."

When I heard the concept of voltage in the Huna doctrine it reminded me of what happened in these meetings in which there would actually be a voltage pass through the room and everyone could feel it and know exactly where it was. They would all agree on its location, it was almost visible. We were sitting there one day and I noticed that Frank's wife was "out of tune." I looked at her and I saw a headache in her head. Just because of the frame of mind we were in. We were in a neutral frame of mind, or I was at least. I don't know where everybody else was. I said to her, "You have a headache." She said, "Yes, I have a splitting headache!" I sat there a minute and the thought occurred to me, "Take it out. Take it out of her head!" I got up and walked across the floor, cupped my hand over her head and pulled the headache out of her head. There was nothing scientific or logical about that. I did that as a result of not desiring, not fearing, but doing.

You need a triangulation to bring about Between-ness, you have to step out of the paradigm itself. In other words... I once studied under a Zen master and he said to me "We have to use words." You labor and attempt to bring something very subjective out in the best possible of physical terms. This is all you can do. Then

somebody in the audience has an intuition and picks up what you are talking about. This is the only hope you have.

TRIANGULATION

Figure 1 - Triangulation

Question: (Indistinct) Can you create a whole different life?

Rose: That would be a whole different paradigm. This is one thing I couldn't understand about Pearce, although I agree one hundred percent that it was the paradigm that killed his wife. Don't try to put something down there at the other end of the line. Put nothing down there. Don't try to replace it. Contemplate possible nothingness.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: There will always be paradoxes in a paradigm as soon as you start talking about them, this is the thing. We mentioned the Aborigines. They didn't allow anyone to witness when they transferred this knowledge to someone else. I think the purpose of this was that it shouldn't be written down. As soon as you write something down someone makes poems out of it, and then someone finds a philosophy in the poems and writes ten books on philosophy. Like Patanjali, he wrote ten pages and there's been hundreds of volumes written about him. He only wrote ten pages but that may have been too much because it keeps being interpreted and reinterpreted and a language developed around it.

What I hope to bring to you tonight, by words because we don't have conditions to demonstrate, is that there is a way of getting things done without recognizing every paradigm in the universe.

Question: Is your system the same as the concepts thesis, antithesis, and synthesis found in philosophy?

Rose: I am acquainted with those terms, and there is a degree of synthesis in many cases. All those concepts aren't necessary here. I said thought and no-thought brings about an Absolute realization. That is not a synthesis. You cannot add up thought and no-thought and come about with realization. You could add two colors and would get a synthesis of color, seeing the new color was a synthesis of the old colors. It is not the idea of adding the two things at the base of the triangle and getting all sorts of variables. That's not it. There is a certain thing that reacts, or results from the contemplation of both things at once. Not just examining them for qualities, but "holding them in your head," both variables at once. The gut realization comes from contemplating truth and nothingness, like the Zen koan, until your head stops, -- and then everything becomes apparent to you. And then you realize that the only reason everything became apparent to you is because you knew everything and nothing] Everything and nothing are on both sides of the line. If you know everything and nothing you become in union with the Absolute.

Question: (Indistinct reference to Alan Watts.)

Rose: That's very clever! (laughing) I'm not saying it's not the truth, or it is the truth, I don't know. It's one of those tricky little things like whether or not if you continually halve the distance between yourself and a wall, -- will you ever reach the wall? Will you ever really reach the wall, or will you always be "halfway" away from it?

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: It is a point of neutrality. Benoit states this. It's not like an algebraic equation I have here. Thought, no-thought results in Absolute realization. Now if it was an algebraic equation then my answer would be somewhere between thought and no-thought or "half-thought." No. What it is, must be found by trying it, -- you do it, you live it... and this is what happens! You reach an Absolute realization by looking between thoughts.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: You can hardly force it, what happens is that you are forced into it. No one really succeeds in following the blueprint for a spiritual awakening or an accumulation of power. What happens is that he just keeps driving. What we have is the pursuit of the truth, capital "T" Truth. The other thing is that we may be incapable of perceiving the Truth. So you have action opposed by conviction that you will be unsuccessful. You live this. A person on the spiritual path lives this every moment every day of their life, they push, and push, and push... and then nothing logical, mental or verbal can explain what happens, -- an explosion. Your being changes. Your being changes because we are adaptable. The thing is, that in the next dimension you discover our space and time don't work. Our time is dependent upon a visible... sun. Our space is dependent upon an aspect of our consciousness, something far, something near. When the sun vanishes, you're timeless. That's the rationale behind the isolation tank experiments by Lilly. He put the person in a position in which he could no longer see a clock or the darkness and light of day and night, and the fact that he was floating in this tank gave him a feeling of space. This causes the computer to shift to that. Now, the computer cannot deal with "non-values," it has to have some system to go by.

Nevertheless, the problem is there and has to be solved and it can't be solved without a change of being. He can't change his being though, but his being is changed for him by a triggering by a little procedure, which is a neutral state, -- the humble, egoless state of continued energy-application with a desire to know.

The same thing applies to some people studying algebra for the first time. I know this happened to me. You get these problems $X + Y = C$, or $2X + 3Rc = Z$. I said to myself, "What are they doing this for?! Do I have to go through this to study algebra?" But one day something "popped." I never learned algebra, I became algebra! That's the only way I can describe it. All of a sudden it all became reasonable. I couldn't see how I could apply it in my life but I could see it was fairly simple. (Incidentally, algebra is a paradigm in itself.) It all became meaningful. Before it was absurdity.

We work with this. This form of inspiration is how we make battleships and airplanes. And they work. They work, so there must be something behind these inspirations (algebraic) that come to us, because there is no logical reason why $X + Y$ should equal Z , they aren't numerical values.... When you look for an abstract answer in the search for Truth (and you don't even know it will be an abstract answer), -- you don't know what's coming up.... When you look for the answer to the meaning of life and death and self-definition, you may well come up with an abstract answer such as oblivion, if you're a student of the truth. You have to accept what comes, not what you can create. This is what you have to keep in the back of your computer too, -- no phony answers.

That which is is all you want. You never learn the answer, you can only become that answer. Then you can go back and say, "I read that in the Bible!," or whatever. Then you can say that someone who wrote that book knew something about true being. Christ, in the Bible, does not say "I know the Truth." He says "I am the Truth." That is when I realized that he knew he became, he didn't learn the Truth. He became the Truth and he found it through an amazingly twisted persistent, painful process.

Question: (Indistinct reference to illusion.)

Rose: You can't help but come up with this thing of what came first, the chicken or the egg. Who started this thing and what is the purpose of it? The purpose of it may be good, I don't know. I don't believe in condoning the blatant inconsistencies of the illusion. I believe the Truth begins with truth in living, not with a tricky mathematical formulation or with very hypothetical thinking. You have to become the Truth and becoming the Truth means you can't afford to be a damn fool! We can't afford to be snowed. We can't afford to be snowed on any level, whether the government is doing it or the guy who is selling you automobiles is doing it and I'm sure he's doing it.

Everywhere you turn it is open season on the consumer, -- or on the kid in school. He is led to believe he can make a living with this paradigm. The paradigm is getting so rotten it is helping to make more sick people.

We're getting more nut-houses as the result of the science of psychology. They're not curing people. They're not saying that there is a sane and good spirit inside this guy that is okay, and all we have to do is get inside his head. In other words, -- step inside his moccasins instead of treating him as a corpse. We treat him as a corpse, then, you know, in that he's expendable.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: I don't believe we're put here to be in a daydream, or a pipe-dream, or the Supreme Being's pipe-dream. I believe all science is aimed at the Truth. If you study chemistry, it is based on the hardest data they can get, the atomic chart. If you study physics it's based on materials that are weighed, categorized and catalogued. It's consistent, as consistent as they can get. If you deal with psychology or sociology, you are dealing with nebulous systems that have no foundations whatsoever.

At Brown University, I was up there giving a lecture, and one of our fellows flipped out. It wasn't from drugs, I don't know what caused it. I think sometimes he was thinking too much, but he went bananas and he fell over on the floor. He had committed himself to this mental institution.

I went to see him before I left Providence and he flopped down on the floor and the psychiatrist was summoned. Before he got there I reached down and got him by the wrist, -- I held onto his wrist and he changed immediately. He stood up and was perfectly sane. The psychiatrist saw what I did and I said to him, "Can you do that?" He looked at me like he thought I was crazy. The patient was laughing, he was very happy and normal.

I started talking to the psychiatrist and said, "What are you treating this fellow for?" He said, "Well, we don't know." I said, "Well, what are you giving him?" He said "stellazine" or "storazine", or something like that. I said, "What the hell are you giving him medicine for when you haven't diagnosed his illness?!" In other words, he's a pin-cushion. If this doesn't work, try something else, and if that doesn't work, try something else, -- instead of getting inside the person's head and finding out what's wrong.

Of course I can't enforce this on society but I say we can question and question and question and ask "Where are you coming from?" What is a thought? Why don't the psychology textbooks define what a thought is? Why don't they define what mind is. They don't. That is their stock and trade, -- thought. They don't have any definition.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: It makes me more tolerant because I see that's part of the picture. In other words, identification is all you wind up with, you'll be able to identify phoniness, when you see it. It'll help you in your relations with other people. If your wife starts throwing a certain type of fit, you know it's just a certain time of the month, it's not time to haul her away and start shooting the dope into her. That's the unfortunate solution to everything today, chemotherapy.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: I'm aware that there is an abominable tragedy going on about me every day, which is nothing more than a drama. People unfortunately have to believe it. Then you have people in Hollywood creating another one inside of it. Like the kids in the other room playing house. It's not bad enough that he has to grow up and be a householder and suffer like a householder. No, he can't wait, he's going in the other room and act at playing house, or he might have tin soldiers on the floor and he's playing army. Make-believe. We seem to be prone to make-believe, and we love it.

I was talking to a man back there from the west coast and we were talking about all the make-believe religions on the west coast. I'm appalled at the stature of the people that go to hear C.P. talk, for instance.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: Energy is a substance and it happens, -- boom! He is zapped and the change occurs. The fellow who is paralyzed gets up and walks or the crazy fellow has mental clarity, and it happens instantaneously. It is a transfer of what I call "quantum energy." Now, I have an explanation of where that comes from. It doesn't come from "upstairs," it comes from the way you live. The healer has to live a certain continent type of life. You cannot accumulate energy while spending it.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: You're thinking about thinking, and by thinking about thinking, you want more understanding. You're criticizing us for having understanding. We're going to think about thinking about thinking about thinking about thinking about thinking about thinking, and that's understanding... infinite understanding! No, No. It's very simple. Knowing. Being. Boom! And then thought is superfluous.

Question: (Indistinct)

Rose: Convictional states. Maybe some of you have read Gurdjieff. Gurdjieff categorized four types of men: the instinctual, the emotional, the intellectual, and the philosophic. I maintain that this is a very good categorization. The man on the lowest state, the instinctual or "lizard-brain man" only lives for reproduction and pleasures and when he gets "religion," he gets the "salvation" experience. It is a paradigm they build up and they feel very comfortable in it. It's like the presidential debaters. When they're inside their own paradigm, they can give you a lot of fancy answers. It's the same way with these different levels.

I studied when I was a young boy to be a priest. I would try to talk reason to these monks who were teaching me and they would say, "Oh... we're above all that. We're above all that logic because you don't find anything out until you believe."

So you see, they said that after you believe for awhile all this great Reality descends on you and you don't have to reason. Unfortunately I couldn't accept that. These preachers have lost something through their belief, or, that is, they never really found it in the first place, and they certainly lost the ability to communicate. Man with his intellectual immanence has to talk dog-language if he's speaking to dogs. And men that are ignorant, and the only language they have is in objective terms, have to somehow be communicated with in objective terms.

You can't just say "Stick your head in the sand and chant this mantra until you believe it." Or, "Say these prayers until you no longer resist." No. I believe that there is a method of digging and that is in observing everything, keeping your mind open to everything. You take what Benoit calls the "pure conciliatory position" in which you use two eyes and see both things at once. You widen your perspective. Right below conciliatory principle I have another word which is Between-ness. It is not the fanatical leaning towards any one view but the constant comparing it with its opposite. Is the opposite true? How much of a degree are you sure of yourself? To how much of a degree is it possible that the opposite is true?

We go on and we recognize that religion and psychology represent two faculties of the human mind, strangely enough. They are almost good metaphorical words for intuition and reason. The religionist is drawn to, and functions, or joins because of an intuition. He can't give you logical reasons why he believes that "Mr. X" or "so and so" is the savior. He just relies on it. This is another weakness, of course. We like to rely on democratic thinking. We like to have statistics and rely on statistics. If fifty-one percent of the people believe that green is composed of black and red, then green is composed of black and red. We change the truth to fit the system of democratic choice.

This isn't valid, of course. Things are as they are and have been since the beginning of time. We try to distort them a bit by trying to force them into our particular political or conceptual paradigm. I'll explain the word paradigm if you are not acquainted with it. It is a very appropriate word because it implies that we do not have truth at all. We have indulgence in paradigms. Every science has a paradigm. In other words, if you get out of a penitentiary, they will have a language there which cannot be understood anyplace else. In the army there is a

certain language. In a research laboratory there is a certain language, abbreviated terms and the like. In a hospital they have a special language. For instance, they call a "hemostat" a "stat." A person unacquainted with this language will be lost. Chilton Pearce brings out, incidentally, that he believes the paradigm is responsible for our belief in illness. Whatever fits into the language of the people will contribute to its own existence. Half the things that appear are the result of the belief that they will appear. Whether this is true or not doesn't matter, but what can be seen is that we do believe in paradigms. The army sergeant says, "You'd better believe it" in the army paradigm. He says it a hundred times. Why does he say it? He says it because it's easier to live in the paradigm than to keep saying "Why?"

Reason is identified with the psychological direction in man, in that man tries to objectify his thinking processes. He feels the tangible world is very important and he tries to make his thinking tangible. The intuitional thing seems miles away. The intuitional person can't talk to the person who is very logical, or demands proof of everything. We take this bottom line again and see an intuition and reason which seem to never meet. But when they do, from a superior conciliatory point off the straight line, you have wisdom. Philosophers are people who observe both sides of the story. They will agree to, or will study anything that relates, and not just what agrees with them. This is the only way you can arrive at a more correct understanding.

Down below the word wisdom I have written something else, -- "being" and "Between-ness." The inner Self I capitalize, and the outer self is the fellow you smile at in the mirror. Your higher Self is synonymous with your Source. You don't learn this through reason and you don't learn it always through crude intuition or superstition. It has to be perfected intuition and perfected reason. By this I mean the intuition has to be tempered with the reason. This causes through wisdom, -- a change of being. It may be gradual, so gradual he does not notice it. What has changed him is this word "Between-ness" because I have no other word for it even though it sounds like a very plain word. It is the conciliatory principle and the things that result from being between, never allowing yourself to flop fanatically to one polar opposite or the other.

We have the same thing in our scientific thinking regarding space and time. We have a line and on one end of it is space and on the other is time. No one sees any relationship. They are the two ways in which we like to describe what we call our life. We live so long, we occupy so much space. Observed from the conciliatory principle we have an item called "space-time." You might wonder why I am mentioning this. It is because this has to do with psychology and mystical experiences. In mystical experiences space and time are out of sync. Most of your great mystical experiences are space-time experiences. Most people who had them at first thought they were nuts until they realized that they occurred in a dimension not ruled by paradigm-concepts.

The reason that we are ruled by paradigm-thinking is because at first this is the only way we can see. I would like to explain "triangulation" and mention it in regard to surveying. If you want to find the very center of a hill, you can do this by standing away from that hill about a mile and sighting from a straight plane to the top of the hill. You can get a line from the top of the hill to the very center of the hill by this type by computing with trigonometry. Without an instrument (meaning a drill) you can measure the depth of the hill by measuring distances and using the three angles of the triangle. You will be able to find the center of that hill which the only other way would be to bore a hole into it. The same thing applies to Benoit's system of triangulation. It's very similar.

We can't see the center of the hill. We would have to do it very arduously and climb to the top of the hill, then bore a hole through the top and then bore a hole through the side to get that same triangle. The same thing applies in psychology. By the use of triangulation you will discover things.

Now we have a thing called "thought" and at the other end of the line we have a thing called "no-thought." In the Zen experience you start with a person who is a thinking creature, and he may come to a point where there is no thought. If a person comes to this place through the use of dope, and he strongly believes in the place he has left, then he will have consternation. It happens occasionally that the mind just ceases to think. Let us say, if the person's energy is "right," then from the point of triangulation he reaches what I call "Absolute realization,"

-- a combination of thought and no-thought, a combination of everything and nothing. This can only come about through thinking, thinking about things being everything or the polarity of nothing. When the computer goes to work on this problem, the result is Absolute realization.

We have a system of magic that results from this triangulation. On one side of this line we have the thought of a paradigm, a system. The paradigm may be a paradigm of faith, or the belief in entities, like in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, -- that there might be entities that can "swing the deal" for you. The thought, whatever it is, will involve some paradigm, it might be some kabbalistic ritual. That's a paradigm. "Paradigm X" I have. (Referring to a drawing on an easel) On the other side of the base of the triangle I have "no-thought of that paradigm." At the peak of the triangle we have the words, -- new paradigm generation or magic.

I came across this not by talking to Ambrose Worrall, but by reading strange accounts of things that people did. The TAT Society puts out a journal and occasionally we get a good article in it. A good article in our upcoming issue (#10) is on the Australian Aborigines, and has to do with what we would call miracles. These Aborigines live in places in Australia where many "civilized" men die just trying to explore them. The Aborigines survive there, and they survive there by knowing. For instance, what I mean by knowing, is that they can throw a boomerang and hit a rabbit on the other side of a hill that they cannot take a sight on with their eyes. They lapse into what they call "dreamtime" in order to do this. They become in contact with what they call the "Two Brothers." We in the western world would just think that he is "picking this skill up" somehow, but it can't be disputed regardless that he gets the rabbit everytime with his boomerang. These abilities aren't accidents because their survival depends upon them. These people are even suspected of having rejected culture because they had everything "sewed up." They had control of this plane from another dimension. They were getting help, everything that was needed by them in the lines of food was provided just by going inside their own heads, getting into "dreamtime" and then throwing their spear or trotting over a hill to pick up a kangaroo's body. (Rose reads from Journal story of Aborigine tracking perfectly the trail of a man who had crossed the plains a year previously.)

Do you get the point of what he did? He was back one year. He retreated one year, and followed the other man across the desert along side of him. That is what is meant by "contemporaneous." He put his mind in a situation in which he would be contemporaneous with the original act. If a murderer disappears over there, they can find them. They're almost one hundred percent accurate.

What did he do on the relative dimension? First of all he changes the paradigm. He doesn't live according to our paradigm because we don't believe these things can happen. The second thing is that he visualizes his system. He visualizes what he's supposed to do or accomplish, perhaps by reminding himself of the person's piece of clothing he has. He actually retreats in space-time. That's the reason of space and time on this line in triangle. Space and time no longer exist in his paradigm. He is free to travel in any segment of that now solidified space-time experience, -- or to describe it.

Consequently these people whom we look upon as being "aboriginal" actually have the secret. We don't find it in our scientific books because scientists have to laboriously prove every step of the way before they can come up with a conclusion. There are other people who do them, just do them, and then leave it up to us to figure out how they did them.

END

end

Retrieved from 'https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php?title=1980-Psychology-of-Miracles-aka-Betweenness-Columbus-from-DME&oldid=2386'