

1981-Intensive-Farm

[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 File 1
 - 3.1 Body, Brain and Consciousness
 - 3.2 What do you know for sure?
 - 3.3 Intuition and Reason
 - 3.4 The Mirror
 - 3.5 Reads some more questions
 - 3.6 Speaking to the public at lectures
- 4 File 2
 - 4.1 Speaking to the public at lectures - cont.
- 5 Footnotes
- 6 End

Data Template

Title	1981-Intensive-Farm
Recorded date	1981
Location	Farm
Number of tapes	One 90 minute tape (this is a copy of a copy)
Other recorders audible?	
Alternate versions exist?	
Source	N
No. of MP3 files	
Total time	
Transcription status	Partial 1st - started June 2015
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?	
Published on which website?	
Remarks	High priority material on dealing with the public in meetings, end of DW side 1 first 10-15 minutes of side 2.
Audio quality	First 30 minutes quality is fair in that words are distinct, but audio spectrum is telephone quality. Last 15 minutes of side 1, and all of side 2 has a lot of noise. If this occurred in the duplicating process, a better version may exist somewhere.

Identifiable voices	Augie Turak, John Kent, Bill King, Vince Lepedi, Several more
URL at direct-mind.org	https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php/1981-Intensive-Farm For access to this wiki or the audio files please send an email to: editors@direct-mind.org
Revision timestamp	20150630102226

Notes

"Truth is a white swan on a blue lake" << this is explained about min 40 on DW side 1. From "Zen and Common Sense Essay"

This talk has no "numbers exercise", so numbers information was moved to separate page Numbers-Exercise

Good material at end of side 1 and on side 2 how to deal with the public.

Side 1 is similar format w/ as 1978-Direct-Mind-Intensive-WV but they are different.

For example, 1978 has Tweeny Town (side 1). This tape does not.

File 1

Side 1 File 1 = 47 minutes. [Note: Tape begins with RR reading questions (midway through the list) in lecture of questions, straight through, without commentary; tape begins with the questions on duration and time.]

dw1-00:00

What is duration? How does a lifetime feel like?

Why is it different for a child and an old man? A child feels the time will never pass. An old man sees everything as yesterday.

What is the relation of memory to time? Do we remember a duration? Do we remember how long a pain lasted when the pain occurred a year ago? We will remember the minutes or hours a pain lasted only if we made a note of the duration on the clock the time it occurred.

Do we remember pain, or just recall the memory of associations to [with] the pain? Such as loss of work resulting from argument or trouble.

When we listen to a clock ticking, thinking that we can hear time, do we not hear the individual and characteristic noises of the clock, while never knowing how long a second is?

If we think our mind understands the ticking of seconds as having exact meaning, what does the mind experience, what does the mind experience when it hears a clock ticking when the mind is in a delirium? If a mind can be so distorted, can it ever really know how long a second is?

dw1-01:22

What is space?

Is space interdependent with time?

Is space measure by inches and miles, or light-years, and the time it takes for a human to traverse it?

Are space and time measured by each other? Or are space and time measured by human experience? – by human consciousness projected upon an idea or object, together with a conscious projection of duration.

Do space and time exist independently of each other? Does either space or time exist at all?

What can man do?

Can a man act, or react?

Is man just [?] a different life form than [from] a carrot?

What is living?

Is living valued by sleeping, eating, reproducing, getting happy, getting drunk or being rich?

Or is living valued by thinking, education, meditation, ability, experiencing psychedelic delights or experiencing spiritual ecstasy?

dw1-02:43

Or is living disregard for all such experiences, and disregard for life itself?

Is living disregard for all unnecessary actions?

What can man stop doing?

If a man cannot stop doing, what does he ever begin to do?

Is discovery plainly? reality creation and projection? If this is true, then the discovery of the true nature of discovery is also creation and projection.

Or is the discovery of discovery merely a redundant term? Or is it impossible?

Or is discovery of the mechanism of discovery the only true discovery, of the two instances?

dw1-03:37

What is meaning?

Is true meaning the degree of relationship of things with their opposites and with things similar?

turn down to -6

Or, is true meaning the degree of relationship of things to ourself?

Is a cat everything that is not [?] a cat? Or is a cat a thing in itself?

Is definition a language? basis? Or is it a disease?

Is meaning expressed in definition, or is meaning projected by us?

Are there two meanings to life forms? – one which we project upon them, and one which they project according to their desire?

Are there three meanings to life forms, the two above, and the real meaning of that which projected them?

Or is there only one meaning to be learned, the meaning of that which projected all life forms?

dw1-04:36

Body, Brain and Consciousness

[Was not able to find these koans published elsewhere.]

What is consciousness?

Are we conscious of external, objective things?

Do we project them and their meaning? Or are we just conscious of projecting?

Is the body all that is aware? Is there something that is aware of the body that is above or behind the body, which we define as self?

Are only living bodies aware?

Is life a requisite of consciousness? Or is the self aware of [that] life in the body has suffered from the life of the self? [?] If the living body responds, and in death does not respond, then maybe the self too may not be conscious if its life is removed.

dw1-05:19

Does this inner self really have eternal life or does it die?

What is the nature of the inner self?

Does it perceive and remember after the body goes?

How can the self perceive when the brain and senses decay?

Is the mind in the brain?

Is the mind in the DNA molecule?

If the mind and memory are separate, where did the mind make contact with the body?

Does the mind make contact between the synapses, or within the DNA molecule?

Why is the mind apparently dead in sleep?

Are not the memories inhibited in sleep?

Is not awareness missing in sleep?

If the mind is independent of the body and not subject to the body's physical limitations or fatigue, then the mind in sleep must be somewhere else.

If the mind is alive in the case of sleep, why are we not aware of the place or activity of the mind?

Can the mind be aware outside the body?

Does the mind leave and reenter the body? Where is the door and the connection?

dw1-06:33

Is consciousness basically sensation?

Is sensation-type reaction not binary, limited to positive or negative reactions?

Is such reaction caused by pleasure or pain in varying degrees or combinations?

Is the meaning of pleasure not measured by the meaning of pain?

Is pleasure only that period when there is less pain?

Is not consciousness basically pain?

Would our inner awareness cling to life if leaving life is not associated with being in pain?

Is real self-consciousness not even more painful?

Do mystics lie about ecstasy in regard to self-consciousness?

What do you know for sure?

[this is the “traditional” list]

dw1-07:28

Now these are a little different type of questions. They are more direct to the individual. They are titled, “What do you know for sure?”

Does a man own a house or does the house own him?

Does a man have power or is he overpowered?

Does a man enjoy or is he consumed?

Does a man really reason or is it all a complex rationalization?

Does a man rationalize or is he so programmed?

Can a man learn that which he really wishes to, by himself alone?

Can a man become?

How shall he know what he should become?

Why build anthills before knowing what an ant is?

Why do we build conceptual towers of Babel about human thinking before we know that which thought is?

How can you dare to define thought before knowing the source-cause of all thought, or the essence of thought?

dw1-08:37

When you describe bouncing do you describe the striking object or that which is struck?

Can you start thinking? Can you stop thinking?

Is thought something received or something projected?

Is thought a sort of somatic effluvium?

Do we think or are we caused to think?

Is negative thinking as commonly discussed, negative to man or negative to nature?

Does the brain generate thought like a radio generates a message, coming from its speaker?

Is thought limited to the brain?

When a tree bends over, does it create wind by waving its branches?

Can theological facts be established by voting?

Is Mary the mother of God or is humanity the mother of God?

Is God determined by victorious armies?

Is virtue established by psychological edict, by ecclesiastical vote, or by the requisites of our ultimate essence?

What is sin? On offense against yourself, an offense against your fellowman, or an offense against God?

Is an offense against God recognized by divine outcry, earthquake or cosmic catastrophe?

Is it a sin to eat meat?

Are the animals our brothers? Are they possessed of intelligence and soul?

Do the animals sin when they eat other animals? Or are such sinning animals pardoned for keeping ecology in balance?

Is it wrong to kill except for food?

Do we do wrong by not eating the people we kill?

dw1-10:29

Who is knowledgeable about good?

Is good that which we desire, or that which is in itself good?

What is the condition of being in-itself good?

Is evil the child of good, or is it a twin?

If a man drives a horse through a plate glass window, should we prosecute, the man, or the horse that went through the window?

If a man robs to feed his children, should we prosecute the man or that which drove him, the children?

If a man rapes a girl should we prosecute a) the man, b) the girl who tempted him, c) his ancestors for his genetic inheritance of glandular inclination, or d) the forces that designed mankind?

What is equality?

Was Sampson equal to Delilah? Is a baby equal to a dying man?

Are you only half of a plan by virtue of not possessing both sexes?

dw1-11:48 Is peace of mind more important than global peace or herd peace?

Who or what are you?

Are you only a body? Are you rather a complex organism, a cell colony? A nature-oriented bundle of conditioned reflexes?

Is the brain a monitoring station designed for the organism's indefinite survival, or is our body programmed for death by the death gene following procreation?

Is all religion and philosophy merely rationalization emanating from that computer to answer constant cellular awareness of death? Or is the universal belief in life after death an intuitive reading from that computer, a reading not completely translatable into computer symbols which are limited?

Is there a soul? Did it exist before the body? Or must it be developed, grown or evolved?

Define the following: Mind, other than somatic awareness; subconscious mind; ego, id, super-ego; chakra; kundalini; tisra til; astral, etheric, causal body; desire body; halo; ectoplasm; aura; spiritual ear (Shabd); conscience; spiritual nectar; philosopher's stone; guardian angel; hydrogen [Gurdjieff's usage].

dw1-13:16

What is the correct definition of sanity?

Do our psychologists practice rationalization and make-believe when they substitute behaviorism for a deeper set of factors of human origins? Or factors of prenatal determination? Meaning factors that would bring us to the knowledge of the true essence of man.

Do they not procrastinate the search for real causes? Do they not manifest a possible paranoia, in fear that subjective observations and pursuits might find more substantial things about the essence of man?

Which is the worse schizophrenic, the man who talks in tongues, the schizophrenic who is possessed and cannot help himself – or the professionals who create great volumes of confusing, complex terminology, describing nothing better than their own frustrating dichotomy?

Which is worse, the manic-depressives who brood and babble as a result of excessive voltage, chemical imbalance, some electrolytic deficiency or toxic condition – or the pompous alienist who babbles on the witness stand that this or that man should be subjected to ice pick, shock treatment or electric chair?

microphone loud feedback, 15 seconds of noise removed at dw1-14:36]

Intuition and Reason

dw1—14:43 We have a few notes now, in a different vein from the questions for what their relation is to our ?? ?? They're disjointed and they're not in any given order. But they provide some thought. This has to do with intuition. It's a little material written on intuition ?? ?? short statements

[Reads Intuition-and-Reason published here: <http://tatfoundation.org/forum2004-10.htm#1>]

By meditation men have improved their Intuition,

By suffering and adversity, men have improved their Intuition,

By abstinence from food, or from certain foods, men have improved their Intuition.

By abstinence from sex action men have improved their Intuition.

By the establishment of a system of shocks, or alternation between abstinence and indulgence, between suffering, and happiness, or even ecstasy, men have improved their Intuition.

By various mental exercises men have improved their Intuition.

By the practice of concentration on one thing, then on many things, and then on nothing, men have improved their Intuition.

By the practice of remembering the self, men have improved.

By the practice of concentration on various nerve centers, men have improved their Intuition.

Reason may be improved by the coordination of similarities and opposites in nature.

Reason may be improved by qualifying all statements with their relative nature.

Reason may be improved by exploring the possible opposite of that which seems to be final.

Reason may be improved by listening to the words of those who firmly believe in opposition to ourselves.

Reason may be improved by the study of mathematics.

Reason may be improved by the study of symbols, words numbers or figures, or by the juggling of these, or by exchanging or interpolating symbols of one system for those of another system, and by the resulting effect of all this upon memory and imagination.

Reason may be improved by desire, or fear.

Reason may be improved by the determination to reason.

The Mirror

dw1-17:25

Reads "The Mirror". On this site: Mirror

TAT Journal Issue 10 -- Source: http://www.searchwithin.org/journal/tat_journal-10.html#6

The Mirror by Richard Rose

Who is it that speaks to you?

Who is it that listens to me?

If all is God ...

Can we pretend to be the soliloquy of God?

Can we pretend for a moment that we are all particles of God,

Enjoying his divinity?

A bird in the tree sings, saying,

I am here now, I am here now,

O the glory of being here now. . . .

O the glory of being here. . . .

O the glory of Being. . . .

O the glory of. . . .

O the glory of meeting a predator. . . .

And he meets a worm, which like manna

Is a delicacy, a divine aspect,

A gift of God's own body in particle form.

And he eats the worm joyously. . . .

God victorious and God experiencing destruction. . .

God sadistic and God masochistic. . .

God organic and God as fertilizer. . . .

Changing

Ever changing

As decaying bird-food, as fertilizer,

Revitalizing less organic soil,

Creating a cradle for millions of microscopic organisms.

All singing the praises of life,

With songs of exultation, anger, despair, and fear.

All singing about orchestral soil,

And echoing the desire of God to experience all.

Do we not hear the voice of God

Howling with funereal sullenness,
Through the forest in the winter. . . .
Roaring in cascading rivers,
Piercing his own sensitivities in lightning and ocean gale,
Feeling cosmic pain in the explosion of planets,
In the quaking of planets. . . .
Or in the divine breath of a hurricane?
Are we not more fortunate than those
Who are "being there then,"
Caught and frozen in a winter wilderness. . . .
Swept over the falls of a treacherous river. . .
Swallowed by an earthquake,
Or incinerated by lightning. . .
Or flung to their death by the winds?

Should we rejoice that God
Through tiny human nerves
Experiences all forms of horror and pain,
Despair and fear?

But the God within all, in all now. . .
Witnesses that not all freeze,
Not all are drowned or torn to pieces. . .
He witnesses this only through human nerves,
In and through his audience of millions,
Through his millions of eyes, ears, and noses
That watch others die, butchered a million different ways,
That watch others suffer
That watch others hope and lose hope

That witness instilled courage change. . .

To instilled despair and terror.

Can we imagine the glories of a God

So self-watching, so identified with us,—

Who are so identified with this pointless game?

Unless we visualize God as infinitely introspective

That watches the eater and the eaten

The beater and the beaten,

Watches the millions uneaten observing

The ones being eaten,

Watches the millions unbeaten,

Observing the ones being beaten,—

There seems to be no point to this drama.

And now he watches another group of observers,

Less numerous than the simple observers,

Those who watch the watchers,

Those who study madness and record madness in a way that pretends to be orderly and sane,

Who study observers

And have millions of reactions

Singing the praises of God by a thousand different names,

While they train themselves to act as rescuers,

Digging out God's victims,

From hurricane, earthquake, or typhoon,

From freezing, burning, or drowning,
From terror and desire and fear,
From thinking about origins and destiny,
From the anguish of loving,—

Doing God's work and believing,
That God likes observers acting concerned,
Acting as though God as the victim needs rescuing,
That God as insanity needs explanation. . .
That God as the destroyer needs apology,
Or needs humans taking on God's sins. . .
By acts of pious asceticism.
For God now breaks into many parts,
Observers watching observers,
And observers of observers of observers,
But which of these billions is really here now? . . .
Which of these particles, among God's infinite number of particles,
Is watching God???

Is he alive to all who watch death and life,
Is he alive to God. . .
Who rejoices in seeing God particularized?
Or is he alive who is not among the myriad observers,
The myriad eyes that sleep or remain less asleep?
Is he alive who hears through millions of ears,
Of greater or lesser dependability,

Or is he alive.
That turns his back on madness,
On rejoicing and despair,

On pleasure and pain,
On Gods and God-particles,
And who looks on nothingness with apathy and indifference,
Who laughs at the thunderings of Hell
And the shrill insanity of Heaven,

Who feels with feelinglessness,

As only God can feel. . . .

But who turns once more back to his fellow man

Saying

I have become a mirror,

min 23

Look beyond my beauty,

Look beyond my ugliness,

Look beyond my wordlessness,

My inarticulateness, My fractured mentality,

For I have been back there freezing and exploding,

burning and drowning,—

I have been the insanity of those observing,

I have lost all my particles except that which is a mirror,

Which is nothing of me,

But which gathers other particles

Which are inarticulate, And which identify with other

infinite articulations of madness.

I am that which gathers other particles,

Saying,

Let us be mirrors.

I am not a mirror of moaning and misery,

I am not a mirror of praying and pleading,

I am a mirror of the process called seeming,

I mirror the seeming. . . .

Watching the watching of seeming and dreaming.

The puppets of the Absolute have broken their strings,

Have formed agreements to dream dreams,

Have agreed to pretend to create other puppets,

And have agreed upon madness together,

Until madness has become to them as reality,

While unconsciously they hunger for

The comfort of the guiding hands of their puppeteer.

I am a mirror that madness looks upon,

And sees a hope surmounting foolishness,

I am a mirror that reflects no madness

And seeing nothing but a seeming of madness.

I am a mirror that looks not to reflect love

For I perceive no love but a seeming of love,

And I see no justice, divine or human,

But a seeming of justice.

I am a mirror that was not made and remade to

Reflect only seeming. . . .

I am a mirror also of myself,

Watching myself, watching myself, watching myself

ad infinitum.

I am a mirror alive and aware

Aware of being aware of being aware of being aware. . . .

ad infinitum. . . .

Untimed and unspecialized,

Dreamless forever,

Not dreaming of life or dreaming of death,

Not dreaming of Gods or demigods.

I am a mirror with my back to humanity,

Vainly lighting a direction,

For puppets to pick up threads and contact,

Strings to the Absolute.

I am a mirror facing the Absolute,

There is nothing to face, until we turn our backs

Upon the void. . . . Upon projections. . . .

Upon particularization, Upon seeming. . . .

Until we realize we are not turning away

From a void or from confusion or meaninglessness,

Until we realize that we do not realize. . . .

Except that the Absolute has a mirror

Which it turns upon itself,

Saying

I have had enough of my adventure,

Into endless possibilities of my self. . . .

[End of The Mirror]

Reads some more questions

dw1-26:01

Note: Art Ticknor mention in the TAT Journal that these were (also?) presented in “a winter intensive in 1979-1980.” <http://tatfoundation.org/forum2008-11.htm#1>

Now let's go to some questions. I would ask you now at this point ...

Why do you study, or why do you work? Why do you pursue whatever you're pursuing so actively? To get a better job? To get a better sexual mate? To get a better position besides just food and shelter?

Is this pursuit a pursuit of ?? fantasies that will beget fantasies, and fantasies again that will beget other fantasies?

Or do you study or work to buy a better house, so that the house will own you? And then this house will stand to constantly remind you that you are locked in space and time. We are locked into material attachments.

Are our heads really dominated by our gonads? Or do we still have an innate spiritual hope? Unless our intuition sees a solution.

Can spiritual hope and belief be nothing but a part of a robot's programmed stimulation?

Does a robot have any meaning or purpose beyond the intents of the program?

Can a robot program himself in any degree?

Can a robot be programmed by other robots for his own good?

Or can a robot decide on a purpose, and know what is good for himself enough to submit to programming by another? Or with the help of another robot

Would such a robot come to know himself in this manner?

dw1-28:07

Can logic be defined as well-coordinated robot functioning? Reacting with seeming consciousness by detailed programming to every possible situation or suggestion?

Is sanity defined by logic?

If so, is sanity attained by logical means?

Is it sane to study material sciences?

Is it sane to study subjective sciences?

Can psychology be approached as a material science, or is it a subjective science?

Is it sane to be curious about our origin and our destiny?

Is it sane to wish to know that which is our real essence?

Will the finite mind ever perceive the infinite?

Now again: <<<< This is repeated

Can the robot program himself to any degree?

Can a robot be programmed by other robots for his own good?

Or can a robot decide on a purpose and know which is good for himself enough to submit to programming by another, or with the help of another robot?

Would such a robot come to know himself in this manner?

Can the robot program himself to any degree?

Does a robot have any meaning or purpose beyond the intent of the program, that is programmed for him?

Can a robot be ...

[break in tape]

Speaking to the public at lectures

dw1-29:47

[After the tape break the reading has finished.]

... universally objective. In other words , if you get up, for instance, I wrote a paper on the definition of truth. [here: Defining-the-Truth and at this link: http://www.searchwithin.org/journal/tat_journal-09.html#2

And I wrote it for the general public. And I can't remember too much about it. I have some copies of it here. But I realize that some of you try to go in depth. [?] Now first of all, it was in depth. [tape splice?] Some of you didn't. For instance, did you notice anything, I'd like for you to say what you saw generally about this. Yeah. The comments.

dw1-30:46

Q. I saw a few unique categories, one of them dealt primarily with absolute truth; and the others were almost political? poetical?.

R. That's one of the words I've got written down here "poetic".

Q. The other category was like everyday, pragmatic, workaday experience.

R. Relative.

Q. ??

R. Yes, see, I had in mind verifying what a person, in other words, when you ask a question, of course, this doesn't matter if you ask it of one individual or 500 people in an audience, the question is still there, "What is the truth?"

[possible tape edit, gap]

[Refers to written responses to questions he had asked.]

Did anybody else notice anything particular that's a common denominator or say, something that was maybe extreme or – you don't have to remember the individual person who ...

dw1-31:51

Q. Some were along how to ??

R. Yeah ...

Q. I have a question. A lot of us presumed [gap]

R. Yeah, that too. I've got that here, "How to find it." There's a lot [of them] that went into how to find it that didn't define it. Nobody defined it. I started off by saying, "I can't define it, it's indefinable," then they went ahead and tried to define it. I don't know whether you noticed that or not. Then there was a poetic presumption of the value: it sounded really good, it was, little words were copied from Three Books of the Absolute here and there, you know, and different writings.

Q. Some of them were very pragmatic, they were very good definitions that you might not find in the dictionary

R. That's true. Well, the first thing that occurred to me when I was listening [?] was, I put here "in depth?" with a question mark. Not many were in depth. By "in depth" I didn't mean to wax? fermin? [laughs] "I wasn't, but I promise to be next year. [?] And I'm doing it because it's shining down the road." [?] The autumn moon or something.

dw1-33:33

The second thing I picked up was that they were telling? how to find it without defining it. The third I noticed was that some people were talking presumption ?? presumption, of values. That this is very valuable because you're no longer negative, you're no longer at odds with yourself for ?? 33:59

Now P had a very good, said he has t have contact with the listeners

I thought most of them were in, an in-group language group

had to "become"

become how?

butterfly is a caterpillar that has to become. If you're talking to a caterpillar he has to know how. And we're in that position

repeated so many times that most of you know you have to become

I have said it so much myself that I probably neglect to enlarge upon it and explain

I just say in my lectures that when I was 21 reached the conclusion that I'd never learn anything, that I'd have to become

Q. ... everybody nods their heads in the audience

dw1-36.:21

R. The thing is that can any of you visualize what happened when you started off on, see, we were talking on this matter and somebody threw it at you and said, "What is the truth? You keep talking about looking for the truth." And that's what I wanted to get at

I don't think they were in depth. When I say in depth I mean not to just say the truth is the opposite of error, or the truth if that which is

well, everything is. Is the truth everything

it isn't everything, it's the straight poop about everything

objective

subjective

time is objective

as soon as you speak of a thing it is objective

dw1-38:40

as soon as you have, if it's a spiritual objective

everything subjective becomes an objective thing while you're evaluating it

37:12

Q. Were you saying truth is a quality rather than an objective thing?

R. What I'm trying to get you to do is to be able to give a definition without being attacked

Here's what I took down as high points:

Some talked of variables. He talked of a constant. And this is a new description of it, "Truth is a constant."
[Dave. A.] [Paul C.] How could there be many descriptions of something that's almost indescribable?

dw1-40:33

you have to do something, you have to immediately discern what is meant

if you mean relative truth and absolute truth both, then you have to broaden your answer

here's a qualification here that I don't think any of you have picked up. And it became apparent to me, I was looking through something I had prepared, I don't know whether I ever delivered it or not, it was a talk about Zen.

See "Zen and Common Sense Essay" at 1977-0428-Zen-and-Common-Sense-KSU

And I posed the question to a, somebody threw the questions at me, or I presumed they were going to throw a question at me, and my answer would be, just for the sake of argument, "Truth is a white swan on a blue lake." I don't know if you ever heard this or not.

dw1-41:48

Q. It's on the tape Zen and Common Sense. 1977-0428-Zen-and-Common-Sense-KSU

R. Is it, yeah. "Truth is a white swan on a blue lake." And I was wondering, of course I went through to, I don't know if you remember this tape or not, I don't know if you went through it and went through the steps of this, but there's some complex reasoning behind this. And I'm wondering if you guessed why. Would anybody know why the answer would be a white swan on a blue lake?

Q. Something that couldn't be described in words

R. Yes

Q. Something that's true for you

R. No, not necessarily, it has universal appeal

[42:40 tape recorder noise]

[break in tape]

... give a type of answer. But this is presuming that somebody in the audience, a large audience, or it's even a bunch of Zen monks who know a lot about it, or like a group here who know a tremendous lot about searching for the truth, seemingly read a lot.

dw1-43:16

You've all got a different perspective on it. See, so the reaction that comes back from the audience then, the supposed reaction, is "Why a swan?" or "Why is the swan white?" Of course, it's a lazy mind that doesn't bother to pick it up or an intuition that's inadequate. So the guy answers, "You don't like a white swan? Make it black. You don't like the lake blue? Make it green." And then of course he drops the conversation. Of course, they could ask questions from then on, but he, he just, because the thing with the white swan on the blue lake doesn't appeal to the intellect. He missed it. I'm not getting it across to you. That was the point.

Now this is a peculiar answer. So I worked my way back, and I realized the many lectures I gave, and I pick up these books where people are describing the truth, and they hedge. Just like most psychology books avoid, desperately avoid defining thought or defining sanity. Or normality, with a scientific definition rather than a democratic definition.

dw1-44:45

So I think that there has to be something done immediately when the question is thrown at you. And what would that be? There has to be almost a universal reply given.

Q. ??

R. No, no. I mean that anybody who would be lecturing and they would say, you'd be talking about the absolute truth. Let's presume he's talking not about relative truth but absolute Truth, you've got the capital-T on it. Somebody says, "What are you talking about? What do you mean by truth."

Q. You'd have to say it was something to find, not something that can be described.

R. Something to find?

Q. ??

R. You're close. Does anybody else have any ideas?

[break in tape, has repeat, no loss of words.]

tape dw1 ends at 45:48

File 2

Side 2 File 2 = 35 minutes.

dw2-00:00

Speaking to the public at lectures - cont.

R. You're close. Does anybody else have any ideas?

[break?]

Q. ... direction of, that's seeking for the truth.

R. See, you're implying of course that it's a process to find it. I noticed that here too, that several people mentioned the process instead of the definition. We're looking for a definition. Well, what is a definition? A definition is my ability to convey to you my meaning. Now some guy might do it with words; another guy might do it with a parable like the white swan on a blue lake.

[R conversing with people about problem of dealing with people in a public meeting with different levels of understanding.]

What is a definition? A definition is my ability to convey to you my meaning. Some guy might do it with words, another guy might do it with a parable. A white swan in a blue lake. There's one thing a speaker has to have before he can go any further. I made this mistake year after year, in being attacked and trying to define and then being attacked – instead of saying, “Who is asking?” You don't answer facetiously, you don't really say, “who's asking”. You have to determine the many motives and the many types of people from the idiot to the Zen student that are in the audience, and of course even among the Zen students are halfway down to the idiot, because they haven't develop an intuitive sense.

[R is going over written responses the participants made to certain questions.]

More on dealing with the public: If you answer anybody from what they want to know, there may be 20 different classes of people that you have to reach. A definition is a satisfactory answer that will bring you to the same understanding. Some people have asked questions to which I have given absurd answers, and they were satisfied. So you tell the guy, “If you take off your shoe you'll find your foot, right?” Yes. “Well that's it, absolutely.”

min 10

not too long ago I just told the fellow he was right

“When you take off your shoe you find your foot, right?” “Well, yes.” “That's it.”

The absolute does not exclude

12:00

while your life may be only 60 years

it's an illusion in the absolute

both are contained in the same vehicle.

Reference to John Kent's book.

Reference to Expansion of Awareness by Osborne. Method of certain speakers appeals to a lot of people and doesn't offend too many.

dw2-14:50

When you go back and you define something, you're talking about meaning, you're trying to convey meaning. So you have to convey different meanings. Sometimes you can't convey yours all the time. There's no way imaginable that you'll convey from the sentence that we have, our acceptance, that's the reason I said the whole group is pretty much off on it. Because they were talking, presumably, to people, if they're talking at a public lecture, it would have been almost like somebody gave them a Catechism to read in public. It was party line. Rather than saying, "What do you think the truth is?"

dw2-15:46

And if they say, "Well, you know, I'm asking you." Say, "No, no. I'm curious about your preconceptions on it. because this thing may be different things to different people."

too many people try to launch into it and describe it

Osborne

expansion of the awareness

you can get caught up in a "how to do it" book.

it may appeal to a lot of people and offend few

the answer depends on the questioner

it's not a logical answer, but it may have a prescribed effect

You can touch the mood of the person.

you can touch the idiot

you can touch the mood and it will open his head

the final constant in all the relative variable

little lady might say, "Why can't it be ...?"

"How do you know it's constant?"

almost impossible to have a dynamic, touching answer for everyone in the audience

10%

Q. Once you get beyond the relative

min 21 – tape noise

People reading their written responses to questions asked earlier.

Q. [Taking turns reading something] returning to Caesar that which is Caesar's

brings about the shock, amnesia to the self

finally after a long period of struggle

forgets what never was.

Q2 a less entangled observer

hope for my becoming truth

min 24

Vince: willingness to change those aspects

cultivation of intuition

discovered through relative meaning

observation of the self

what is beneficial and harmful.

R. Okay, we go to the M's.

PM. ... everyone is looking for better truths

skilled factory

fat profit margins

which relative truth

triangulation of the opposing relative truths

this brings us to absolute truth

must be experienced personally

everything else as a subset

to me, van der Leeuw has the best picture

min 28

Q. to the child the belief is true

determines perspective, change of mind and being

truth is what is

relative truth immediately implies duration

relative natural laws true

becoming is a relative being changing to a less relative being

only a change in being

everything is a witness

the truth is “I don’t know for sure.”

know of oneself

what becomes of the knower?

min 3

R. Next.

Q. I do not claim to know the truth but

ways of coming closer to truth

world as it is

detached from his body senses and egos

finding the absolute state of being

truth cannot be found in normal states of awareness

one’s universal essence

combining intellectual knowledge with a higher intuition

33:30

R. I think PO is next

PO. ... otherwise, what one observes may not be truthful, but may be a faulti ...

[break in tape]

No further words by Rose.

[Tape ends abruptly at minute 35]

Footnotes

End

Retrieved from 'https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php?title=1981-Intensive-Farm&oldid=1285'