

1674 High St.
Benwood, W. Va.
Oct. 10, 1960

Friend Pulyan,

You are evasive. What do you want to define as friendship? I presume by your correspondence that you do ^{not} wish me to play the credulous fool,--and I doubt if I should even if you did.

You invited reasonable discussion of the items in the letters. And immediately you accuse me of being intellectual,--because I do so.

You have made a statement that there is no immortality. If there is no immortality...and if your teaching of me is merely to allow me to know that I shall terminate totally...I would not care to strain to hard to find it out. If the statement is qualified then I do not appreciate ~~deliberate~~ ~~misdirection~~.
before the Oct 6.

In your last letter you spoke of reincarnation in such a manner as to lead me to believe that such a condition existed. "Researchers try to get thru to their loved ones via a medium, but rarely look around in society to find where their loved one has reincarnated!!" How you tell me that you know nothing of reincarnation

A person who "knows God directly" should know whether or not he has had past lives or future ones.

In your letter of August 27 you state that there was no Immortality. If so, what difference does it make whether we come to know God or not?

Another question I would emphasize is "What do you want to define as friendship?" Shall it be a mutual exchange? This is hardly possible because you have so much to give and I have nothing. Shall I on the other hand give you honesty, while you toy with evasiveness. I realize that abstract things are not verbalizable, but I also realize that you are trying to verbalize something to me else we would not be using words.

You mistake the tone of my letters if you take me to have a jaunty attitude or coolness. It is just that I presume that He who knows God knows everything, and I become suspicious when you manifest inconsistency. On the other hand, if this business of knowing God is a condition only, or a feeling, and is not coordinative with presumed synaptic knowledge or "infinite" understanding, then how can you be sure of what you experience as far as finality and validity is concerned.

I am not gearing myself for argument. However I feel (in my definition of friendship) that it is not kosher to chatter

about being able to duplicate the miracle of the loaves and fishes if you are not able to do it, and are talking to a person in desperation from hunger.

How do you know that that which you experienced was God?

Why did you choose the particular word "God", in lieu of Brahma or something else.

What do you mean by awakening or enlightenment?

A persons' is enlightened when he discovers that there is no Santa Claus, but to a persons who discovers that beauty is in the mind and not in the object, then the former discovery does not seem like an enlightenment.

It is true that much of what you say has been uttered before. And some that you say is in direct opposition to what the public reads about theology and fundamentalistic interpretation. I purposely avoid the references to the bible because everybody gets his backing from it one way or another. I have read Sikh and Moslem quotes from the bible written to justify their own beliefs. Along comes another more esoteric metaphysician who will tell you that the only reason you do not endorse him by way of understanding the bible is because you read the bible literally.....you should read it Kabbalistically, or Swedenborgianally, or you should read it while eating Peyote or standing on the head....to get the proper(his) slant.

You differ in that you deny the existence of an immortal soul. (I presume here that this is not a coy evasion of exact definition, but to mean that nothing of man survives the physical death.) In this case we are animals, and while it might be an intense delight for an animal to see a God (whatever that is), it seems kinder to tell the animal fairy tales and let it go to sleep somewhat happier.

What is this all about then? Are we going to try to be reasonable or impulsive? True....I want to grow closer to reality, to shed the illusion. However, if I am an illusion, and life-after-death in any form is non-existent, then what does it matter to me if someone tells me that I, too, am an illusion. How can the transient know of the eternal?

You speak as though sending a photograph will make us friends!

It is true that to understand you I would have to have experienced that which you have plus. I also know that I can do little about by-passing that experience except by guessing or intuition.

I realize that I can now neither decide nor negate. As you infer. Any similarity between either and the above efforts to effect understanding is illusory. Just trying to be cooperative.

Respectfully
Richard

Oct 12, 1960.

Dear Dick, "Evasive" would imply that I am avoiding deliberately (since my eyes are supposed to be wide open) a logical or reasonable reply to your questions & remarks. So let me take all your specific questions as a minimum and segregate the topics, thus:-

(1) GOD Why did I choose this particular word?

(You & I know it is semantically precarious & carries a heavy "charge" of meaning, put there by theological know-it-alls.)

(a) Well, first, what is the origin of the word? The Jews used Yahweh (or at least JHVH leaving the vowels to be forgotten as the name was tabu), Jesus used "abba" (Father) in Aramaic. The Jews also used Adonai (Lord), Elohim & other words.

"God" is not cognate with "good" apparently & is some old German or Gothic deity, now obsolete. He may have had a wife & may have required weird rituals. I wish I knew more of his origin!

However some names for the One are very impersonal & ineffable like the Tao (Way), the Brahman, the Dharmakaya, etc. Others are personal like Allah, Jehovah, (Yahweh), God, Krishna, Siva, Brahma (the masculine member of the Brahman trinity - there is one temple to him, none to the Brahman), Chemosh (the god of the Moabites who amuses me by his name somehow, as also Lord Dunsany, & to whom Solomon made a "high place" outside old Jerusalem, but who was a bloodthirsty old ruffian, worse than Jehovah if possible) & so forth.

Now the first group we naturally call IT. (including the "Absolute")
The second group we naturally call HE.

(She's are rarer, Isis, Diana, Kali, etc.)

INEFFABLE DEITIES I find in practice that I have a harder time with Buddhists for example because they will only exchange ego's pride for their ineffably ineffable. Since the ineffably ineffable is so remote they too become inaccessible, since ego has pitched his goal deliberately (!) out of reach, inconceivably. He JUMPS RIGHT OVER THE HORSE. "He" means a Buddhist student e.g. whose "Dharmakaya" is very remotely ineffable (like the word "Absolute")

HUMANLIKE DEITIES Conversely the Jews, Christians etc. have an anthropomorphic "God" whatever they say to the contrary. In practice he reflects their anger, frustration, racism, weariness, & so forth. They JUMP SHORT OF THE HORSE.

We want to jump RIGHT ON THE HORSE of course. Now since the One Self is intimately associated with us, although NOT on a "personality" basis I have less trouble PULLING THE JEWS, CHRISTIANS UP A BIT than PULLING THE BUDDHISTS, TAOISTS, HINDUS, INTELLECTUALS, PHILOSOPHERS, ETC. DOWN A BIT, A BIG BIT!!

It is a practical matter. Ego can take a delight in being very SUBTLE, very OCCULT, very INEFFABLE whereas the primitive religionist can be too childish, affectionate, etc. instead of CHILD-LIKE, SIMPLE, LOVING.

over
pleas

One obstacle is world-weariness, adult cynicism, etc which blurs the child-self you must recover. If I were a primitive religionist you could reject this (and me) very easily. But I am not!! I am at least your equal, my fine friend...

As an example there is a bad mistranslation in the New Testament - it is really STUPID. The result is that a tense interchange between Jesus & Peter is converted into a mere question & answer THREE TIMES repeated POINTLESSLY. It is even repeated in the Revised Standard Version. It is John 21, verses 15-17.

LOVE OF AFFECTION ?

Jesus asks Peter "Do you love me?" (ἀγαπᾶω). Peter answers "You know I love you" (φιλῶ). → Non-emotion (Jesus) versus emotion (Peter).

Again Jesus asks: "Do you love me?" (ἀγαπᾶω - with emphasis)

Peter says "You know I love you (φιλῶ).

~~The third~~ The third time Jesus asks stactfully & sadly: "Do you love me?" (φιλῶ)

Peter says "Lord, you know everything, you know I love (φιλῶ) you."

There are two kinds of love, ἀγαπᾶω which is the love I call "God" & φιλῶ, a personal & mechanical love which can turn to hate even. When I said "friendship" to you I meant "ἀγαπᾶω" which is outgoing, eternal [& since it is "God" himself, or itself, in us, it is truly "eternal".] Happy are the people who know this rare and wonderful thing below personality level! It can exist between two people of the same sex - David & Jonathan or between a man & woman. In the latter case it overrides "sex", "sex" is its conscious servant & supremely natural. Then the man & woman are equals & their association ("married" in the customary sense or not) is a "sacrament" in some old & genuine usage of this term.

The woman is not merely a convenient receptacle for a sex organ and intercourse does not lead to satiety. Alas, this is rare indeed. It can be a young man or woman's ideal, but they usually settle for less.

Here then is the "love" of two child-selves (wise as serpents and innocent as babes) and it truly reflects the Source of the Universe for which I used so obsolete & curious a word ("God").

The English "Revised Version" of 1984 notes in margin "Peter twice uses a different Greek word than Jesus (Not much help to a casual reader!)"

Maurice Nicoll in "The New Man" (Nisiant Street, 1955) deals with it in detail.

The "Twentieth Century New Testament" (1900) catches it & uses "love" as said by Jesus, and "I am your friend" as said by Peter (but this is incorrect as "friend" is merely the wrong use of that word we all make)

(1941) The "New Testament in Basic English" also catches it & uses "love" in Jesus' first two questions and "you are dear to me" as Peter's replies.

Since very likely you do not know this "heightened awareness" (ἀγαπᾶω) but only the emotion (φιλῶ) you have NO REFERENT to "God". You must naturally discard all semantic overtones.

This love (agape) "loves" the personality for what it is, good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant, as a mother loves an erring son.

(1) GOD (cont.)

(b) "What do you want to define as friendship?" It is the state previously illustrated in detail. It is the "transmission" of Zen. It is when each is "open" with the other. It is an approach of the One Self in each. It is a way to realization. It demands a certain discrimination & a certain culture. A trigger-happy hood, a sadist, a chawbacon, a "fishwife", an autocratic boss, a proud intellectual, the Pope, --- all these can easily have a "mystic experience" or "cosmic consciousness" (even though they might call it "only subjective"), but not so easily the "awakening" experience which Jesus said is denied to them and reserved for simple people.

(c) "What difference does it make whether we come to know God or not?" Nothing & everything. This is a paradox to make the angels weep. Since you are "God" & nothing else it is God realizing himself in this time-space episode. Thus if you do wish to know God then it can be an urgent desire (beauty, music, Nature, love are fingers, pointing the way). In that case "you do" & we should continue. If you do not wish to awake then clearly that too is an alternative situation and we should not continue.

There is no OUGHT, SHOULD, MUST, --- there is no REASON, PREFERENCE etc. I do not dangle carrots before the donkey's nose (you) although I could. The old Testament says "I put before you life & death". "Nature" is indifferent. Refusal to know God (as opposed to ignorance that it can be done) can lead to a quicker "end", & then you nourish the trees & flowers & eventually recombine somehow. As Shakespeare says "mighty Caesar dead & turned to clay, may stop a hole to keep the winds away."

Why is this? Because "refusal" is an ego phenomenon. About 90% of you is autonomous (fortunately) & the blood circulation, digestion, involuntary muscles, glandular secretions, body repairs, cell growth & division, etc. etc. go on even in sleep regardless of "Richard Rose" (great & mighty one - perhaps). The other 10% is "you" apparent decision. Thus your stomach may be saying "please, please, no more sugar, or fat food, or carbohydrates", or whatever is wrong at the moment, but your hand may shove more & more of it in your mouth! One is involuntary, one is "voluntary" (in a sense). Further ego "channels" your modes of action & response, leading to tensions & local lack of circulation. These can be deadly & one day the thing (your body) "gives" at the weakest spot. Then there is a "disease" or something and it has a NAME. It may be "cured" but the underlying condition remains. Doctors do NOT have the weeks, months & years of time required to "work" your body to get rid of

over
please

the predisposing condition. This is not occult or in question. Only "flare-ups" get names & are treated. They have been in preparation for a long, long time. The same applies to the mind. It is a delicate instrument & statistics show that one in three are either treated for a mental trouble by a psychotherapist of some sort or are put in an institution. In a lesser degree there are doubts, conflicts, frustrations & so forth. A man who has "enlightened self-interest" would be a great big fool not to consider such a situation.

However it is a good time now for you to make up your mind. I am doing some of the work of a psychotherapist and then going far beyond him. However we are alike in that I & he have to change you - not present ideas to you. He gets \$25 or \$30 an hour or 40 minutes & since he doesn't want to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs he goes snavelly & slowly, three years, five years, & -- Of course you may have an anxiety complex & it is either your psychoanalyst or the river. Then you are hooked. Otherwise he doesn't want to lose you, unless you are a really messy piece of goods. My case is different. It takes me a lot of time and trouble to write to you (& this letter is in great detail so as not to seem unnecessarily "evasive"), and naturally you are no different than anyone else. Nor can I work with too many people at this rate obviously. So if you are merely going along for the ride, having intellectual exercise & all that I would appreciate your saying that your interest is slight - and thanks & good-bye. That would avoid a hundred more letters each taking several hours (if that many were necessary, it might be far less & after has been). Since I wish to "work" faster than the psychotherapist I have of necessity to be "rougher" in handling your precious ego, just as concentrated soup is saltier & over-flavored until diluted.

(i) GOD (cont).

(d) How do you know that that which you experienced was God?

Here is the joke of the year & you will I hope see the fantastic nature of the question if I ask you to define "God" first! (And I have every right to do so, since you are asking me.) I do know that what I experienced was NOT anything I or you has ever seen defined as God or heard so defined. It was entirely new & entirely different. So why do I call it God?

For this reason. It appears from the accounts and attempted

entirely possible to explain it to one who also knows it. The Zen Masters can tell by the mere look on the student's face. I have had many curious expressions from students when they "awoke" & very obvious ones to me. Further, with all due deference to your sensibilities they were much better human beings than you are now. I asked for your photograph only to stimulate friendship (!) but to know a little more about you. If you came to see me you might know a little more about me, but don't do that at the present stage.

Your questions have been answered, so about the rest of your letter.

REINCARNATION I was very clear about this & my comment that people rarely (except in India!) look round to see where a "loved one" has "reincarnated" meant (as it would do to any half-perceptive person) that people do NOT believe in it, obviously. Common-sense would tell you that. Their actions prove it. Besides your body gets scattered & certainly doesn't "reincarnate" so what does? Body & mind are not separable. They go & you know it. However I do not dogmatize on "life after death" since you must first find out for yourself by "awakening" WHAT OUR POSITION IS & then, armed with this information, you may consider life after death for yourself. First understand "life".

MARVELS & MIRACLES "a person who 'knows God directly' should know whether or not he has had past lives or future ones."

Such questions as to what I SHOULD know are best answered by considering the experience of the race of human-beings since they were reasonably conscious, & it could be five or ten thousand years. In this time the race found that the sun rises every morning, that we cannot levitate, that we cannot see at a big distance usually and AT WILL, although curious cases do occur, that we cannot yet change chalk into cheese except via a cow or complicated chemical work since we need Nitrogen & Hydrogen for example for cheese & they are not in the chalk, that we cannot usually and AT WILL foretell the future, although curious cases do occur, & so on.

Future experience may add to our knowledge, but, as of now, human beings, you & I, have the above limitations. It is not

descriptions of men in all ages & all countries, Santana, Jesus, Eckhart, Heraclitus, Plato, Plotinus, & innumerable ~~and~~ other sources (I have a shelf full for example) that they & I did have an experience which is like a fully conscious version of the "mystical experience" (which millions have a taste of!). Thus it cannot be called "unconscious"! Further my teacher had the same & the Zen & David's masters passed it on to their students too down the ages.

This experience led to the great religions (except Islam & Christianity which are later derivatives of Judaism) — which began about BC 850-500 superseding the animism & crude fertility rites, often with human or animal sacrifice (Judaism never got out of it — at least not until much later). It was NOT AN EVOLUTION! There was a world-wide upsurge of these "awakened" men. It was a "discontinuous" phenomenon & not explicable by the methods of the anthropologist.

Each of these men spoke of One Source & their knowledge of how it expresses itself through us both as human organisms & curiously enough, simultaneously as our apparently "outside" perceptions, in other words — the Universe.

Many words which I have already quoted (Iao, The Brahman, etc) were used to describe this. One is "God".

I WILL STRESS that the followers of these men made an unholy mess of what these remarkable men said (the Buddha even said this world!) & this mess you call "religion." I have tried to AVOID starting a new one, but in lectures in Taiwan for example I hear my poor efforts spoken of as 'something new in Asia'. Heaven help us! Another one? Subud in Java was "awakened" in 1933 & here again "Subud" may develop into one of these movements alas.

The fact is people love MARVELS & MAGIC which they SUBSTITUTE FOR THE TRANSCENDENTAL. [I shall show YOU de. too]

Thus "God" is the meme for my experience, NOT my experience was "OF GOD". First Richard Rose must know what the experience is, then that it is (and was) world-wide to a few, & finally he can call it anything he pleases. ←

This answers (partly) your question "what do you mean by 'awakening'?" The answer is that, like Buddha, I cannot tell you now but I can tell when you or others have it, because then it is

over
done

my object to assist you to these powers, which I do not have myself (note all the qualifying words), since I am a humble, limited human-being like everybody I meet. Certainly I would like you to be more of a human-being but even this is hard to explain to you now.

Consider an underprivileged child from a poor neighborhood being suddenly - by adoption for example - transported to a wealthy and cultured milieu. It would perhaps be necessary to tell him not to "pick his nose & eat it" or not to spit on the carpet and a few other trifles he might overlook.

One could tell that kid that he would be one day a distinguished & cultured man, mixing in all societies, but it would be hard to explain the difference there would be in him (as he now is.)

When I work with students they are cynical, suspicious, unkind, mean-minded [e.g. they could say "you are taking all this trouble just because you like teaching & showing off; well, I will make it hard for you!"], low-motivated, not too perceptive, not too intelligent, not too friendly [every now & then I have to dodge a metaphorical knife in my back - & Jesus was tortured to death in an atrocious way while Peter and company considered the matter with gaping mouths & expectation of flocks of angels & big celestial boom-booms - no feeling for their "friend"] & so forth.

It is an "occupational hazard." The psychotherapist has the same hazard (e.g. suicidal & homicidal cases), but even he cannot take his patients further than he has gone (except by accident & I have known such) & so HE HIMSELF has a point at which he would revert to a louse!

I ought to know! I was a student once myself. I am not much better now - but I am a trifle kinder & a trifle more perceptive maybe!

If I were in the pulpit of a big cathedral or in the Zendo of a (or as a) Zen Master nobody would think I had thrown a plate at my wife that morning or done a few other disgusting things in private.

Thus as Shakespeare says "the world is oft deceived by ornament" - the PROFESSION, POSITION gives ELEVATION and the "sheep" probe no deeper. But perhaps you and I

can indulge in the luxury of the truth about ourselves and humanity.

However it is also the truth that if this thing we are doing is false then there is absolutely no other hope for you, me, or humanity, unless Spiritualism or ESP meets your deeper needs.

We are not animals, we are human beings with some consciousness, & that is a deep mystery.

We are perhaps puppets. We are perhaps even "nothing". But we are "nothings" that can be "something."

So make up your mind. If I ask for a photograph send it. It is the least you can do. And further I do not know of any way you can escape from your frustrating ego-domination except by voluntarily giving powers to some other person - me or another if you can find him or her - which will involve your obedience. I had to do it, I know no other way.

Friend,

Al.

P.S.

In this world you do not get something for nothing, there is always a price-tag. And in this case it is "sacrifice." I must say the price is very reasonable considering the merchandise. Yet people would rather die than know the truth. That means that ego is so obstinate that he would rather be extinguished than step down! There are 3,000,000,000 like that. Al.

1674 High St.
Benwood, W. Va.,
Oct. 17, 1960

Friend Puljan,

It is possible that I have too strong an aversion to the use of the word "God". From my early youth I built up a sort of anger with the pretender, who mouthed it too easily. I felt that the ignorance of hungry students was often perpetuated by wind-bags with a facility for getting into the act. My father-in-law is a minister who is ~~an~~ personal friend of "God's". He has learned to distinguish God's voice from the devil's. They talk together like two chums in a pub. And I know another guy who claims he is Jesus Christ. Not too long ago he wrote me a letter saying now that he was not sure if he were God the son or God the father. So there is an "open season" on God by petty squakers and confidence men who would avoid gross sales tax or the postal regulations.

I have a deep respect for those who do not try to label. As the Jews perhaps with IHVH. I think if I actually did experience what I consider from this angle to be the sum total I would devise another symbol.....and while losing a little mantra-magic gain in meaning by differentiation from the God of the minister's vest-pocket, and the phallic gods of old.

You used a word which to a English speaking person (Christian origin) implies personality by omniscience; and omnipresence. And the essence of this entity (in reality the personalized total ignorance of mankind to date) has been vaingloriously blue-printed by the summa theologica of Aquinas. And it still means nothing to me.....except an answer created by heat and hunger.

We have an added difficulty in our correspondence. I would have been more insistent upon definition at the early outset, but I had heard that Zen is full of shocks and gimmicks, and I waited a while to see if you were doing something for effect.

Many would run to you when you use the word God, because it is a great door-opener....especially when they claim to know all about God. But these fundamentalists are all madly chopping at each other with the sword that Christ left behind. On the other hand I think a genuinely honest man would be inclined to avoid you when you make your first claim. And of course your sifting may be the aim...but what does it leave you.

Your letter is still evasive to a degree (although I am deeply grateful for the volume and labor on your part. You speak of me not being fit to know of life after death until I know all about life. It is impossible to know life until one knows about death. And I think you know that. Still bicameral and polar.

We only know a thing by that which it is not. There is no positive definition alone. We can say that Is-ness is Is-ness, but only a man speaking from essence would understand essence.

Do not think I am quibbling. You invited reasonable argument. I think all argument is a waste of time, reasonable or not. If it is necessary for "transmission" then I will try to put up a pretence of argument, and try to be reasonable even if it is painful. But now you hint that maybe we should discontinue this attempt to awaken me. I will leave it up to your superior wisdom, and will quit writing whenever you say, or when you quit writing.

Either we use reason or we do not. My hunches tell me that we will not get far with reason. But this is your idea. Mine would be to talk to you a few days and let the intuition add up something. When I suggested this you replied that my self-invitation was "almost comical". I can tolerate that crack if it was meant to be an insult to irritate, but if it was meant sincerely.... then there is only one other way to communicate and that is written words with written definitions, and it surely does not make a bit of difference how I look.

I would like to summarize my thinking or attitude in this way.... I think you have had an experience. Perhaps such as mentioned in Bucke's book on cosmic consciousness. Perhaps even greater. But how am I to know. My recognized position is that of a germ in a windstorm. I am too small to be terrorized by the windstorm.... besides I have learned that if the germ wants to learn anything or be anything fear will avail nothing. So you may as well know, I fear neither you nor the windstorm. When you threaten to drop my case, you are counting on my fear of extinction.... and my greed for crumbs. (This is the old "drop-pigeon" game, --a hint of great savings in animal investments).

There is still another disease. You keep maintaining a desire for "friendship". Not by the fact of definition "it is the transmission". You cannot expect me to say about that. And on the other hand, after the transmission, I presume there should be no doubt of my friendship for you and all men of like effort. (Evidently Christ failed to transmit to the apostles).

Until such time as I am forced with this transcendental friendship, the most I try to live up to is that known to other germs like myself. The most you can expect from me is human friendship, and it exists only in mutual reciprocity. You are really demanding when you expect a germ to understand you enough to want to obey every unexplained order without better understanding than a scribbled line permits.... while you (who should know all about all including me) have need of a picture.

I can do things without any hesitation for no reason at all.... if asked, ----but am generally reluctant to be ordered about under the guise of a reasonable reason that is really not commensurate with what my germ brain considers common sense. I found this attitude necessary in dealing with certain cults

that used a certain dialectic to obligate all sorts of things including all wealth....and this by mail alone.

I am ignorant. I seem to sense or know it, but I, knowing my limitation, know also that you know about it. Like the pie-man and Simple Simon.....it is not enough just to brow-beat me into accepting the pie-man's claims.

Humility may well be needed to take great strides, but we must know in what direction. Inverting the lead in the first dang-heap would be aimless humility, and in all possibility, --reward-less. Beating our head against a wall or gazing at the sun until we go blind may be good implements for attaining.... but we had better make real sure that we have some insurance that we are going to attain. We may need the eye to look elsewhere.

My insurance was my intuition....sub-headed, or imperfect as it might be. And my intuition required that I personally meet and talk with you. Your cold and almost vulgar reaction was supposed to be licensed by you and your unchallengeable understanding of my "egotistical" motives. Maybe so. But you still paint an egotistical picture to me by your high-handed analysis of me that indicated with only a few words but which now is left wanting for want of a photograph.

Come now, why should this all be so one-sided. Do you really want friendship or sycophancy?

Sincerely,

Richard

Oct 23, 1960

Dear Dick,

Call the object of our discussion the "One" if you like - it has nothing to do with your frenzied semantics. All the people you mention have only a fancied referent & must be completely disregarded. If they are cuckoo there is no reason for you to be. I thought I had dealt with "God"!

Do not concentrate on the high-colored (& rather delightful) stylization of Zen. Beneath that there is serious "work" done.

As regards "experiences" Bucke mentions many of course. That type may have differing results. One person may guard it as a jealous secret all his or her life & as the most wonderful thing. On the other hand Sir Julian Huxley, who is a high-type "humanist", may have several such experiences and regard them as purely subjective.

They are not rare. They are "valid" (not subjective) but having one does not enable one to prove their validity. Sir Julian Huxley is an obvious case in point. They can come to anyone.

They are discussed fairly often, but there seems almost a conspiracy of silence about the "understanding" we are dealing with in these letters - because for one thing it is quite rare - and for another the words "an experience" do not properly describe such a fundamental revelation and discovery. Have you read what the Jpanishado for example say about it? (There is a pocket-book on them)

I am not "threatening to drop your case" but rather aware that you do not even show verbal desire for this thing - and many do. Further you must believe that, without any desire to press this upon you, I am actuated only by consideration for you, because life can be rough. If there is nothing in you that wants it you cannot blame me for the obvious realization that we would not get anywhere, except to acrimination & that is undesirable. All through the ages misguided followers of "awakened" men filled with zeal have endeavored by assertions of miracles & marvels to boost their masters' reputation - and actually such things are beside the point.

Zen says that to desire miracles is to try to put another head

over your own. In plain English the marvel is to be found in what we are already familiar with, writing a letter or drinking a glass of water - in the so-called "commonplace".

Naturally I want your photograph - is that such a terrible request? Did I send you mine? If not I will at once do so. Or is there some special reason, as was the case with a lady student of mine who was terribly disfigured in an accident?

Friendship is desirable in a study of this type because the delicate discrimination required is not attainable in an atmosphere of cynical distrust, picayune carping and falsetto accusations. Even a psychical researcher gets further if he approaches this often murky subject in a pleasant manner. But leave this matter for the moment.

The experiences you mention come unmasked & unexpected. They leave ego the same as before, almost.

The understanding we are dealing with demands an [⊛]abnegation of ego, even if only once, yet completely. This is for us humans usually a real problem. For me it was nearly impossible... The friend who is assisting you (as a sort of catalyst) does not have a pleasant job because ego starts a furious battle by any & every method, tricky, snide, violent, withdrawing & so forth. (The same is true in psychotherapy but it is diluted so that ego doesn't get so inflamed. It is "diluted" because the "attack" on ego is slow, long drawn-out, gradual, gentle - and highly profitable!)

[⊛ You will find this exemplified in the remarks of every page through the ages - & I will instance Heraclitus, Sautama, Lao Tse --- all around 500 B.C. when there was such an abrupt change from the (evolved) animistic & sacrificial cults, as dealt with by Frazer & other anthropologists.]

You will never while you live find any other "way", since intellect alone cannot do the job & only revolves in its own squirrel-cage.

You will never find a teacher-friend who will let you fix the conditions of "work" because then you are using your ego to work on ego & that is self-defeating.

This is how it is. I cannot change it. It is an "odd" universe you & I are born in & will die in. Friend, Al.

1674 High St.
Berwood, W. Va.
Oct. 27, 1960

Friend Pulyan,

It is not cynical distrust.....unless you would call caution distrust. I distrust all the movements that have sucked the brain-blood of mankind....and of course I am hoping that you are an exception.

As for "frenzied semantics" all semantics are frenzied, but you asked for it. I prefer not to do so much talking since I know basically that I know nothing for sure, and it gives me no pleasure to accuse others of the same thing.

My main difficulty you overlooked. I am not lacking in desire for the solution of things, but impatient with what seems like a piddling correspondence.

What am I supposed to show verbal desire for? You call it "this thing".

Enclosed is a photo. Hope it is of help in your psychoanalysis.

If I knew you only to be a searcher for Truth I would welcome your friendship. Now if I knew you to possess it it goes without saying I would be bidding for your friendship....not just accepting it. Of course, who am I to say what can be expected of me until I fully know myself.....and consequently why should you expect anything from such uncertainty.

Sometimes I go back and read our old letters (I keep carbons). And I am reminded of the ridiculousness of a dog chasing its tail. Yet the dog does it with such seriousness that I am almost convinced it is some strange but fruitful ritual.

Thanking you for your efforts,

Sincerely,

Richard Rose

Oct 31, 1960

Dear Richard,

Brain-washing or
brain-punching?
brain-blood

I am not a "movement" & I haven't "sucked the
brain-blood of mankind". Very few people write to me and those
that "succeed" (even those that do not) are not LESS intelligent, but
more so, not less sceptical but more so. My line is not belief, it is
proof. However there is a paradox (IF THERE WERE NOT THE WHOLE WORLD
WOULD BE "AWAKENED"!) - the first step must be belief that proof
will come.

like many others I wondered what satori was, what the
Oriental religions were all about, what Santama, Eckhart, Lao Tse, Jesus,
Heraclitus --- experienced. I soon found that there was SOMETHING,
& to little Alfred that was a sufficient challenge. But one has first
to dip one toe in the ocean.

Gops!

Many thanks for the photograph, I see what you mean.

Sense or
no-sense?

By speaking of "brain-blood" and so forth you negate
your own early words (Aug 17) "I have come to look upon reason
as the vanity of the intellect."

The truth is you are still the Supreme Court to yourself
even though Heraclitus says:

HUBRIS

ὑβριν χρεὶ σβεννύναι μάλλον ἢ πυρκαϊήν
("One should extinguish pride more carefully than a great conflagration".
- and not leave a spark. ὑβρις or HUBRIS = pride, presumption.

What do you
hope to
find -
and
where?
Answer
me..

YOU KNOW, and your letters show it, that there is
absolutely no way to gain anything by a verbal understanding.
If one could, then let us publish it right away in the magazines
& newspapers! By "anything" I mean "anything ultimate" as regards
ourselves & this universe, the source of it or what is responsible for it.

Thus there is only one way left - it is work on oneself
& it is found, since you cannot decide not to decide, which is
essential, that a friend or teacher is necessary.

If I were "only a searcher for truth" we could go on
yak-yakking our fool heads off and the correspondence would
really be piddling - as piddling as philosophy or art-criticism.

As has Dae
says.
Flat,
no obvious
goal..

Whether I were working personally with you or by mail
(as so few, if any, do) the kind of work would be the same,
seemingly "flat, stale and unprofitable", distasteful, uninteresting,
no new discoveries, no tit-bits, no theories, plodding, annoying,
with no obvious aim or goal & no obvious raison d'être.

WHY IS THIS? A smart fellow would see at once.

I have a well-stocked library, I could (I have done so) write fascinating stuff, like, say, Manly Palmer Hall in his "Horizon" magazine.

There you can get the low-~~down~~ down, inside stuff on Nostradamus, the Tarot, The Heng Society, Diana of the Ephesians, the Kundalini, Dante, Blake, Mandala Magic, the Harmon Papers, the Nuremberg Chronicle, the Doves in the Light Blue Mountains + so forth. (3341 Sniffitt Park Blvd, Los Angeles 27, Calif.)

Beware when the self is deased!

EGO PURRS. THIS IS THE LIFE! EGO IS PLEASED.

But that is the whole trouble. These glamorous things actually leave a worse taste behind. It is like knowing how the illusionists + professional magicians do their tricks. It gets terribly blah!

There is One Self, not many. You hold it away by your insistence (like most people) in holding to the hegemony of your "self". When your hand finally releases its hold of the bedelbites your pretended "ownership" of your body (which you do not even "run") + of your consciousness (as though it were a piece of real estate) ceases, but the Consciousness goes on.

What will happen to you will happen to me.

However you can know the One Self-Consciousness as well as you know anyone - indeed far better. By "know" I mean really know, know by experience, know by acquaintance, know intimately - not any of the theological-hot-air + clap-trap. I speak as a mathematician with accounting + auditing background + scientific education - not as a dweller on cloud 51 or a "true believer".

Ego kicks up!

But you are judging all the time "I AM IMPATIENT" (lucky I am not), "I FEEL IT IS A DOG CHASING ITS TAIL - A STRANGE RITUAL"

You said "A STRANGE AND FRUITFUL RITUAL" as a bare possibility.

You are like all the rest - maybe more inaccessible.

Well I have been successful with several friends + they did "attain" + they did pay. "How could you have put up with my nonsense?" (just exactly like yours) + I said "My teacher put up with me".

When you stop trying to run the show + to discover some verbalized magic, when the maturing change starts to show in self-indulgent + smart-aleck Richard, then I know we are on the way. As yet you have merely fenced + shown no participation or understanding.

Heraclitus said "Dogs bark at what they do not understand". So while I chase my tail you bark! (But I am not implying you are a dog or even a s.o.b.)

I am NOT a psychoanalyst - you are fully capable of tracing your own attitude to various childish manifestations - if that is the cause. "I don't wanna, Mom. I don't wanna" + he grows up another C.G. Jung Boy, oh boy. But be comforted. Suzuki said of me "no hope + not worth the effort". He was right, it was IMPOSSIBLE. But it happened because to the One nothing is "impossible". So if it happened to Alfred who was worse (I... ..)