

Albigen-Papers-2-Psychology-Truth

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

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

Albigen Papers Index: <http://direct-mind.org/index.php5?title=Albigen-Papers-Index-and-Introduction>

SECOND PAPER

Psychology and the Truth

The path to Truth begins with the self. We cannot properly identify the self, isolate it or analyze it, because it is the subject of which man knows the least. We know that we are talking about "us", but if a convinced monist is talking, to him the self might be entirely different than the self that is contemplated by the dualist. Despite interpretations, we still must try to find out that which we are, and that in turn may involve that which we were, and that which we will be.

Up until now, most of us accepted ourselves without any examination. We did not know who we were, or from whence we came, but if anyone dared to challenge the pseudo-reality of our existence, we had recourse to a game of dotting the challenger's eyes with the fists, and followed this by asking the educated recipient for the identity of the person who dotted his eyes. This is a little trick known as parrying a question with a question.

We accept much. We like to call it faith. But faith is a carryover from the trusting days of childhood when we had no alternative to trust. Maybe there never will be an alternative, but then perhaps maybe we can carry the childish trust too far. We clutch ... at promises, at words, at euphemisms -- at magic mirrors even!

To wean ourselves we must learn to doubt, to compare, to analyze, and also to synthesize. We must have the courage to question authority. We must have the maturity to wean ourselves from folk-customs, traditions and conventionalism. We need not look too far in our circle of friends and relatives to see the varying degrees of weaning or emancipation that others manifest. How many make conformity a sort of passion? The puppets wish to be dressed just like other puppets.

We think that we think. And then we go a step further and announce that we know. Does a drum think because it reacts noisily when struck? It is possible that all thought is the result of forces or impressions striking our nervous systems, and if there is an essence more subtle than the nervous system, it may be impacting upon that also. We have little to say about the quality of this impaction upon the senses, and hence we have a lot to learn about thoughts. Like a baby hanging by its heels, we do not think too actively until the doctor instills a sensation by slapping the posterior.

A prominent mental concept, possibly an aberration, is that we think with our heads, or in our heads. There is no real foundation for this concept, any more than there is a foundation of any worth for the parallel or resulting concept that when the head decays, our thoughts decay and cease forever.

If telepathy is possible, then it is possible that our thoughts may be sent out as a sort of electronic stream from a cranial broadcasting tower. But telepathy may also function in another manner -- as a sort of mental tenuosity. However, with either explanation, we can see that the mind is not contained in or restricted to the head.

Paul Brunton demonstrates several of these points in his books on Yoga and the Overself. Likewise, other phenomena tend to determine that the mind is independent of the body. Dreams that are later verified as being an actual (mental) visualization of something happening some distance away at the same time as the dreaming,

are a good example. The phenomenal visions of seers, especially when accurate and the ability of clairvoyants -- all give us reasons for accepting the theory of mental tenuosity, or Universal Mind tapping, as opposed to taking the long odds that successful clairvoyance results from guessing.

It is possible that the idea of thinking inside our heads comes from reasoning by elimination, and the isolation of nerve-responses. We can cut away most of the body and still think, or so we are led to believe. But much has been cut away from the brain, by accident and surgery, and this varied elimination of brain tissue has failed to localize a thinking center. A severing of a particular portion of the brain may cause unconsciousness, which would mean that the head contained a switch-box or relay for all body-functioning. Unconsciousness is only a qualification of the thinking process, being a screen that interferes with the observation of the process. That which would appear to an observer to be unconsciousness in another may well be the detachment of the senses from their usual manner of functioning.

We have the anaesthetized body on the operating table chattering distinctly about its dream. The patient is evidently unconscious. Yet when the patient awakes, and remembers that of which he dreamed and chattered, it signifies that unconsciousness as observed by the doctor is not the same as was experienced by the patient. At least not always.

Here we see the difference between consciousness and responsive thinking, and this makes the thought itself very elusive. Of course we can argue about definitions, in the event that someone might define dreams as other than thoughts.

One of the greatest contributors to illusion and confusion is the coiner of scientific words and terms. It is the delight of men with paper laurels in sight to coin a strange word or two in writing a thesis. And it is an ensuing error for students to accept such words without proper judgement, or to parlay them into another vain concept-structure.

Of course, at this point we might indicate that exact definition is impossible. But we can ask for consistency and for the so-called authorities to do all possible to avoid building a fabric of thought and expounding it merely because no one is clever enough or desirous enough to immediately attack it. It is no great wonder that many psychiatrists find themselves upon another psychiatrist's couch -- especially if they read one another's writings. We can take the various opinions on the attributes of the mind, and note the divergence of number and types of attributes pinned on by different authors.

One of these attributes is Will. There are two schools of thought on the matter -- the determinists who claim that things are predestined, which means also that we only have the choice to choose things already fated or chosen, -- and the libertarians who see for man various degrees of freedom in forming his environment and future.

We should not jump to conclusions in a negative manner. It is possible that there is such a thing as a will. And we have no choice but to act as though we have one. However we can look upon it in the light as to what it most likely, might not be. It seems highly foolish for this milling mass called humanity, to pretend to have a free will of unlimited range. Can we choose the thought that inspires us to think that we are choosing? Does the hog choose the butcher? Those who stand by fatalism are no more idiots than those who claim to be libertarians. There are philosophers on both sides. There are major religions in both camps. And as long as there is a doubt, the least we can do is to refrain from actions that might result in remorse as a result of fanatical convictions in the matter.

The paradox remains. It might seem egotistical to presume ourselves to be free agents, but it also seems foolish to be constrained to eternal shackles, and at the same time to feel separate from our environment. And the fact that man is programmed to yearn for separateness, brings hope that man, by some manipulation, may increase his separateness and individuality. We are almost willing to hold ourselves responsible for knowing exactly that

which a Creator created us for, if He will just cut the puppet-strings. He can throw us in the fire if we guess wrongly. The robot bids for life. If the master puts the right amount of electronic tubes in, maybe we will be self-aware.

We can expand the possibility for freedom, even more. It is possible, (to borrow words from the Bible) that the truth will make us free. The masses vegetate in slavery, but a percentage, measured in very small fractions, studies freedom. They create, even as they were created. They generate a will, knowing that it is not totally free. Their freedom consists in having "yard privileges" while the other convicts are restrained in the cells. Those kept in the cells may not have to crack rocks. and may consider the yard-convicts to be less free than themselves. There is much labor in working for freedom, and often considerable scorn from the mob that languishes in its destined groove.

It all comes back to this ... do we really wish to find the Truth? And how desperately? If knowing the truth means upsetting almost all that we have believed or have been unconsciously addicted to in the past, -should we desert the path? Do we seek for euphemistic truth, or for the Truth regardless of how it looks? The desire that energized the beginning of the search for Truth, may be dissipated or deflated by our findings along the trail.. Yet these same new findings will create new perspective and a new, but different, desire.

Does this mean that we should rebel against convention? It would be better to advise detachment from conventionality. We cannot rush out and shoot all the lawyers, judges and theologians merely because their inconsistencies are noticeable. Such public demonstrations might edify the masses, but the masses are not interested in pursuing the Truth, and the masses value rather highly many of the weavers who are able to twist an intangible bit of fuzziness into a great yarn.

A word need not have final binding meaning. But neither is it expressive of a great psychological discovery just because of its prolonged public usage. Thought, is a word that is more accepted than defined. Everyone proudly lays claim to the ability to think ... a process is thereby preempted without the least cerebral struggle, since man is neither able to begin thinking, nor to stop it. His thinking processes originate in environmental suggestion, or from previous thoughts. They end with exhaustion, or by mechanical methods of stopping consciousness.

Sleep is not considered a conscious state, but even in the state of sleep there is evidence that some mental activity continues. Men have been known to work problems in their sleep. Both the psychologist and the mystic consider the observation of the dream-process and different levels of sleep as being very valuable in the study of ourselves.

Scientific men are no closer than laymen to knowing the essence of thought. Most of the technical data gathered by scientists or psychologists are observations of somatic references to the thinking processes. Many of these observations furnish data on reaction to suggestion or stimulus, but these data concern our sensory apparatus, and a field of reaction connected with automatic reflexes more than thinking processes. We have not been able to disprove that our mind may be part of a universal mind, or that our equally elusive soul may be only an extension of a soul-matrix or Brahman.

We hear the words of illumined men but fail to evaluate them. "I have no life, but that God lives within me." "I and the Father are one." "You cannot find yourself unless you lose yourself in Me." Great men openly indicate a knowledge of their own insignificance. The authoritative technician struts across the stage of life and bravely postulates himself. Of course the illumined man have been unable to prove their claim (of union with the God-head), by using the implements which we might demand that they use to arrive at proof, -because the intuition does not prove, but aims at direct knowledge. A person may try to translate the convictions of the intuition into a logical presentation, but this is generally for the benefit of another person not yet illumined. A person of a keen intuitive nature generally grasps the idea with a minimum amount of explanation.

At this point, I would like to reiterate that no particular interpretation is being endorsed. Yet, as long as the theories about a universal mind or Brahman are not disproven, they must remain a part of the answer for the unexplained phenomena of the mind, and one answer is as good as the next one if it answers with common sense, and if neither is proven.

In a way these concepts do not rob us of our individuality. Even as the cells of our bodies relate to us, we may be both a separate entity, and at the same time we may be eternally tied up with all other entities, who manifest mental capacity. We must admit and appreciate the paradox. It is possible to think within our heads, yet know that thinking need not be limited to the head. It is possible that we think, but that we are also a thought, a projection, or an extension.

There was once a theory that thought was synaptic. The nerve ends or synapses act like a set of ignition points, and nerve-impulses are forced to jump across the intervening space between the synapses. This type of theory exists only because it is more difficult to disprove it than to accept it, especially when the disproving is attempted with the same coined words of the tradesman who concocted the theory.

Saying that thought is synaptic is giving us a mechanistic explanation of thought. It is an effort to present a tangible concept. We like to be able to get our hands into abstract matters, and we feel safer if our grand theory sounds practical.

However the same technician or psychologist who pretends to build a tangible concept and who seeks justification in science and common sense, is not daunted by his presumptions. And he will be the first to attack another concept-builder, by using not only his entire stock in trade implements, but every pretence of common sense as well.

A learned philosopher, or dedicated transcendentalist, may devote his life to the development of a grand theory. A psychologist may cast a cursory glance at this grand theory, and decide, while using the particular terminology of his trade, that the entire grand theory in question was simply a reflection of some psychotic condition of the writer.

The psychologist pretends to examine the philosopher clinically, and decides that the writer was merely enjoying a mental catharsis. He notes in addition, that the results of the catharsis, the grand theory, or stool, upon inspection show such ailments as the God-complex, the narcissus complex, the inferiority, sadistic, masochistic, Oedipus, Eros and Thanatos complexes. And he is also guilty of the survival mania.

And of course, while the psychological high-priest was making his damning interdiction, he managed to miss the point or message, if the philosopher had a worthy point. The chicken may have a mental aberration, yet may produce a healthy egg.

The complexes mentioned, exist in all of us, but an individual may for a period of time favor a particular complex with more energy than his neighbor. If these complexes, and drives are motivating factors peculiar to all of us, they are not abnormalities, and are not individual improprieties, but are rather, -functional parts. If such motivating factors were removed from the constitution of man, he would probably die.

I do not wish to justify all of the conduct that results from the various complexes, and would follow this by adding that if a man is really pursuing the truth, his first line of endeavor would be the inspection of any possible complexes or drives, with the idea of not allowing any complex or energy-dissipation to take precedence over the pursuit of Truth. The supposition that he still struggles with complexes should not infer that he is a liar, nor prove that his motives should be regarded with suspicion simply because he displays urges or emotions.

Those which are referred to as the narcissus-complex, the superiority complex, and the god-complex, may be the necessary pride or self-esteem that is both a motivating factor for an otherwise poorly functioning organism, and a purposeful personality-glue, without which the various personality components or drives would become more erratic. When a better balance comes about through experience and maturity, those complexes become less significant, and the person is more deeply motivated, or dedicated.

Sadism and masochism are carry-overs from our primitive, carnivorous ancestry. The beast of prey is motivated or helped by sadism to survive, and the necessary victim is helped by masochism to become the contributor. True to the patterns of nature, the bird flutters before the snake, and the martyr finds (and describes) the bliss of his immolation.

The Oedipus and Electra complexes, through the conduct so motivated, receive much attention from not only our psychologists, but from the legal department of social discrimination, and from the religious segment of society as well. On the other hand, homosexuality is looked upon by some psychologists as being merely a stage of development. The psychologist, who wishes to serve as the high priest of nature, should realize the degree of usefulness of the homosexual. And the religionist, should take into account that the survival of Lot's tribe depended upon that man's relations with his daughters, while the angry God saw fit to destroy an entire city because of homosexual advances, (which were not even successful, and hence were not homosexual acts).

Various sexual complexes are simply variations of the survival-drive. And if the survival-drive were removed, most of the people on this planet would be removed. The survival-urge is responsible for this writing, and for all scientific and transcendental quests. This does not mean that those who are inclined to search along transcendental lines, will still possess the survival-urge with the same urgency which they possessed when they first began the search. The Truth may develop in us a reversal of hope, and our urge may then be one of non-survival, or it may, if nothing else, change our definition of the survival as desired earlier.

A very important point should not be forgotten, in regard to complexes. They are sources of energy, and once they are recognized and their energy is diverted into work-channels, they can aid our upward climb. To denounce them is to negate them, and to negate them is to pull up our roots.

Let us move on to psychological terms that relate to mind-definition. Both religion and psychology owe their origins to concepts of the psyche, anima, soul, Atman, purusha, spirit, microcosm, self, "I Am", or whatever you wish to name the unproven essence of man. Immediately most authors agree on one thing. Consciousness is evidence of the-one-who-is-feeling. Aquinas and Decartes both agree. But from there on, we have immediate dissembling. It is with great difficulty that we are able to know that which any psychologist-author means by any of the above terms, other than to know that he is conscious of consciousness. And the confusion will become more multiplied when we approach the terms of esoteric religion.

The so-called science of psychology is based upon the study of the behavior of the individual, and is so defined by authors of psychological texts or by the masses. It has little to do with exact knowledge about the essence of the psyche, the essence of man, the limits of the self, or the true origins of the behavior of the individual.

Psychology use a yardstick which it calls Normality. And from that is in turn spawned a definition for sanity. Without knowing the true essence of thought, or the mechanisms of thought, the psychologist shall presume to know which thoughts are healthy ones. And when the opus-writer runs short of material, he resorts to telling the public that which it wants to hear.

I do not wish to discourage the study of psychological works. I would rather like to be able to create some sort of sieve to separate the gold from the dross, and thus save the youthful seeker a few months or years of labor under the impression that just any book is an authority.

One good test for any work, is application to actual experience. If there exist cases which are not included in an author's theory then the theory is lacking. If there are cases which throw the book in doubt, and there is another book with better explanation, we must, of course, pause and reflect.

So timid, and cocksure have the pseudo-psychologists become that they have decided to measure the intelligence without first defining. So what do we have? We have a meaningless charade with which school teachers or personnel-interviewers fritter away their time. It becomes a dignified sort of eeny-meeny-miney-mo. As yet, there is no valid calibration of the mental qualities of men, in relation to one another. An I.Q. test determines only that the group being tested reacted as they did, individually and with varied responses to varied symbols. If the tests have to do with numbers or mathematics, then a person who can count on the fingers may look like a genius alongside of a person who coordinates in generalities, or who reaches conclusions intuitively.

It has not been too many years since psychology lay in the womb of theology. This parent had a peculiar authority in the middle ages, and the foetus has inherited some of its parent's facetiousness. At an auto-de-fe, it was often suggested by way of intercession, that the culprit was crazy. It was left up to the theologian to decide if the victim were to have the devil burned out of him, or be locked up in a dungeon with his presumed insanity. They had various ways of determining his sanity, such as the ordeal of fire, and the augury of screams.

We have the same thing today. Pompous alienists today who have not the candor or honesty to stand upon a witness stand and simply tell the court that they know nothing, about sanity or insanity, will utter jargon in a convincing tone, but which neither they, the court, or the victim, can understand or debate. They are driven by a trade-survival urge. If the court recognizes them, they must in turn, not let the court down when -- the court needs some help with the hatchet.

I must admit that all legal procedure is designed with good intent, and it must continue until the human family evolves something fairer. However we can avoid sitting in judgement, or posing as an alienist. Because the masses have a certain fever, there is no excuse for us to jump up and pretend to be the Zeitgeist.

The office of judge is a result of the masses' illusion that they can institute a system that will protect them but never take away their just rights. All this is born of fear. The next illusion is that the judge (and this term applies to a jury as well as to an individual) is able to determine guilt. Not even a guilty plea is proof of guilt. Masochists have been known to plead guilty to the crimes of others. Thus we can see that much suffering results from unclear thinking, and that the tolerance of one illusion creates more illusions. So that the pattern of wrong thinking becomes so interlaced and interdependent, that many people imagine the human menagerie to be an articulate and perfect entity just because it is complex. Weakness employs bombastic oratory.

I would like to make a final observation in regards to psychological research, such as is carried on currently. The psychologist would like to copy other material-scientists, so much attention is paid to graphs, and every little human whim is polled and charted. This is like making notes on the results of fertilizers upon the growth of grass, when the real problem is to determine the essence of the core of the earth.

A LOOK AT THE MIND

Psychology is definitely in its infancy, and infants do some wildly imaginative things. Modern psychology is mostly behavioristic, which evolved in a mercenary fashion, to tempt teachers and persons in supervisory positions into believing that there exists a system of predictable behavior. Of course the supervisors hope to control the minds of other men by utilizing a knowledge of the system.

Then we have the psychology of salesmanship. This is purported to encourage customers to buy things that are useless, and enable the diligent student or salesman to profit astronomically. And we have the psychology of war, of aggression. This is the study of the capacity of man to suffer, to kill now but abstain from killing later, to

learn to give chocolates today but rape tomorrow, to learn the profanation of the human mind (brainwashing), and to learn to build entire structures of gossamer concepts that pretend consistency (propaganda).

There is also therapeutic psychology, which may be anything from free lance group-therapy, to professional psychiatry. This category has become a pseudo-science of manipulation, using mechanisms to syphon off our tensions (pills), to neutralize tangential or anti-social manias (trepanning, icepicking, castration), or to give some poor professional a more magnetic voice (hormone shots).

There is naturally some variance between theoretical psychology and utilitarian applied psychology. But there is also conflict between the different fields of applied psychology.

We can take the psychology of salesmanship, as it is applied to international diplomacy. The psychology of salesmanship functions basically by developing in oneself a positive attitude of belief in the intelligence and probity of the opponent or customer, to such a degree that the customer is ashamed not to live up to the pretty picture that we paint of him. The salesman, or diplomat procedure avoids direct criticism or confrontation of any kind, and employs rather, a "kill them with kindness" routine, and an exemplary patience in outlasting the customer.

The psychology of war, however, is not quite the same. It is based on confrontation, terror and abrupt actions. With no partisan political motives, I would like to point out the trouble that has occurred by exposing our general public to both the propaganda put out by the diplomatic corps and by the war-hawks, which is available on radio and television.

One segment of our society, consequently, thinks that we can "kill them with kindness" and instill in the enemy certain virtues by simply proclaiming the enemy to be virtuous. The state department talks of peace, while the generals are trying to convince the public that killing the enemy is the real international social remedy. Both are trying to use psychology as a tool.

We can go a step further and see how a third utility -- therapeutic psychology -- becomes involved in the confused mess. The military system of training men, will impose upon those men, and encourage in them, anti-social traits (to say the least) that a therapeutic psychologist would deplore ... traits which the civilian therapist will later be called upon to dispel.

Modern therapy has made the confessional old-fashioned. The sins now are not forgiven, they are blotted out. If you wish, the ability to sin again can be removed (with the ice-pick), and with the removal you may become a civilized zombie.

We are learning to drive our vehicular body, but we still do not know about inner motivations. We get inklings, now and then, but we are reluctant to settle for less than a very complicated blue-Print. Egotism would not permit it.

In regards to blue-prints, there are certain laws concerning the protoplasm and its relation to the programming of the computer, and those laws favor the protoplasm. After all, the brain must take care of its house. Action, or reaction, is based upon the endorsement of pleasure-sense, and upon the rejection of pain-sense in the flesh. A stand is taken for every experience -- neutrality would mean no reaction.

If the mucous membrane conveys to the record-room a perception of intense agreeableness, then the computer might find a pleasantness in the contemplation of such words as will, and immortality...for the mucous membrane. And if our interacting Reactions, (Reason) tell us that the mucous membrane has to go in death,

Reason will also find it pleasant to observe the reaction that the system of Reactions with its Perception, and Memory, will or may possibly live on without the mucous membrane and the grey convolutions. And the dallying with this pleasant thought in turn, may lead us to believe in a personally directed potential for survival.

We must not legislate that it is impossible to have a Will. It is not impossible for a robot to become short-circuited by fatigue, and begin operating in a way that would be more conducive to the longevity of the robot, rather than according to the intentions of the inventor of the robot. In fact, the combinations of memories and reactions to them (Imagination) are infinite. However the perception of one of those possibilities, and the naming of that same possibility as Will, does not add another attribute to all minds. It would be added synthetically, not necessarily being common to all men -- being something like a heart-pacer installed in a particular entity.

The robot, from the beginning, was programmed with a catalytic reminder to keep it working. I prefer to call this catalyst an implant. Desire was one. Desire was not an attribute of the mind. The amoeba moves toward pleasant liquids, and hurries away from irritating substances. There is a tendency in all living things to avoid irritation, and not to avoid pleasant contacts. So that desire is more of a faculty of the flesh.

Another faculty that seems to be part of the mind is curiosity. The amoeba also demonstrates curiosity. Curiosity is an implant possibly built in the flesh and mind to guarantee a certain life-span. It may have been inherited in the genes of the specie, yet such an impulse poses as a mystery in that it seems to be a continual irritant and lure, capable of projecting the host into all sorts of instantaneous dangerous adventure.

If the young calf and kid did not possess this faculty to a high degree, they would perish surely before they were able to reason out the purpose of the mother's udders. And this is not a quality in the mind of calf or kid. This is an urge -- a force which drives the host -- leaving the host with little evidence of choice in the matter.

Curiosity is a factor that is inversely proportional to advancing age. As it ages, the host is less able to receive stimuli from outside, or less compelled to because of fatigue. The death-gene would be another implant, and if such existed, it would be likely to trigger a series of body changes long before the day of death. And this clash of implants would account for the ability of the older hosts to manifest more indifference to the curiosity implant.

Regardless, that which diminishes with proportion and consistency to the aging processes, may well be assumed to cease after death. I mention this, because I think we should seize and use this implant, curiosity, and bend its energy-vector toward the pursuit of wisdom while living, rather than dissipate that energy in the instinctive search for food and sex -- procrastinating the day of spiritual efforts, and rationalizing that we will be better able to satisfy our curiosity after death.

Regardless of the validity or invalidity of the after-death concepts, it is worthwhile to note that of all the reports of infernal, celestial, astral, or just uncategorized apparitions, there are none reported that give the observer any inkling of curiosity on the part of the apparition. Many phantoms have demonstrated an ability to perceive, to remember and to react. But none have ever asked curious questions, nor betrayed adventurousness, being more impassive and quietly aware. We might say that the spirits are not curious because they now know everything, but this is not so. I can recall reading many accounts that corroborate the several experiences I had at "genuine" materializations, where the apparition was asked if it had ever seen Christ. Invariably they gave vague answers, such as "We have heard that he is here", or "We have seen his light", "This is about the same as where you are". But none manifested any curiosity to go look up Christ if he were available in that state. In fact their attitude toward the question was one of apathy, not excitement or reverence.

These things, though not sensational proofs of any sort, bring us back to the definition of mind. Immortality, without including something of the mind, has no meaning. And to just presume that the mind as we are aware of it, will remain the same after death, is not to face a considerable amount of evidence with honesty. The

determination of this book is to locate that permanent state of mind. This is likewise the objective of the Zen movement which strives to bring our present mind to its real, or unchanging state, while we are still living.

In later chapters we will hear much of a technique called reversing the vector. Or, the law of the vector. We can see that if our present essence is motivated by almost irresistible burrs or spurs in order to promote a biological destiny -- then those implants, or burrs, are not part of our essence, nor will they be after death. So that by removing them now, (and by replacing them with intentional self-discipline to keep the biological pattern going) we may approach a type of mind that would survive death. It is for this reason that certain schools of yoga advise hatha-exercises (to keep the body going) while contemplating the raja yoga philosophy.

Patterns of Instinct and Curiosity are seen in plants. The growing sprout or delicate tendril of a plant looking for something upon which it might climb, reaches and probes. Its roots will search and find cracks in the rocks, and adventure in divers directions, looking for moisture. All of this is built in, as well as a crude form of memory which is manifested when the plant is injured, by the resourceful method of repair.

If the memory of man has access to knowledge of prenatal incidents, and is supposedly carried over in some depths of lower conscious levels, or in gene-chasicals, then we might say that Instinct and Curiosity are merely reactions to a former familiar pattern. Regardless of the origin of implants, any acts which are the result of Instinct, Curiosity or Desire should not cause us to be held accountable, simply because they are causes imposed upon us, and rarely controlled by man.

We can see that that which religion calls temptation, comes from the outside. Yet the master word-builders and creators of the guilt-complex would notify those being swept down the stream of libido, that he, the helpless man, was the creator of libido, and that furthermore, libido was evil. Man is expected to feel guilty, and he is flattered by the fact that he is able to do such "guilt" feats.

Of course man reaches the peak of confusion, when another authority (behavioristic psychology) courageously decrees that mass-man is always right, and that anything done by the masses is acceptable, or normal. This does not rescue the man from the idea of guilt because libido is still considered to be a private possession, a quality, and not a prenatal brand upon the genes.

The religionist, sensing somewhere that the computer works better when free of libido-stimuli, decided that the libido should be controlled in the layman, and avoided entirely by the priests. They may have had a good idea, but they made a mistake in denouncing functions of the body which require glands, since we need glands to continue here. The Church protests that God made us, but that the glands are of the devil.

And yet there is a hint of wisdom in that protestation, if by "us" the Church means our primary essence, and if by "devil" it means Nature.

That man may become a true observer is his aim. He may generate a qualified will. In cybernetics we hear that machines have been known to adjust themselves. However the only machine that is able to adjust the universe to suit itself, is the universe. The human will, or the human body, may exert itself upon the environment to a degree, but in the long run finds restrictive limits. And when the power-source is pulled out, we simply have a dead machine, unless by some Herculean feat of magic we are able to create another vehicle for the indefinite extension of mind and observer.

When man talks about having a will, he infers that there might be a sly chance of taking over the computer, and being more of a doer than an observer. It would seem appropriate then, to understand ourselves rather than to confuse ourselves. in our early role of creator that would create a picture of ourselves which might later prove to be unreal. If we can will ourselves to live, and then follow up by conjuring up a stranger to ourselves. Meaning that we would thus have immortalized a false personality.

We get on now to the attempt to split the mind. Science must be analytical ... the mind must be broken up into parts. And many different scientists, or Quixotes, charged the phantom windmill of the mind with their axes, and came away with equally imaginary component parts. Those pieces were called by various names. Subconscious mind, and conscious mind, Id, Ego, Libido and Superego.

And of course we must not neglect the modern psychologists and their partners in crime -- the sociologists. They came back from the windmill with the spectacular announcement that the mind was physical -- we only have a body.

We cannot avoid any theory that might well be true. And so we find ourselves riding the horns of the paradox all the way. An admitted ghost writes about reality. Yet the system or outline which is stressed throughout this book is no less true if it is found on the ceiling of the Platonic cave of illusions, and to some strange world of the universal mind at the same time. We who sit in the cave of illusion, will be a part of illusion until we manage to separate ourselves and reality from illusion. Are we the chaos, from which shall emerge creation?

Psychology decrees that phenomena that are not explainable by materialistic standards, are non-existent. Likewise all phenomena must be recognized by the senses -- the five senses -- or an instrument that is able to bring the phenomena within reach of the senses, such as a microscope.

The five senses which we hear so much about are gross and imperfect. Knowledge of this led several authors, such as Brunton and Van der Leeuw, to imply that there might well be an illusory world of experience, and another dimension or state not yet comprehended, or at least not yet describable.

When one man sees a mirage, we do not have much evidence. But when ten men see the same mirage, we have something that might give a hint of the possibility of illusion. All ten men will agree that actually it did not exist. But it did exist, in that it was a Perception.

The phantoms witnessed in genuine materializations by us, or the ghosts encountered by us are not denied existence, (although their true identity may be variously defined). And we have many instances where, out of a group of observers, only a few witnessed the phantoms or spirits. This was the case with Joan of Arc, and with the little Spanish girls who claimed to have seen and talked with the Lady of Fatima.

In such instances we can conclude that there are phenomena not visible to all eyeballs. Joan of Arc, and other mystics, must have another sense. They do not have another attribute of the mind. They have, accidentally, or by chance specialization of being, another channel of Perception. There are likewise phenomena which involve the hearing of sounds inaudible to others, and smelling things not smelled by all.

The refusal of modern psychology to understand that the mind is not limited to the convolutions, results in the failure to explain phenomena of the mind. Mr. J.B. Rhine had to laboriously translate this mental ability to his fellow-psychologists, although the ability had been in use for many centuries by such primitive peoples as the Australian aborigines.

Many rigid ideas have changed in the last few decades. Memory has been released from its cranial, synaptic prison, and is now found to be in every cell. It has found to be transferable through the digestive system to the animal eating another, as in the case of Planarians recently investigated. There are cases on record of people who have developed a sensitivity of skin that enabled them to identify light, and degrees of visualization. These things indicate that if memories are found in the nuclei of cells, and in bits of chopped worms, then the mind is not within the brain alone. And if Perception can come through the skin, which is usually the domain of touch-feeling, then visual perception is not limited to the eye.

Complexity may be an inseparable factor of life, but there is no advantage to adding complexity to the study of life by generating complexities, when simplification aids understanding. Too many terms have come into existence for their euphemism or palatability.

It is foolish to pretend that psychology will ever be drawn up on paper with mathematical formulations that will enable the layman to understand himself, or to plot with graphs and slide-rule the distance between thoughts, or the fractional spaces occupied by memories. And therefore this concept is not designed to answer all, or to bring a student to the truth by way of a symbolical comparison of the mind to a camera. Symbolism is used to show things more clearly, and to indicate that things are not as muddled as our experts would have us believe.

Psychology, as well as economics, operates according to Burke's law. Complexity in any system, breeds experts in complexity, and the sincere ones are hard to distinguish from the selfish ones.

There is only one true psychologist, and that is he who is able to enter the mind. Starting first with his own. There is questionable value to debates on proper thinking -- the point is to begin to think.

The subconscious mind, in the camera analogy, is merely the roll of film. The data room in the computer. It is unrecalled memories in totality. It is not a half of a bicameral mind-system. To say that there is a segment of the mind separate from the continuous consciousness of daylight experiences, is like saying that the big roll of film in the movie-projector is not the same film as that which is spinning past the projecting lens.

That there is a relation among memories, is not denied. That memories may be cross-checking with other memories while the attention is focused upon something entirely different, is not denied, and may be explained. The synaptic theory is denied. These things are denied, not as being totally false, but as being incomplete ideas. We still do not know, and may never know, exactly where memories are stored. The important thing is not to isolate memory, but to prolong that faculty, and improve it.

Lastly, we come to Intuition. Reason is a pattern of reaction of reactions among themselves. Many such patterns may form a reasoning. It differs from intuition, in that it is a process that is projected through the window of consciousness, step by step. Intuition, is that same reaction, or gestalt interchange, or cross-checking of reaction-patterns, without any projection through the window of consciousness of each step of the process. Only the answer is projected.

THE MIND: SOME OBSERVATIONS

My quibble with modern Psychology is that it not only poses with inquisitorial authority, but also reneges on the basic job of at least approaching the mind. It tries to make of Psychology, a materialistic and mechanistic science, and in the ensuing efforts, aborts the very meaning of Psychology. It now investigates only protoplasmic and sensory reactions. The physical senses are part of the body, which is visible, while the mind, and its projections are not. Of course the modern psychologist gets around this by issuing an encyclical... "Either the mind is physical or it does not exist."

Either the body is part of our environment and is independent of the mind, or else this observer is merely a chance evolution of flab with some really fanciful concepts about himself. If memory is synaptic, we must reexamine our hopes for immortality, or be prepared to settle for immortality that carries with it no memory of living. Likewise, if memory is something chemical in the chromosomes, or cell-nuclei, we are in a bad way at the termination of those cells. I should say -- if memory is contained only in the cells, we are in a bad way. The mechanics of cell-memory have not been determined with precision. We have known for a long time that the genes were memory-pads, but they were thought to be only genetic memory-records, and nothing to do with memories of current happenings. This evidence (cell memory) helps us to understand that thinking is not limited to the head. And the possibility remains that the mind, rather than being completely somatic, or confined to the head, is an essence with contact-points in various points of the body, but without limits to that body in consideration of form, mass or tenuousity.

The science of Psychology, in an attempt to pay its way, leaned lately to the therapeutic or exigent approach. It concentrated upon a utilitarian enterprise that experimented with physical media, and which brought forth answers, chiefly behavioristic. Those findings were limited in that they related only, or mostly to those media.

The investigations of such media are worthwhile, in that some search is better than no search, but they should be classified according to their limitations. They are the study of the actions and reactions of physical bodies, chiefly. It is doubtful if Psychology as a science will ever become a study of the "psyche". You cannot "isolate" the spirit and subject it to tests and measurements.

The student, who is trained from childhood to lean upon authority, pays a dear price for the false pose of psychologists. Only recently have the colleges decided, in a half-hearted way, to enter the field of ESP. In the fall of 1958 I paid a visit to the University of Pittsburgh and talked with a professor of Psychology. He viewed the field of ESP with some temerity, and at the time was playing with ESP cards in one of his classes in a sort of non-committal manner. In other words, the students would have to take full blame or credit for any discoveries. There was an outspoken fear on his part of "authorities".

A friend of mine had been delegated to contact this man, in order to persuade him to head a parapsychological research group which had been recently endowed in San Antonio by Tom Slick [Mind Science Foundation]. My friend's blank check and portfolio of credentials may just as well have been a cobra -- to judge by the man's reaction. He had a strange solicitude for his job. Who are these mysterious "authorities"? Why must dedicated research be first cleared by politicians and religionists? Are we to presume that Truth may not be divulged or approached except in a prescribed and arduous manner?

Occultists have known for centuries that telepathy existed and that that faculty was perhaps more important than the more evident five senses. Yet mankind had to wait for the scientific world to partially free itself from the controls of the witch-doctor and prelate. And here as late as 1958 we find science still trembling like a child at the wood shed door. This trembling child ... that may be allowed to send you to the electric chair with his definition of your sanity.

It is demonstrable to a degree, that there is another sense which has more direct access to the mind than through the computer, which is largely a physical apparatus. It has been found that while the function of the five senses depends upon a well-functioning physical body, (eyes without cataracts, etc.), the functioning of this outer or other sense seems to be independent of the body's health or well-being. In fact, in some cases, the new sense functions better when the body is ill, almost to the point of death. Under extreme alkaline or acid shock, wasted from fasting or disease, or largely inhibited by prolonged meditation.

We should not confuse the phenomena of such a sense with the mind itself. And this sixth sense, while being tactically superior to physical senses, still has its limitations. However, there is evidence to demonstrate that some of the limitations of the sixth sense are removed by practice, as experiments have shown with the use of ESP cards and dice. Accuracy increases with practice. With clairvoyance, however, there are discrepancies which no amount of practice seems to remove. This does not imply that the mind (the clairvoyants) involved was in error, but that either its faculty of ESP had some difference or limitation, - or that the source of clairvoyant information (spirits, entities) contained factors not yet fully explored by us.

Modern psychologists label most of clairvoyant-observations products of mental aberrations. Like the priestcraft of old, what they did not think of first must come from the devil.

We have many accounts of people who claimed to have visited heaven, or to have seen God. Examples are found in the testimony of world-prophets, life-stories of Catholic saints, medical records of cases of persons revived from near-death, testimony of spiritualistic materializations, (these latter give testimony only about their heaven), and of course certain mystics. In some respects, the medical cases are more evidential in that the records are of people who did not approach death with the idea of returning to testify, while the evidence brought to us by mystics is of a deliberate nature. The mystic in so seeking, qualified the results of his findings, since minds have been known to create desired results.

I hope that it has been demonstrated that there are illusions in the physical world. The statement that illusions exist, implies that there is a true state of affairs, which when correctly seen by all, will have but one appearance. The mistake that the observer (who incidentally may well be an "authority" or scientist) makes, is in announcing himself to be above illusion after the first trip to the optometrist. He is no longer deceived by mirages or magicians. He may even pride himself with his new perspective including space-time concepts, and the force-field concepts of matter.

Our space-time concepts imply that things may not really be as they appear to be when observed with the telescope. And force-field concepts imply that a situation may exist that cannot be observed with the eye, even with the aid of a super-microscope. The senses are consequently inadequate in these cases, because they were not able to perceive the ultimate nature of objects under scrutiny. And being inadequate in these cases, are no more commendable, as senses, than the sense that lays claim to witnessing heaven or God. The varied testimony of enraptured mystics does not imply mental aberration. The stuff was seen through a glass darkly. It is true that some of the testimony of visionaries was caused by a predisposition toward imagination, and some accounts may be deliberate lies. Some may have unconsciously copied from earlier authors. We can however accept that those, that we feel are sincere, did actually witness a state of being, if they attested that they did.

The fact of their difference in testimony lies in the difference of the vehicles or persons observing, and in their individual difference of faculty that facilitated the observation. When the observer relays that information to us we have still another refraction, depending upon the limitations of language.

I would say that the mind itself is not finite. I would also include that the perception faculties and the translation faculties are considerably finite.

And there is some explanation for all of the strange and diversified evidence found in this business of heaven-seeking. Some of the phenomena may well be conjurations, or creations triggered by mental tricks. Some materializations actually seen by human eye, are in some ways less evidential than other concepts because they have been conjured up -- ordered, so to speak -- as you would order bacon and eggs in a restaurant. Eliphas Levi gives us a hint of this mechanism, when he describes the materialization of Appollonius of Tyana. Deeper investigations of Spiritualism infer, (with a degree of justice) that the phenomena of ectoplasmic figures is of human creation, being an emanation from the body of the medium, and being subject to certain intellectual limitations relative to the limitations of the mind of the medium and his circle.

It is also believed that the mechanics of the seance is engineered by entities. William Crookes was supposed to have had a Titania for a pet. It has been my privilege to meet one of these entities, and it was quite the opposite of a Titania. So there must be other types as well. We come now to the business of entities, demons or angels. They may or may not have substance. It depends upon the amount of substance we claim for ourselves. When we begin to concede that we, as far as our physical aspects are concerned, are a degree illusory, then we may assume that these other entities may be to a degree illusory. But we should not assume them to be illusory just because it is not convenient to try to identify them. We can take accounts from the Tibetan Book of the Dead, and find that the book warns of impressive encounters after death with alarming, if not terrifying entities. The book wishes us to note, that when these things are encountered, they signify that we are still in transition, and not yet fully liberated from illusion.

From what we read of Aleister Crowley, he was really not too happy with his discoveries up until the time of his death. Yet his metaphysical career started off with the conjuration of a swarm of demons in a drug-drenched experiment. With easy access to definitely supernatural acquaintances, the prospect of tapping those acquaintances for supernatural information immediately suggests itself. However, the last moments of Crowley signify that his demon friends were lacking as informants. Eliphas Levi, after spending many years in the art of conjuration, is supposed to have had disillusionment that resulted in his return to the religion of his youth.

It may well be that travel to another planet, and the consequent study of its people or beings, may be similar in value to the study of demons. It is strictly a matter of objective. We may discover that those beings are of another dimension or rate, but not necessarily of a dimension more real than our own here in the human bodies. The worth of contact with demons is questionable in the light of all the information gathered from them.

We come to another type of visitation -- the projection. This is a form or phantom projected by another intelligence -- perhaps human or perhaps supernatural. Under this heading come the visitations of witchcraft and some magical rites. The inference here is that this type of being has no existence other than mental. They are created by one mind to influence another. Recently an article appeared in a magazine titled "Does Telepathy Cause Insanity?" The psychologist who took note of this particular phenomena was gingerly introducing the idea in the form of a question.

I went to school with a man who was convinced that he was God (Jesus Christ to be exact). He became convinced of this, he told me with candor, because of voices from beings that spoke to him and addressed him as Jesus. The man was, to all appearances, a sane man. He was homosexual, and he tried to copy that which he thought to be the physical appearances of Jesus. He was no apparent lunatic. In college he was an astute mathematician, and by avocation he was a skilled fundamentalist. He was very practical except on the subject of his own divinity, and on the insistence that he had a vast telepathic following. He had, that which the minister in graveside-eulogy referred to as a subtle sense of humor. Incidentally, he believed that he would never die because he believed in himself.

The mental institutions are filled with people who hear voices and see people and animals quite invisible to the attendants. Yet these same insane people occasionally come up with startling announcements. At one time, in Russia, about the time that starets-Rasputin came into prominence, there was widespread reverence for idiots that bordered on worship. It was supposed that the miserable condition of the idiots was the price paid for their unusual contact with higher dimensions.

I was startled a few years back, by a young neighbor who had only a few days prior to the following incident, - been released from a mental institution. He sat beside me in my kitchen. Our wives were, for the moment, monopolizing the conversation. Without facing me, or even looking at me, he read my mind aloud. I thought to myself, "he is reading my mind". He half turned and commented, "I have been able to do that ever since I have been a child."

These were not his only words. He replied for several minutes to my thoughts, and replied in depth, being fully aware of things I knew but did not speak. Nor did I even answer him at the end. I was too surprised. This particular man claimed to have seen God. But God appeared to him in human form. He once mistook the family physician for God, and knelt prayerfully before him. The physician, who had recently recovered himself from a nervous break-down, became alarmed, and ushered the patient out of his office. The result was an institution for the patient.

The man who thought he was Jesus had been committed once to an institution. He was picked up for walking the streets of a small town, dressed in burlap, while preaching the gospel. He could laugh while describing the experience. I asked him about his release from the asylum.

"Heaven knows it was a task," he smiled as he replied. "I never knew before that I was an actor until that time, nor did I know the full insidiousness of society, and of those in charge of saying what insanity is. Heavens, yes, it was the best acting I had ever done in my life. I had to act sane, and if you have never tried acting sane. you must try it sometime. Especially when you have to guess what they mean by saneness, - what will pass the board. You learn after a while that sanity is basically, harmlessness, industriousness, and gregariousness. You have to put out the idea that you are just a plain, hard-working chap without a brain in your head and they will let you go. It is easy to frighten them and you must not do that. Questions frighten them, as do metaphors and

harmless equations. They pretend to be thoroughly logical in their interrogation, but it is strictly instinctive. If you manifest logic yourself, they will manifest fear immediately. I rather think that they are afraid of a reversal of positions if the logical communication is encouraged."

Swedenborg was considered insane by his contemporaries. He knew St. Paul and most of the apostles rather intimately, according to his writings. He had not only visited heaven but hell, as well. His description of these two regions was predominately one of an objective experience as distinguishable from the more subjective experiences of other mystics whose experiences or ecstasies led them to proclaim heaven to be a state of being for the mind, or a state of rapport of the mind with a more extensive Being or mindstuff. Swedenborg described not a state of being, but a place visited by beings.

Swedenborg was not too reliable as a witness about other matters on which he spoke with authority. He had written scientific treatises years before becoming a mystic, and in one of his scientific books he proclaimed that the moon was a mirror. He also claimed to have intimate knowledge of beings on other planets. We can note without prejudice that his faculty of perception -- which he extolled as being extra-sensory -- was not infallible. And was in fact laden with error.

Swedenborg is no reason for a wholesale rejection of all accounts of experiences of mystics. And records by celebrated prophets and religionists are not more valid than the information gathered from individuals who have had unusual experiences, and who make no great fuss about them. The words of a drunk, a dope addict, or a social derelict, are as valid as any other, if we are gathering material for the study of the human mind. The prophet, in fact, may have weighed his words, while the unimportant habitue of the public square, may have nothing to gain and less to hide, than the most of us.

I have recently read a book, *Modern Clinical Psychiatry* by A. P. Noyes. He tells us much about mental diseases, but does not give us a definition of the mind. In this book (of mine) it would be impossible to bring to account every other book on the matter of psychology. It suffices to say that I have never found one that properly defines the mind. Noyes avoids that definition until he can smother us with a hanging garden of Babel.

He then decides, "It will be noted that in the definition of psychiatry and its discussion as a branch of biology, there was no mention of the word 'mind'. There need not, however, be any objection to the use of the word provided it is employed as a collected designation for all those activities and phenomena that when the organism functions as a whole and that represent the product of interactions between it and the environment."

If you think that that was confusing, he elucidates in the same paragraph and utters an awesome decree. Like the witch-doctor of old. That which the witch-doctor does not know, does not exist. The decree is in essence a mandate for religion. Man is monistic. Man has no indwelling soul. Man has to be the soul or nothing. He also abandons the whole field of mind study, for the safer ground of what might be called, "mechanistic observations."

I quote him, "As a corollary to this definition of mind the reactions of parts of the organism would be designated as physiological. Mind is therefore the biological expression of the organism responding to its own needs and to the stresses of the environment. Man is a unitary organism or being whose physical, mental, emotional and social reactions constitute but different aspects of one individual whole which functions as a unit. The mind therefore is but one of the biological characteristics or functions of the organism, and not an entity having an existence parallel with the body."

If you read this the same as I do, this fellow does not believe that the mind is anything but the factory control-room. You will see a parallel to a degree in the concept which I offer that draws a picture of illusioned man possessing capacity for reaction more than for will. Man does react, and "modern" psychiatry is biological in its scope. But psychiatry is not then a science of the psyche. This man Noyes is more of a biological mechanic ... an electrician skilled in knowing brain areas that are likely to be undercharged or overcharged in the cases of varying symptoms and irregularities of behavior.

He tells us that "exaltation" (his word for ecstasy) is a proper diagnosis for the state of mind (body mind) evinced by Buddha, St. Theresa, John of the Cross and any enraptured mystics. The millions of followers of these mystics must then be psychotic. Yet he defines abnormality or "undesirable functioning" as that which disturbs the subjective state of the individual or his relations with other persons. The serenity of the mystic is surely not a disturbance to his subjective state. And the history of mystics shows that after they reached the "exaltation" they were more acceptable than before. The most harmless being on earth is a mystic. We can note the acceptance of Jesus and Buddha.

We may note here that Noyes relates that which is psychotic to that which is not desired by other people. Sanity is once more a matter of public mandate, not scientific proof. The psychiatrist, having no intuition, has no qualification for piddling with the minds of other men. Unfortunately, it is important only that he helps to build a new infallible priestcraft for courtroom intercourse with the legal profession. And it seems not important that he is not able to help a person who comes to him with a sickness that is intangible as far as a biological examination might show. How would he treat a case of possession? With shock treatments or exorcism? Never exorcism. How would he treat a case of mediumship? To him of course, the medium is schizophrenic. And to some psychiatrists, telepathy itself is only an hallucination. It does not matter to them, that the medium or recipient of telepathic messages may have data produced that bears no relation to any prior knowledge or experiences of their lives, nor to knowledge of things happening even as the medium is speaking. This in reference to astral projection or its equivalent.

We must keep our eye on the over-simplifying methods of modern psychologists. They are simply mechanics. Somatic electricians. It is true that they observe behavior, and have experimented with methods and gadgets to alter that behavior to please society, or its herd-bosses. But watch these gadgets. They include trepanning and ice-picking, pills of questionable after-effects, mild electrocution for mild resistance and permanent electrocution for stubborn resistance. There are some cases where such a mechanic is useful, but we must always keep in mind that this mechanic who treats our body-voltage, still knows nothing about the essence of electricity of that body.

No man can lay claim to being a psychiatrist until he has learned the trick of stepping into the mind of the other, to think for a while with his thoughts. Any other pretensive approach is peripheral.

We should, therefore, not hurry to define the mind, but honestly try to enter it. To be an authority on life on the moon is expedited best by going there, not by resorting to scientific daydreams.

If the body is the totality of man, it certainly has subtler extensions not visible to the eye.

I believe that the computer is perishable., I believe that most insanity, or that which is diagnosed as insanity, is physical derangement, or an incompatibility or impairment of parts, by disease, aging or accident. The case histories of many people who have been cured, or have recovered from that which the medical profession labelled as insanity, show that they were aware of their affliction at the time of their insanity, even though they were unable to communicate to others.

I believe that this detached witness to this suffering, is the mind. It is the final individual observer. It is not the final Mind however. The individual mind may yet have contact or union with other Mind-substance. The body is the observer, but it is not the final observer. We could accept that memory is chemical, synaptic or genetic (chromosomic), and we still would not account for the memories transmitted by telepathy. We may refer to them as mind-pictures but they are still memories, once pictured. We can readily admit that the five senses will decay some day, but we do not know if that other sense -- the telepathic sense -- or sixth sense -- will decay. The body, which is like an electrical generator, some day will lose its voltage. That is true. But the relation of that voltage in any instance to the final observer, is not established. As we have seen, many of the desired phenomena, such as satori, occur when the voltage is very low, or when the wires are badly crossed or shorted out.

From my own personal experience, I have that which may be to the reader, a strange conviction. I cannot offer it with any pose of proof. It must be taken as just a case-history for what it is worth.

My Comprehension of the mind of the final observer is such that it precludes the observer to have neither need of mundane perception nor memory to BE. It has a different perspective when the body is negated or removed, in that it no longer particularizes, for one thing. The memories and personality that we identified as being us in the body-coat, have ultimately about the same dearness and wistfulness as the characters from a story projected upon a screen for our edification. It might be like coming out of such a dark theater --out of the comfort of illusion --this business of finding our real selves. For a short while, the chilly shock of the out-of-doors reality is there.

ROMANCE AND TERMINAL CASES

The different sciences of man are interdependent even as the definition of a word relates it to almost every other word. And in examining the structure of any science or department of human behavior, we find the fallacy of one science rooted in mistakes of another. So that it is now a question whether the symbol of the serpent with its tail in its mouth is the symbol of wisdom, or is actually a hint that all pursuit of wisdom will bring us to that embarrassing, circular position.

Let us look at the looker. Let us examine the postulate that man observes. All of the sciences postulate that man is not only the observer, but the doer, and what is more, the doer of mighty things, the possessor of a will, the manipulator of magic, and the artist of logic. He gives himself the accolade of responsibility, and a sinister godliness, when he slyly acknowledges the power to commit sins. He reminds himself eternally of this prowess by romantic drama, both as an individual, and as a nation or race. In the romantic drama he is only seen strutting in the uniform of conquest, in the perfumed haze of a Romeo making boudoir history, or he is seen posing as a saint with eyes averted. The fragile minds of youth observe these romances and are moved to action equally fictitious, and to write scenes for coming generations. But death is hidden from the stage. Actually. In some places strong pressure is brought to movie-producers, to inhibit them from depicting a man in uniform in a horizontal position, unless he is a man playing the part of the enemy.

What does a dying man think of all this romance? In fact what does an older man think of the ambitious play and toil of his thirty year old son? The freshman is looked upon as being "green" by upper classmen, who view the lower classmen as unwise, and unaware of the true state of things. And the whole lot of them are tolerated for unwisdom by the bewildered professors. And if the professor is more mature, let us assume that there is a knight or two still more mature. And ask ourselves about his reaction to the big question What happens to the Galahad of a thousand jousts with the windmills when the bell tolls?

Why do they cover a dead man's face? Or pull the curtains around the hospital bed? Why do they wax and paint the face of a corpse, and murmur in guilty undertones, that the face of the corpse flatters sleep? Why do we pay a man to salve our ignorance with a pointless tirade over the casket? When all romances and pseudo-sciences have failed, there is one last attempt at histrionics. And refusal to part with make-believe.

If we are to look upon man as a computer we must admit that he is beset with many problems at once, and at all times in his life. The computer must feed, repair itself and amuse itself, and create other computers, and feed, repair and amuse them. But there comes a time when the computer feels itself coming apart. The lights are going out not only in the viewing screen, but in the whole rotting tangle. Here is a chance for the computer to forget all functions but one, -self-definition. If the last burst of energy is not wasted on thoughts of escape, the mechanism might, by shutting off the disturbing environment, and with the automatic decrease of sensory impulses, bring about at least one chance in its lifetime to coordinate all circuits in the memory-bank and come up with a startling discovery.

Let us go down to the hospital and see what happens to the computer when it breaks down. Our evidence must be second-handed, because the dying computer loses its communicating power, and we can only attempt to estimate its final deduction by the death-bed behavior. And what happens? Some are startled, some seem bored, and some smile -- but that smile cannot be always judged as seraphic it may well be risus sardonicus. We do know, however, that long before the communication-mechanism is disabled, that the aging computer has a dim view of the romances of the younger computers. Dying is not always a sudden process, and some people take many years in the preparation for death. Some repent and are quiescent in their later years, but many a young man, and middle-aged man swears off his vices and follows an abruptly different life.

It cannot be denied that the dying man does come up with a momentous realization, that he may not be able to communicate to us, or that which is not verbalizable even if he were given the mechanism for communication.

Later on also, we can deal with the possibility of there being no separate observers. But to make a beginning, we must first examine the field of psychology with the assumption that it is possible for us to talk about it, therefore assuming that we are individuals or observers.

[End]

Retrieved from '<https://www.direct-mind.org/index.php?title=Albigen-Papers-2-Psychology-Truth&oldid=329>'