

**Richard Rose****The Psychology of Zen: Science of Knowing****Ohio State University****October 4, 1977**

<b>True psychology</b>	<b>Points of reference</b>	<b>Q &amp; A:</b>	
<b>Visualization</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Healers</b>	<b>Adverse forces</b>
<b>Observer</b>	<b>Observing the observer</b>	<b>Transmutation</b>	<b>Familiar spirits</b>
<b>Agreement</b>	<b>Correlation</b>	<b>Tulpas</b>	<b>Absolute</b>
<b>Psychology</b>	<b>Outside view</b>	<b>Spiritual energy</b>	<b>Levels</b>
<b>Creation</b>	<b>Method</b>	<b>Voices</b>	<b>Trauma</b>
<b>Self-study</b>	<b>What do we know for sure?</b>	<b>Possession</b>	<b>After death</b>
<b>Love</b>	<b>Six types of vision</b>	<b>LSD</b>	
<b>Umpire</b>	<b>Mind dimension</b>		
<b>Process observer</b>			

In this lecture Rose reads selections from a paper entitled “Psychology of the Observer” while he injects explanatory comments. There were at least three university lectures on this subject given in 1977-78. One of these lectures was released by Rose Publications in an audio CD with the same title. The present transcription is of a *different* recording, although Rose reads from the same paper in both. Two years later, in 1979, Rose published the book *Psychology of the Observer*, which contained new material plus extracts from the university lectures. The book and CD are available from richardroseteachings.com After the book was typeset but before it was published, there was an additional university lecture known as “1979-0403-Psychology-of-the-Observer-Pitt”, in which Rose refers directly to the book. The commercial CD also contains portions of the 1979 lecture.

We’re going to tape this today. This is the third in a series of lectures<sup>2</sup> that contain an explanation of what I consider true psychology. Some of the previous talks were in regard to Zen’s ability to penetrate the human mind. It is my belief of course that we have belabored ourselves in the western world, since the turn of the century, trying to search out a materialistic form of psychology, while there existed for centuries before that a sound, workable system of psychology in Asia. And we neglected to look at this closely because it was from a “pagan” country, possibly, or from the egotistic viewpoint that nothing valid happens except in western technology.

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.direct-mind.org/index.php5?title=1977-1004-Psychology-of-Zen-Science-of-Knowing-OSU>  
For access, send email to editors@direct-mind.org

<sup>2</sup> Tapes of the first two of the series are missing. The most recent recording in hand prior to this talk is “1977-0915-Zen-and-Death-Washington-DC” which does not contain “Psychology of the Observer” material. Recordings on the topic that follow the present lecture are “1977-1012-Psychology-of-the-Observer-Kent-State” and “1977-11-Method-of-Going-Inside”. Notes in the book *Psychology of the Observer* indicate that there was at least one lecture on this topic in 1978. The full recording of that talk has not been located, although parts of it may be on the audio CD.

I'm going to get right to the point, and after I'm through there will be time for discussion. Because we're taping this, I can't interrupt, so if you can make a mental note of things you'd like to ask about, I'd prefer you do it that way.

I want to establish the premise of course that psychology, as defined in its original sense, is the science of the psyche, not the science of the body. But regardless, we can say simply that we're talking about *knowing*, or about that part of us that has to do with knowing. I'm going to try to give this in very simple terminology. I don't think we have to get into complex formulations in order to discuss things, as you would have to if you were dealing with chemistry or physics or something of that sort. I think one of the obstacles to true psychological knowing is the fact that we've woven ourselves a big ball of yarn, instead of going directly to the human mind and trying to understand it.

[reading from paper]

We talk a lot about knowing, and knowing involves two possible directions: inside and outside. The outside knowing involves the physical world, and it involves the body and observable products of the body. And one of the products that is observable is thought: thought patterns and dreams.

Now I'm laying down a certain premise. We're talking about environment, and I'm speaking from a viewpoint that the body is your environment: that your fingers aren't you, your fingernails aren't you, your toes aren't you. You can exist without them. There's a tremendous lot that isn't you that afflicts you, influences you. There are things that evolve *from* you, such as babies, that aren't you. And there are things that emanate from you – this has been established as far back as J.B. Rhine's experiments at Duke<sup>3</sup> – an extrusion of the human being, somewhere, his mind, that goes so far as to move objects. And this isn't us. It might be an arm, but it isn't us.

With this statement, I immediately have to get into the business of defining the line between inside and outside: i.e., inside and outside experience. The designation depends upon the interpretation of the word *observer*. This must not be an arbitrary designation, used merely to expedite some argument I wish to use. We must at least attempt to be scientific and methodical in our handling of any complex problem. Yet these things should be expressed in simple terms, or as simply as possible.

First of all, let us look at the *observer*, ourself. And the word *observed* is chosen to indicate not only that which is seen, but that which is apprehended by any means: by the senses or by internal mental observations.

For instance, we see with the eyes but we apprehend other things by virtue of certain senses, sometimes telepathic senses. Now if you want, you can narrow yourself down and say you don't have these. And in much of the current field of psychology this is what the authorities do: they pretend these capabilities don't exist and they don't have to study them. But these things are continually being validated or verified by another group of scientists.

<sup>3</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph\\_Banks\\_Rhine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Banks_Rhine)

Psychology, especially psychology of the modern utilitarian type, wants to be scientific,<sup>4</sup> and in order to follow this pretense with the least amount of responsibility, it takes a very materialistic pose.

It poses that the body is all you have. It pretends further and declares that this can be examined with material measurement systems. And we'll see why this is not logical or sensible.

It talks of behavior, it says, "we do this or that", but it never says who "we" is.

Psychology never really bothers to define the mind. Well, it may in some cases, although I've run through quite a few psychology books where they talk about behavior but never define the mind. I read in a book one time where they said it was the collective products, the collective reactions or something of that sort, the collective actions of the person.<sup>5</sup>

It neglects the reservoir of thoughts and thought-data that makes up the *impetus* for behavior. And behaviorism would pretend that we do not think: that we do not have little entities, little separations from ourselves called thoughts.

It just says that we react and we are somewhat conscious of our reactions.

Being scientific doesn't mean that we have to put things in a test tube in order to examine them. Being scientific means that we think in an orderly manner. And it implies that we are able to make predictions according to our findings.

This is basically the core of any science, whether it's physics, chemistry or anything else: predictability. Now there are many psychological systems, but they do not predict. Well, certain predictions *are* being made,<sup>6</sup> and coincidental with these predictions, bigger and bigger nuthouses are being built – to house the people who are neglected, or put there when no one knows what to do with them after they've been treated by the specialists.

Physics predicts. Chemistry predicts. For instance it says, "Here's how water is made: hydrogen and oxygen, you put the two together and you prove it." I maintain that this same type of reasoning, this same type of prediction, can be done in psychology.

We accept the predictability of the physical sciences. But if you look things over you'll see that modern psychology *pretends* to predict, on enormous scales – and combined with so-called modern sociology, they would predict how we're going to change a whole nation of people just by indoctrination. I've had this told to me by a college sociologist. He said, "We're going to re-create history." In other words, it isn't true but we'll make it true; everyone will believe it if it's in the textbooks long enough.

Modern psychiatrists usually piddle around, allowing the healing of the patient to come about by group therapy – meaning group accidents.

<sup>4</sup> Rose argues that his own system is scientific, and calls it *direct-mind science*.

<sup>5</sup> Wikipedia: "The primary tenet of behaviorism ... is that psychology should concern itself with the observable behavior of people and animals, not with unobservable events that take place in their minds." <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behaviorism>

<sup>6</sup> In the form of social conditioning.

Some of you here have been into group therapy and you know what I'm talking about.

The socio-psychologists are uttering advice to all levels of social authority, and social authorities are implementing the prescriptions of the former.

The social psychologists are consequently being reinforced by the people who are reinforced by the social psychologists. The basic aim of modern psychology and modern sociology is, as B.F. Skinner says,<sup>7</sup> to placate the masses – by whatever sexual means is necessary, or whatever you have to do to entertain them. But the thing is to placate them, keep the ripples down, keep social order, and to hell with any concern for the long term sanity of the individual.

The result of all this is that our social climate is becoming increasingly more muddled; our morality is declining under the pretense that morality is only a subjective attitude,<sup>8</sup> and in the wholesale acceptance of B.F. Skinner, we've decided to make morality a sacrifice deemed necessary for the peace of the herd.

You who have studied psychology know what I'm talking about

But the herd is getting daily more hateful, because it is rankled by the idea of shotgun-love.

The socio-psychological authorities are reinforced by specially vested groups, which may be minorities of special interests or by lone individuals who think that they may become famous or funded by accurately representing a trend or a zeitgeist.

This modern approach is failing, because the wants of the individual cannot be granted to him until we know more about the real nature of that individual. He's just not as B.F. Skinner says, a lion that needs masturbating.<sup>9</sup> He may be something more.

A man who pretends to know what is best for humanity, or a socio-psychological dynasty that think they know what is best for humanity – and know how to force upon humanity the prescription of spiritual leeching through physical masturbation in order to render everyone placid, helpless and harmless – do not take into account the true nature of the individual, let alone the nature of the blueprint.

... and the fellow who drew up the blueprint, whoever or whatever that is.

<sup>7</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B.\\_F.\\_Skinner](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/B._F._Skinner)

<sup>8</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral\\_relativism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moral_relativism)

<sup>9</sup> In context, this notorious quote by B.F. Skinner in *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (p 39) can be seen as criticism by Skinner rather than approval: "Genuine reinforcers can be used in ways which have aversive consequences. A government may prevent defection by making life more interesting - by providing bread and circuses and by encouraging sports, gambling, the use of alcohol and other drugs, and various kinds of sexual behavior, where the effect is to keep people within reach of aversive sanctions. The Goncourt brothers noted the rise of pornography in the France of their day: 'Pornographic literature,' they wrote, 'serves a Bas-Empire ... one tames a people as one tames lions, by masturbation.'" An expanded excerpt (5 pages) is here: <http://selfdefinition.org/psychology/quotes/skinner-on-taming-the-lions.htm> Pdf of *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* is here: <http://selfdefinition.org/psychology/>

We have the conceited little idea that humanity is going to create humanity. But there's an admission that humanity is unable to take care of itself – or our Skinnerian psychology wouldn't be advising them for wholesale masturbation. Who is advising? Who is behind this? Another robot? And where does his ultimate authority or ultimate wisdom come from?

Even discounting the force which we might call God, it is manifest that there is an order in the universe, not just among the inhabitants of this planet, this natural aquarium. And this natural plan must be known, not guessed at.

We can't guess at what we would *like* it to be, and say we're going to carry that out, just the little willful sociologists and politicians.

It may go deeper than we think. It may go deeper than just fertilizing the soil.

The material scientist would like for us to ignore all that is not seen, except with the eye.

Everything has to be visible in order to be evidential, in other words.

However, you can take one eye out and look at it with the other. You can discover nerves running from the eye to the brain, but upon examining the brain, you can't decide that which sees.

What is it that sees?

I'm starting to direct the thinking here to the point of simply observing yourself. It need not start with a complex psychology book, if you want to understand yourself. It has to start with a bare, basic appraisal – "What's going on?" – a simple, mechanical procedure of say looking at an object or a wall and understanding the operation. What happens when you look at the wall? And from this, we're going to get maybe a better idea of what the observer is, in relation to the observed.

## **Visualization**

We look at an apple on a table, and we can close our eyes and still see the apple.

It's as simple as that: What is looking then? Where is the second picture? Call it imagination: that's loose, that's easy to do, just call something imagination. But what went on? Where is this vision, these things we see? Is it inside the head or out in front of us? The eyes are closed so it couldn't be out in front of us. Two months or two years later you can still close your eyes and see that same apple, and you might be a thousand miles away so you're not seeing it through your eyelids.

We might say we *imagine* an apple. But we see this apple with *visualization* and we don't see it with the physical eyeball. We do not see the apple when the eyeballs are

removed except by visualization. And we do not see except with the whole sense-nerve-brain combination, originally, and then with visualization.<sup>10</sup>

Not only do we have the senses, nerves and brain, but we have another faculty called visualization which has to go into this picture. And of course this happens with everything you see, not just when you want to recall. We'll see later how this happens.

Visualization not only occurs in dreams and in deliberate recall, but with every perception at the time of perception. Somewhere behind the brain-part of the combination there is a part that visualizes. The word *visualize* means to *create*, because we are able to create that picture of the apple at any later time when the apple itself is no longer there.

*With the ability to create comes the ability to delude oneself.*

We've all experienced this self-delusion but neglect to note that we have just dichotomized ourself: one self is doing something to another self. If you delude yourself, that means that one self is recognized as true, and there is recognized as being untrue certain faculties which are part of an erroneous self – that lack the ability to react properly to environmental thoughts, reactions and various stimuli.

This can be said very simply: that there is a self that is influenced by another self. We are not monistic. Whenever you say that a man is talking to himself, there's got to be two. I'm not saying there are two people, but there are two cameras [chambers<sup>11</sup>]. There are two entities, if you want to call it that. There are two compartments, one communicating with the other.

Of course we can say this differently: that the inside self is at times incapable of true apprehension, and is capable of making distorted creations. An entire, separate set of instructions on the intuition is necessary at this point to try to correct this delusion- and distorted-creative ability.

I don't deny that you can create. This is done all the time. But if you want to know yourself, you want to know which visions you're creating and which visions are coming to you. For instance you take some LSD and you say, "I created that." Another fellow says, "No, that was a real dimension." Well, when two fellows get together and compare their two LSD trips in the same room, and they see identically the same thing, we have to stop and think then, where did it really come from? It wasn't a creation of an individual mind. Either one of them got it from the other, or both of them got it from outside. And how did it come? Through the eyeballs? You never see that sort of thing with the eyeballs. This stuff goes on every day and people never

<sup>10</sup> See Franz Hartman, *Magic White and Black*, chapter 2: "The popular idea is that sensual objective perceptions are real and subjective ones are only the products of our imagination. But a little reflection will show that all perceptions, the objective as well as the subjective ones, are results of our 'imagination.' If we look at a tree, the tree does not come into our eye, but its picture appears in our mind ... if we look at a subjective image of our own creation, we perceive the impression which it produces on our mind." <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/hartmann/magic-hartmann-chapter-02.htm>

<sup>11</sup> A reference to *The Origin of Consciousness in the Breakdown of the Bicameral Mind*, Julian Jaynes, reviewed in TAT Journal (1976, vol. 1 no. 3) [http://www.searchwithin.org/journal/tat\\_journal-03.html](http://www.searchwithin.org/journal/tat_journal-03.html)

bother to really think about it. Incidentally, I took LSD and I'm quite sure I know where the vision came from.<sup>12</sup>

## Observer

We must return to the point at hand: If behavioral psychology is the science of behavior observed, we cannot neglect these internal observations. And determining a few basic things may correct for us many external reactions.

If we're going to study behavior, we're going to have to study the factors behind behavior. It's impossible to just start somewhere out in space, like starting to build a house without a foundation. And the entire behavior of humanity rests upon things like LSD trips, things that may come from outside.

We must determine first of all, who is observing? Is it the eyeball, the sensory arrangement, or an entirely separate creative mental self? – which up until the present mention of it may never have occurred to us as existing at all.<sup>13</sup>

Now of course this is nothing new. There are fields of esoteric philosophy or metaphysics in which they believe that there is a creative self that a person enters after death; I think they call it the causal world<sup>14</sup> [Theosophy] or the desire world<sup>15</sup> [Buddhism] – in which all a person has to do is imagine things, and they are suddenly there; that you can create almost anything you wish.<sup>16</sup>

Another point to determine is that when something is observed, we must admit that there is an observer.

This is just very simple, plain logic: if you see something – who sees? Nothing sees something? No. If you see your body, there's an observer watching your body that is not the body.

This brings us to the admission first of all that we can observe our own behavior. We can observe not only our own thoughts, but also thought processes such as visualization and introspection. And it brings us to another admission, that either the observer and the observed are one, or the "we" that we refer to when we say we think

<sup>12</sup> Explained in the Q&A section.

<sup>13</sup> Franz Hartman, *Magic White and Black*, chapter 2: "But here the great question arises: 'Who or what is this unknown One that perceives the images existing in its own mind, and the sensations that come to his consciousness? What is that which you call your "I," which knows that you know, and which also recognises your ignorance? What is that Self, which is neither the body nor the mind, but which uses these things as its instruments?' If you know that invisible being, you may throw away this book; it can teach you nothing new, because you know God and are the wisest of men."

<http://selfdefinition.org/magic/hartmann/magic-hartmann-chapter-02.htm>

<sup>14</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal\\_plane](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal_plane) ; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal\\_body](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Causal_body)

<sup>15</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Desire\\_realm](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Desire_realm)

<sup>16</sup> Rose calls this the "prop room" in 1977-0428-Zen-and-Common-Sense-KSU: "You go back through your manifested mind, the dimension of the prop room from which all this stuff is projected."

or behave a certain way is separate from what is observed. We have to take one course or the other.

This means that the true self is always that anterior observer.<sup>17</sup> I maintain that the observation of the anterior observer brings us to an ultimate or absolute observer. This sounds like a simple verbal manipulation or formula, but in reality it is the true method of reaching the realization of the absolute state of mind, pointed at by writers on enlightenment.

This is how it's done. Not by shutting your head and saying there's nothing behind my fingernails or behind my skull or behind my thoughts. It's by knowing what's back there.

## Agreement

So we go back to our simple search for inside and outside knowledge. We usually want to know what is "out there" first.

Nearly all the scientific minds want to know what's "out there" first. And nearly all of our educational processes are beamed in the direction of controlling the outside, manipulating the outside. And getting paid for it.

The external world attracts us from the moment of birth. We build an orderly explanation of what we, mankind, collectively see.

I said that deliberately: We build an *explanation*, not truth. Science is not truth; science is an agreement.

Our external world is largely one of agreement, and the material sciences are really just systems of getting along. We develop systems of measurement, and cataloging according to genus and specie. And later we discover that we failed somewhat in our methods of calculating and cataloging. I majored in chemistry around 40 years ago and there were 92 elements, with an infallible fiat from the hierarchy of chemistry that there would never be any more. Now of course we agree that there are over a hundred elements.

This is what we were taught. We were taught a way of balancing equations that they don't use today.<sup>18</sup> It worked – that's all that mattered. Today's system of chemistry works and *that's* all

<sup>17</sup> Rose uses the word *anterior* to refer to an observing self that is closer to the essence than whatever self or process is being observed. So the umpire is anterior to the body, which the umpire is observing, and the process observer is anterior to the umpire. These terms are defined later in the talk. The choice of the word *anterior* is problematic because the word is generally understood to mean "in front of", even though Rose states that these observers are "behind" in terms of position or perspective. Anterior also is understood to mean "prior to in time," but a search of Rose's works shows no indication that this was intended. It could also mean "prior to" in terms of what Rose calls the "projected ray of creation", but Rose does not spell this out either. For details, see the separately-published appendix: *Richard Rose and the Anterior Observer*.

<sup>18</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Valence\\_bond\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Valence_bond_theory)



that matters: that the bomb doesn't blow up before it gets into the shell, that things come out all right. But it's explanation and agreement.

It may go even deeper than that. It may go as far as that this whole visible world in which we live as one is here just because we agree that it's here.

This habit of agreeing upon things not fully understood has not caused very great mishap to humanity as a whole when such agreements were limited to the material sciences. Many of us believed that penicillin would cure everybody of certain infections, and when deaths were reported from allergic reactions to penicillin there was no great sorrow; a few people died, but in the whole it was orderly.

It was orderly and we eventually said, "Well, watch out; some people may be allergic to it and if you get such and such a reaction, run to the hospital." But there was no great disappointment. That which was infallible was gracefully accepted as still being 99.44% pure, and we could sacrifice a few.

In science we say we can get by with it. But this goes on to a *greater* degree in psychology. Our psychic and psychological determinations are made, and they seem to come from an orderly examination of the field of phenomena in question. But they too are developed and determined by campaigning for the public's agreement.

For instance, you hear people say, "Well, Freud – he's a has-been, he doesn't exist anymore. He never was true, and we're into this other thing now. Freud's been superseded, Adler's been superseded," and that sort of thing. I can't quite see that. I've read the psychology of many of the people on these different steps and I find they all had something. They all have limitations, but they all had something. But there was a *campaign*. Freud himself carried out a campaign to establish clinics all over Europe, to package his own little brand of something that was going to help everybody.<sup>19</sup>

But there's an attempt to perpetuate: First of all, the guy writing a thesis wants to be recognized as being knowledgeable. Perhaps he does nothing but bibliography work; he draws a little bit from this fellow and that fellow, he's careful he doesn't disagree with the spirit of the times, and he writes his book – so we're swamped with a lot of inane books.

There's an understandable fault that causes our reliance upon agreement rather than exact knowledge. To begin with, exact knowledge is the same as absolute knowledge – which does not exist, at least for us today – and we cannot delay the preparation of all medicine until we know all possible side effects upon all people.

This is where the word *reasonable* comes in. And we use that term as a euphemism instead of the word *orderly*. We hang a man when there is no longer any reasonable doubt, when circumstantial evidence that points in his direction makes him a criminal. It's true that we're going to go on hanging, gassing, trepanning,<sup>20</sup> and shock treating a certain percentage of the population, and this lethal sort of lottery must have some explanation for the sake of conscience.

<sup>19</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freud#Early\\_psychoanalytic\\_movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freud#Early_psychoanalytic_movement)

<sup>20</sup> Transorbital lobotomy: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ice\\_pick#Medical\\_uses](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ice_pick#Medical_uses)

There's always a little whisper of conscience, saying, "Do we really have to go through all of that? Isn't there a better way out of it?" And we somehow have to depict our professional acts as being rational.

## Psychology

While exact knowledge is for practical purposes impossible, there are methods that can be used that might eliminate some of the bungling, gassing and hanging. We soon learn that our inadequate understanding of the outside world is the result of *defective observation mechanisms*.

In other words, we don't see properly from inside.

This points in the direction not only of our senses, but also in the direction of mental habits of visualization, dreaming, creating or projecting.

Now if you understand what those words mean, especially the word *projecting*, you'll get into what's wrong with your individual heads, as well as collective humanity's method of appraising things. We see people and fail to understand them, that sort of thing.

We may not understand the external world properly until we understand our self. This is especially true in the psychotherapy department and the attempts by individuals to get along with their fellowman. The psychiatrist who can no longer prescribe for a patient in terms of medicine or behavioral analysis, turns the patient over to group therapy, in the hope that an accident will do for the patient that which his paradigm or theory-agreement failed to do.

That's all you've got with any psychiatrist in this country: theory-agreement, and tampering with drugs that seem to have certain effects. I had a psychiatrist brag to me one day – he was shooting one of the people I knew full of needles and talking at the same time. And I said, "What are you doing?" And he said, "I'm giving him Stelazine."<sup>21</sup> And I said, "What's your diagnosis?" And he said, "Well, I don't have a diagnosis yet." And I said, "What are you giving him medicine for then?" They were holding him down, shooting this in his posterior.<sup>22</sup>

This was a guy in college who had done too much thinking, drinking, smoking, or socializing, and it had got the best of him. His head got rattled and he went down to the doctor. The doctor said, "Go down the street, they've got a nuthouse, and talk to that fellow down there." Well, they checked him in and wouldn't let him go – they got him down and were pumping him full of drugs. (I don't think the drug was too harmful, but it sure destroyed his ability to make a decision for himself, or even try to pull himself out of it.)

But what got me was the fact that this doctor had complete charge. A man arrested for murder would have more rights: he could call a lawyer, he could get out on some sort of *habeas*

<sup>21</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trifluoperazine>

<sup>22</sup> Rose told the story many times as this was a group member. When Rose held his hand the young man immediately became calm and was able to stand. Rose asked the doctor, "Can you do this?" and the doctor just brushed him off. Rose says the drug was Stelazine in 1990-0503-What-Is-Thought-Ohio-State and in 1981-0215-Psychology-of-Miracles-Akron.

*corpus* procedure. But this fellow had no rights whatsoever; he was in the hands of this man with the needle. And I know of another case right here in Ohio where a psychologist called the police and had a fellow put in jail who wasn't even disturbed. He had threatened to punch the psychologist, who just called the police and said, "This is one of my patients and he's gone crazy, lock him up, he's dangerous." And they had him up for six months. No trial, nothing. Six months or a year, I don't know which it was. He served at least six months of it.

Now this is the type of theory-agreement we have. I fail to find the threads of anything except authority. If you go to school long enough and get into a position where you can dare to do so, you can exert a lot of authority with a needle. But this doctor made the remark – this happened over in Providence, Rhode Island<sup>23</sup> – he said, "We have a drug for every thought." That's our science. If a man says, "I think people are persecuting me," "Okay, we've got a drug that will cure him of paranoia." If he thinks he's pregnant, well then he's a schizophrenic, so they've got a drug for that.

The other people in the therapy group serve as a mirror for the individual. (Now this part is true.) He begins to see himself in a new light and realizes that he may be taking an erratic or selfish pose that alienates him from the mainstream of human agreement.

This is the benefit of group therapy – it's alright, that part of it.

He goes back inside of himself, and realizes that he has been fooling himself. When he recognizes this, instead of being a social misfit he may immediately become a budding psychologist.

And he does this without too many complex words, just by looking at himself.

## **Creation**

When one part of a man fools another part, the part that has been fooled is the essential or anterior self.<sup>24</sup>

Now this is what we have to remember: somebody has been fooled. It isn't the second-class self that's been fooled, it's always the better man who has been fooled.

With the ability to create, come visions and states of mind so powerful that the anterior self or mind accepts as valid all of these creations.

This is how the fooling takes place. Either in our environment or our desires, a package of things we want to do are so strong that the wiser part of us accepts them. And what is the wiser part of the self? Survival. If a man eats too much or drinks too much he may bust a gut; or if he takes too much booze and mixes it with dope he may have a heart attack and die. He does this as a result of something inside himself that strongly wants to do it. He can't resist it. Some of them will tell you, "I'm *doing* this." They say, "He OD'd." But *he* didn't OD. He was

<sup>23</sup> Students of Rose established groups in Boston and Providence in the fall of 1975; see *Pyramid Zen Newsletters* for details. Rose gave talks there as follows: 1975-1118-Brown-University (missing tape); 1975-1119-Boston-College; 1975-Harvard-University (unknown date, missing tape).

<sup>24</sup> See footnote 17 above.

OD'd. His anterior self had long since gone to sleep, or it would have stopped it. Now there's a name for this which we'll get to later, a very simple name.

We might dramatize this idea of fooling yourself by mentioning the practice of some Tibetans.

There are some Tibetans who are adept at making what they call a *tulpa*.<sup>25</sup> Are you acquainted with this? A tulpa is an entity that looks to all appearances like a human being. Now this is not superstitious talk. If you get a chance, I think Alexandra David-Neel<sup>26</sup> describes the entities that they encountered.<sup>27, 28</sup> Well, whether you want to believe that they're real or not, they were photographable.<sup>29</sup> And the monks would create these things; they would always create a woman, not a man, because there were no women in the monasteries. So they created themselves a woman and they had intercourse with her. David-Neel witnessed this,<sup>30</sup> and was curious about it: weren't these people fooling themselves? Wouldn't a real woman be much better than this creation?

But if you knew how they created these, you would also know something about the human mind that we don't know. They are supposed to be so skillful mentally – some of these fellows are; that's how they spend their lives, back in these monasteries – that they can actually create an entity in human form from their will and imagination. And again, those two words, will and imagination – if you go back into the kabalistic dogmas you'll find that this is the seed of creation: all creation is the result of the will, plus the imagination, plus the fiat ["so be it"].<sup>31</sup>

This tulpa becomes their companion and often their master. One Tibetan priest commented to this author that it took him six months to create this tulpa and six years to get rid of her.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>25</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tulpa>

<sup>26</sup> (1868-1969) [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexandra\\_David-Neel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexandra_David-Neel)

<sup>27</sup> This appears in her book, published 1932, *Magic and Mystery in Tibet*, also titled *With Mystics and Magicians in Tibet* (an English rendition of the title in the French edition). The PDF of the latter version is searchable. Both versions are here: <http://selfdefinition.org/tibetan/>

<sup>28</sup> Nearly all available references to tulpas trace back to one chapter by Alexandra David-Neel. However, see the following for an experiment on tulpa conjuration by the Toronto Society for Psychical Research in September, 1972: <http://www.strangerdimensions.com/2012/03/20/the-philip-experiment/>

<sup>29</sup> A web search turned up no information on the photography of tulpas. However, the following article describes attempts at spirit photography. *Fortean Times*: "Psychic Photography, Capturing Spirits" [http://www.forteanimes.com/features/articles/2455/random\\_dictionary\\_of\\_the\\_damned.html](http://www.forteanimes.com/features/articles/2455/random_dictionary_of_the_damned.html)

<sup>30</sup> In *With Mystics and Magicians in Tibet*, there is no reference to monks creating a female tulpa for sex. Web searches about this practice were futile. Inquiries to staff at various tulpa message boards also turned up no historical references (although there are some contemporary deviants at 4chan who are attempting the practice). David-Neel actually tried the procedure herself, but not for sex. She produced a tulpa, a short, fat, jolly monk, which she says took her 6 months to dissolve. She covers tulpas on pages 278-285 (pages 218-224 of the pdf file). <http://selfdefinition.org/tibetan/>

<sup>31</sup> An exact quote with this trinity of words was not found, but the process is discussed extensively in Eliphas Levi's *Transcendental Magic* (Doctrine and Ritual, books 1 and 2). <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/> and in his *Paradoxes of the Highest Science*, Paradox VI, "The Imagination Realizes What It Invents", <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/eliphas-levi/paradoxes/levi-paradoxes-6.htm>

<sup>32</sup> In the book *Psychology of the Observer* a different time period is given: "six years [not months] to create his tulpa, and six years to get rid of her". This is in the University Lectures section.

So after a certain length of time, even with this wonderful manipulation, he realized that he wasn't ahead of the game; that he had been fooling himself. This is what I'm getting at: Who lived with the tulpa and who got rid of the tulpa? It wasn't the same person, the same analytical personality.

We get into habits which seem to be acceptable and later find that our peace of mind has been permanently impaired. We may have acquired habits such as drinking because we thought that the habit was harmless: it was a nice social thing to do, everybody was doing it, and the first thing you know we're hooked.

Then of course we say, "Who is hooked? Geez." You may even rationalize it. I had a fellow tell me one time that you weren't a man if you couldn't hold your booze. I ran into him two or three years later and he was a derelict on the street corner. And he was still quite proud of his situation. He said, "You've never been a man, Rose, unless you've had the heebie-jeebies."<sup>33</sup> That makes a man out of you."

So there are things that people think are necessary, just to get along – because you can talk more easily with drunks when you're drinking and it's a great social leveler. But every one of these people, when you meet them down in Alcoholics Anonymous, recognize that they have fooled themselves. That's the first admission they have to make in order to be cured. And a person who is irrevocably lost on dope has to make that admission. He can't say, "Ho, I've got control of this thing." He has to admit he's lost before he can find his true self, and then go back to that true self and fight his way out again.

### **Self-study**

Let us get down to the business then of studying the inside of ourself. It is not as easy as it sounds. Most people think that they know themselves.

One time at a lecture in Pittsburgh I made the remark that people didn't know themselves. And a fellow said, "Oh, that's foolish, I know myself." And I said, "Well, who are you?" And he said, "I'm the guy who's sitting in front of you." Now of course, I didn't even bother to answer him, because he was referring to his physical self, and he knew very well it was just a pert reply. But nevertheless, a lot of people think they are familiar with themselves. You are *not* familiar with yourself. You're familiar with a projection. His physical presence was part of the outside world. It is objective. We can say that things observed are objective. The observer is the only subjective thing we can study.

Descartes said, "I think therefore I am." But if a man thinks, he should immediately ask himself who's doing the thinking.

You can't define yourself by the fact that you're thinking. The thinking occurs, let's put it that way. We accept that the man thinks, that thought is occurring. But where is this thinking coming from? Is it just reactions? (Now I don't doubt that these reactions come from different levels.)

<sup>33</sup> *Delirium tremens*. In 1977-0915-Zen-and-Death-Washington-DC the quotes is "the hoodles".

Is it the mouth and the body talking? Or is there something behind the body that is trying to communicate? If a Tibetan priest talks to his tulpa, is he the one who's talking, or is the desire for the tulpa talking?

Say you meet a man down at the corner. I used to know a guy who'd panhandle for a drink, and he'd say, "Give me a quarter." (Of course that was years ago when you could get something for a quarter.) But the answer was always, "That's not you talking, Joe, that's your booze talking. Here, let me get you a bowl of soup. You don't want a quarter, you want a bowl of soup." But the booze talks. And we proudly own it. The dope talks and we proudly say, "I tripped." You don't trip; you are tripped over.

In the case of the tulpa you say, "How does a man get bound so tightly to something like this?" And the answer is, he's into an operation he doesn't quite understand.

The tulpa is a creation in the mind of the priest, but a tulpa is also the materialized embodiment of the desires of the priest. So the desires may be talking to the tulpa, which in turn is the desires of the priest.

He's talking to himself. He can't get away from himself. He's closed into a tight circle. And really, he's objectifying, dichotomizing himself, so he can have intercourse with himself so to speak.

We can see that a man can quickly lose track of himself if he were such a priest. But there may not be too much difference between the tulpa of Tibet and the Galatea of Pygmalion,<sup>34</sup> or between the sexual voyeur and the objects of his desires.

The theme of Pygmalion is pretty much the same as the tulpa.

If desires are observable then desires are objective and outside. When the subjective considerations are viewed they immediately become knowable and objective. Whether the desires are recognized by us as gestalts<sup>35</sup> or entities, they are external afflictions or assets. They are not us.

Desires may try to involve us, try to identify themselves as being us. But if we go to jail or the hospital because of our desires, we will quickly become identified with another set of desires – which will save us – which are the desires for health and survival, or the desire for peace of mind. When this happens, we divorce ourselves from our desires nominally, by identifying the dangerous ones as "not us".

## Love

But we continue to deify ourselves; we assert that we desire to love and be loved.

This is the big thing that goes on continuously today. When somebody's lost everything but the last gasp of consciousness, he's still a lover. He's trying to create a tremendous interplanetary field of love, like the steam off a manure pile.

<sup>34</sup> The sculpture that came to life. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pygmalion\\_\(mythology\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pygmalion_(mythology))

<sup>35</sup> Thinking patterns. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gestalt\\_psychology](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gestalt_psychology)

We use this as a bond with the cosmos and with God, by announcing that God is love. Many of us identify ourselves very closely with the desire for love. We are little, harmless, fluffy balls of love. But it becomes apparent to us that we are really not as loving and lovable as we project ourselves to be.

In other words, the original smile was meant as a warning: "Stay away, I'm going to bite." But now we say, "See, my teeth are harmless."

It is then that we view our fluffiness and loveableness as being external ideas, more compatible with our fellowman than the desires for lust and blood. (We don't want to show him that.) And we eventually recognize that our love is a projection, born out of a desire for love

Everybody wants it, nobody gives it. Everybody's saying, "I love." Hell, the one's I've seen who say this, the ones who are preaching this so violently, are so helpless and weak that they couldn't perform the most rudimentary type of love.

## **Umpire**

We are better able to recognize our desires and fears as being external when they conflict with one another.

That's the only way you see them. You don't see them when you're just in one state. You have to see the opposite.

The desire to get drunk will be countered by the desire to be delivered from the consequences. The fear of death will temper our desire for body pleasures, and join with the desire for prolongation of life. We watch this contest for human energy, and then we notice that we are *acting*: we are taking steps to conserve our energy. And this step-taking is witnessed by us as a *process*.

I would like to give a name to this anterior self and call it the *umpire*. The umpire has a motive, and the motive is the preservation of the body or the self.

I want to give you a picture of what we're approaching with this talk. What we're talking about is *influences* that are evidently acting upon a group of things that we identify as ourself. For example, we begin by identifying our "love": maternal love, fraternal love, connubial love or whatever. A person says, "I like to eat," another says, "I like to drink." Or, "I want power." Now these things manifestly are always getting us into trouble, endangering possibly what we really want to do – which is to live forever. We soon realize that these things are going to keep us from living forever, or even living as long as the father and the grandfather.

So there goes on inside of every human being a sort of automatic procedure – until it's recognized as being automatic, and then there's a chance you can reinforce it.

Now this is the first step that you have in activating and controlling yourself, or doing something for yourself. I don't mean control yet, but at least you can throw a little weight. And that is when you realize that there's an ego, something inside you that's an umpire, that says, "Hey, if you're going to dope, don't take that booze, you'll kill yourself. And you can't have any

fun if you're dead." Or, "Be careful if you have such and such a sexual relationship, because they might hang you for it. You might catch something you can't get rid of and it will shorten your life, or play hob with your sanity." So these voices are all going on, which we have various names for down through the ages: one of them is *conscience*. Conscience may well be one of the names for the umpire.

Upon the first witnessing of this, we see clearly that there is something behind the senses, behind the appetites, behind the fears even. It's not just egotistic or hungry voices; sometimes fears have to be dealt with and umpired. But there is an umpire, mainly interested in the continuation of the body, the survival. Because up to this point that's all the intelligence knows. All we know is a body. There's no proof. If you want to be factual, there are very few people who ever have any proof that there is something besides the body. That's the reason it's so easy to put the idea across that that's all you have, because it's very difficult to ascertain anything else.

I'm hoping to get to the point where that can be seen, that there is something behind the umpire. The reason there is something behind the umpire is the simple fact that it can be observed. And then it immediately becomes objective and vanishes as the "self". Because once something is objective it is no longer subjective. So we watch the umpire processes.

### **Process Observer**

The umpire may be extremely intricate, and in the contests between desires, it is necessary to study the thought processes – so we can identify and forestall any destructive trends before they get too strong. We now find another anterior observer, one behind,<sup>36</sup> one that observes the umpire. The umpire seems to be very real, meaning very objective. This new anterior observer is still hypothetical until we can see *it*. And when we see it, it will be something observed and will not be us.<sup>37</sup>

Of course we do not see the umpire with the physical eyes, nor does it have an image that might be visualized. We witness a *process*. And this witnessing is scientific, because we define science as an orderly thinking process that carries with it an ability to predict.

Once you are aware of the umpire you can predict future conduct for yourself. You'll say, "I will see these forces coming. I'll know when I get the urge to smoke a cigarette. Or I'll know when I get the urge to take a drink, and if I inhibit it, then I'll be able to think more clearly, I'll be able to go to work and earn a living. If not, then I'm going down the toboggan ride." So with this type of prediction we have a pretty good hold upon our umpire as a part of our self, and know it as a part of our self.

We observe our reactions in regard to the senses and our fears and desires. We observe these things not directly but as forces and factors that impinge upon the body.

<sup>36</sup> Again, Rose uses the word *anterior* to represent something that is "behind".

<sup>37</sup> Rose says below that these are only perspectives. We are only clarifying the observer, and there is really only one observer, even though the point of observation changes. See the section "Observing the observer".



(When they impinge upon the body, the effects are observable with the senses.) I am not saying that all reactions are perfect or bring ideal results, nor that the umpire knows how to preserve the body in all cases.

The umpire is not God and it's not a perfect mind, because it's evident that it gets out of hand. Until the body gets a certain amount of training, or will, or a desire on our part for an umpire to become more perfect, it *isn't* perfect. It makes mistakes. And as a result of the mistakes, it starts to set up a better and better system. But it never gets to the point where it can immortalize the body. It might build us an innocent desire to study biochemistry or something, but it doesn't have any more knowledge than what we can put into it.

But we can witness adjustment in the body as the result of this umpire. If we had been in jail for getting drunk, with promptings of the umpire an appeal to the survival ego may create conditions for the body – in which the body may be free from jail and legal complications.

Everyone who goes through these changes is aware of the processes of thinking mentioned. They will never deny that these thinking processes are logical and valid for the new self. But the individual rarely watches the complexity of the inner struggles, nor does he see all the factors involved, nor does he name these factors the same as others name them in similar experiences.

And this is one of the confusions about psychological observation: unfortunately we've got whole systems of vocabulary that confuse us. And I maintain that unless we get back to simplicity, the field of psychology will become so vast, with so much terminology in it, that it will be hopeless. So hopeless that, as Chilton Pearce says,<sup>38, 39</sup> we'll have to throw the language out and start all over, to try to get something said simply.

Some are delivered from alcohol and say God was the agent. Others will say they just made up their mind. Others receive help from a clinic or a special group of people like AA. However, they had to make a decision to search out their God, their inner strength, or human assistance. And the umpire was behind that decision. A lot of thinking and reasoning went into it that was never talked about.

What I'm saying is that if you want to just consider the umpire as being the determining factor in your thinking, that's alright with me. I'm just pointing out what it does, and the fact that this is a department of thinking.

We get a picture now of an umpire being observed by a newly-discovered, more anterior observer. This second observer is distinct or unique in that it is totally a process observer.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>38</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph\\_Chilton\\_Pearce](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Chilton_Pearce)

<sup>39</sup> *Crack in the Cosmic Egg*. Pdf here: <http://selfdefinition.org/psychology/>

<sup>40</sup> Rose has named this process observer or self by its function, or one of its functions, but he indicates below that it also partakes of a higher sort of mind, capable of ESP, direct-mind activity, etc. See the heading "Mind dimension" below. Alternatively, there is a higher mind that has various capabilities, one of which is observing processes such as the umpire, and hence its name.

Now if you want to go into meditation sometime, think this over for yourself. And think what happens when you see the umpire, when you're watching the umpire work. You're not watching something physical now, like a table or an automobile, you're watching processes going on inside your head.

The umpire watches over the body or the self, the small "s" self, and while getting interested in preserving the body-life, it cannot help but get into planning for ultimate survival or immortality.

I want to distinguish between these, that there are two selves: a mundane, physical, tangible, thinkable self, and one that is always remote and never quite tangible. But here the umpire is talking. The umpire would like for immortality, because that's taking care of the body.

Consequently, the search for immortality is not a screwball idea – that a lot of psychologists would have us believe<sup>41</sup> – it is basically a fundamental, animal direction. All life desires to live forever.

Every animal fights death – for example, when they know you're trying to kill them.

The aim of all survival has to be a hope and a plan for eternal survival. But because the umpire has somatic values at stake, it cannot get to the problems of ultimate survival as much as it would like – since it identifies with the physical survival first. And of course, the ultimate survival is a big project.

Now we get to what I really call the mind, that is not just an umpire adjustment:

The process observer, the *mind*, retreats from material observations and contemplates patterns in thinking. This may well be called higher meditation. And it is this observer that watches the mind, and comes up with results that are like mathematical functional curves instead of exact, demonstrable answers.

In other words, when you get into the logic of the science of the mind, you don't get points in space; you get like trigonometric functional curves.

### **Points of reference**

For instance, it is the process observer that sees that the physical universe may well exist, and at the same time may not exist.

He's contemplating theories, contemplating possibilities. He doesn't know the truth about the physical universe. He has to take in what may be sound theory: One theory is that it's there, another theory is that it's not there, or that it's an illusion

At the same time it will see that the physical universe may exist as an illusion only to people able to reach certain abilities for observation. Likewise it takes an abstraction such as "good" and again realizes that the definition depends upon the position of the

<sup>41</sup> See comments on William James and "medical materialism":  
<http://selfdefinition.org/psychology/james-medical-materialism.htm>

observer who takes the value of "good" into consideration. He may see that good is God and everything's final destiny. Or he may at the same time see good as a polar point of evil.

You live in a relative world and you've got a relative brain and sensory apparatus.

And he may, by observing the previous two conclusions, come to the further conclusion that "good" is defined from the position of the observer and has no real meaning as a thing in itself.

Now, so what do we get? We get something between X and Y.

We get the possibility that the answer lies in the fact that the universe may be physical, it may be an illusion, it may be whatever we see from our point of viewing.

Now there's a reason for saying this. Things are definitely different from different points of viewing. It's like looking at the clouds from the bottom and then getting into an airplane and looking from above; you see an entirely different cloud.

The amazing thing is, that all of the different conclusions are valid in relation to the accepted validity-standard of each position of the observer. According to material standards, material exists. We measure it and it exists. If we identify ourselves as being strictly material bodies in a physical universe, we are valid and we are being consistent – but it is like saying that material defines material.

Now this is something people don't think about, that material defines material. We're not stepping away from this; we're not stepping into another position to view it.

## **Definition**

Definition requires comparison. Knowing may be direct and absolute, in understanding the nature of things, and we know that we are not absolute creatures. Or in the event that we know we are absolute creatures, we have not found a means to communicate that finding except with words.

It is possible to know things directly. But once you know them, it's not always possible to communicate what you find. So in the business of communicating with other people we get back to definitions. And definition requires that we talk about something in relation to something else we're familiar with. It's like creating a small planetarium out of marbles and showing the relationships of the planets: we can get a better idea by talking about marbles than we can by talking about infinite planets out in space.

Words relate to bodies, and that includes our own body, body-mind or mundane consciousness. So that we come back to definition, unless we have found a state of being that satisfies us, and which we do not care to promote among our fellow man.

Now if we find this state of being and don't care to promote it, that's alright. You don't have to talk. But if you do want to talk, then you have to find words, definitions.

When the man who has *become* says that the universe does not exist, he means that it does not exist as permanently as does another dimension.

Now of course, I'm hinting at the things you hear in Zen. The Hindu philosophy also mentions the word *maya* and says that all is maya.<sup>42</sup> In Zen they talk of nonexistence, non-being, no-mind and that sort of thing. And yet when that fellow gets through talking, he goes and drinks a beer. So he doesn't deny that the beer exists.

He looks from this other dimension, and uses words on us that have been used to explain the validity of the material universe. And from this practice results an endless explaining of limitations of language, and of the limitations in the listener's mind, that is explained best by the use of the word *paradox*.

Everything is paradoxical until we can have better rapport, where you can just go directly to a person's mind and they know what you're thinking.<sup>43</sup>

We take a stand on good and evil: we might say that life is good and death is evil.

I'm going to try to show you how these definitions occur from different points of view.

For the pig about to be butchered, death is bad. But for the man about to eat the pork, the pig's death is good, as it extends the life of the man. However, for the man who has become afflicted with trichinosis from eating the pork, the situation may change, and death as evil for the pig once more becomes evil for the man.

However, there is still another point of observation: the man may sometime later view the scene from another dimension and decide that neither pig nor man held the same values as before, and that death, good and evil were simply the results of man's position of observation at the time.

Most of us don't like to accept the possibility that we might view the physical universe from a dimension of any other type of validity. We cannot accept this possibility until we realize that we are demanding that a non-material dimension render itself material so that we can measure it with material standards.

Whenever a person says that he has had an experience, there's a challenge immediately to define it – so that they can weigh it, put it in a test tube, compare it with certain scales or so on. And if this doesn't happen, or if it can't be defined suitably in language, then it's discounted. Of course, the reason it's generally discounted is that the listener is unable to receive the communication. This is what it amounts to.

Of course this business of communication cannot be done except in ineffective word imagery if that dimension is more real than the physical universe.

This is what we get into then: Which of these dimensions is real?

But regardless, what I'm trying to get to is our evident attempts to define. We see something, where everybody says, "Oh, it's out there, that's the universe," but even that isn't very easily

<sup>42</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maya\\_\(illusion\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maya_(illusion))

<sup>43</sup> So the "paradox" is not something that exists; it's just a result of mental limitations.

definable. Because as long as there's another valid explanation that involves some sort of orderly thinking, we've got to pay attention to it.

### Observing the observer

Up until now I've only hinted that these new dimensions are possibilities that might be surmised by pattern observation, by taking note of pattern thinking that results from inadequate physical senses.

What happens to the process observer is that this consideration of the possibility of alternate natures for things apparent, brings the observer to a point of high confusion – that puts all physical evidence in jeopardy, and then puts all mental process observation in jeopardy.

The process observer is the mind in its deepest potential. This becomes with relentless meditation on pattern possibilities, and observing-the-observer processes, a dynamic study of the mind with the mind. And the results are an explosive quandary.

There's only one way to study the mind, and that's with the mind (not with ink blots and normal curves). And when you do this you practically go nuts. But yet this is the procedure. Let me add that when you go nuts – you get the answer.

This is the first time we realize that we have been studying the mind itself. When we talk of an observer anterior to another objective observer, it looks like we are either chasing our own tail, or that man has an infinite number of observers: that we are continually something that is observing the observer.

Now this isn't true. What happens is that we're clarifying what is the observer. Because we *don't* have an infinite number of observers; *we only have one*. But as long as we're able to watch the processes, the process is not the observer.

It was before. The umpire at one time seemed to be the real, true self. But as soon as we discovered that it's just a process, it immediately becomes objective. It disappears as a self and we see the self behind it. Now this one is only an illusion yet; it's only something we built, and we see it as being a construction. But when we see *that* self [the process observer], then whatever is behind that is the true Self, the capital "s" Self.

So the real self keeps retreating. The region or the domain of the small "s" self enlarges, it becomes vaster. And the small "s" self involves an objective type of mind, in contrast with an essential mind, perhaps, that manifestly doesn't think in terms of the mind that we're used to.

So the pattern-thinking or possibility-thinking creates a possibility, but eventually you reach the point where you know that it's no longer just a possibility, that it's really there:

We take this process observer, alias mind consciousness, as being "us" once more, never dreaming in the beginnings that it too will become an observation. And when it truly becomes an observation, not just a possibility of being an externality or observation, this happens by reaching a deeper or more anterior position of observing.

You can't just say, "Well, there's something back there then, because there has to be something behind something else." No. You can't realize this until you go there. You have to get behind the umpire to see it, and you have to get behind the process observer to see *it*.

## Correlation

We are now approaching a real self by divorcing all of our pattern thinking – even from let's say the genetically-imposed patterns of thinking. And we come across an awareness of correlation at this point.

As I said, you get into a real state of confusion, and you say, "Hey, I can't keep track of this. I don't know whether I'm thinking or not thinking, and, maybe I'd better let go of this because I might get lost somewhere."

In the initial stages of observing we deliberately look for patterns.

We do this in mathematics. I call them common denominators.

One method of looking for patterns is to examine the field of data for common denominators. This does not always bring us mathematical revelations unless we can throw into the computer all the factors that cause these common denominators. To give an example, one justifying argument for the God theory in theology would be the common-denominator type of evidence of the God theory existing in nearly all religions.

Every religious system seems to have the God theory.

Many are eager to seize this type of evidence, as they are hungry to believe and too tired to do further thinking. The factor that is missed is that things are not proven by belief. A belief is only a postulation. Another factor that affects the conclusion is that the beliefs may have sprung from a *desire* to believe – a certain dogma – rather than to try to find things out for whatever they really are.

Still, correlation can be of use. In esoteric writings we come across the correlation, "As above, so below." This is no more absurd than Einstein's theory of relativity. Checking patterns of thinking with patterns of thinking – for example, looking for common denominators – may be the only tool we have for this mental observation. We just have to keep an eye on slipping into projection of our desires.

You're always keeping a check on your thoughts, to see if you're creating some concept structure you want to create.

We hit a snag in our studies of the material world by using material to check material. The material world is consistent within itself, and the material sciences are the evidence of that. But we cannot use the material world to check anything beyond that.

That was the point in bringing up the idea of definition needing comparison.

## Outside view

So we need to define the material world properly. And to know that, for the interior observation of the material world to be valid, it has to be defined from outside.<sup>44</sup>

Definition requires comparison. The thing under scrutiny must be viewed in terms of something else – something outside the self – in order to determine its uniqueness.

If you go back into the definition of words, you'll know what I'm talking about. You don't say a rose is a rose. You say a rose is a plant – something else – that it's a unique type of plant, and the rest of the definition is its difference from all other plants. Not the fact that it is *like* something, but that it is *different* from them. It is similar in some respects but it is unique, and for this it has to be viewed from somewhere else. The rose cannot define the rose, so to speak.

So a man is defined as an animal but a unique type of animal, and the difference becomes his definition. However, when we lump the entire material picture together, and attempt to define the visible, physical universe – this whole material universe – we can only do this adequately from another dimension. We cannot do it properly even from another universe, if that universe is of the same material as we are.

It's not just looking from some other galaxy that operates under the same pattern. The only way to really evaluate it is to look at it from outside of itself.

Yet many of our relative minds reject the idea than man can, from some anterior mental dimension, really perceive the material universe in a valid, if not really real, appreciation of this world.<sup>45</sup>

In other words, that he can see it and have a just appreciation from it. The first impression is that if a man looks at things with his [interior] mind, he's liable to become hallucinated or something else.

In trying to be reasonable, we might say that we will accept these findings if we could be sure that the exponent of the new theory, the describer of the new dimension, is not creating the new dimension out of whole cloth.

We have a lot of people who do this, who tell you what heaven's all about, or the different levels some cults or religions go into, such as seven different layers of heaven. As I mentioned, the Spiritualists believe in a causal world, a world where things are created, a mind dimension. And I don't doubt that some of this may well be true. But I don't think it's right to postulate. The worst thing you can do is postulate ahead of time that a certain spiritualistic concept is valid. But we have to look at it from someplace else. You have get outside, view it, and then come back and identify it the best you can.

And we should all doubt. Along the road we should not accept any cosmology or concept. We should doubt everything we hear and make the trip ourselves. In other words, we're faced generally with listening to experts talk about what they have experienced. And this is alright –

<sup>44</sup> Another paradoxical verbal construction by Rose: that the "interior observation" is from "outside".

<sup>45</sup> The phrase "valid if not really real" implies relative rather than absolute knowledge.

it's entertainment perhaps – but it won't take you there. If you want the information you have to make the trip.

Now, of course I'm not talking about making an external trip, and I'm not even talking about making a trip all the way into universal definition. I'm saying it's just a matter of going back inside yourself. And it's a very simple thing to do. I think that once you get beyond the umpire and realize that the same rules are effective on the mental world as exist in the material world – that you have to define yourself from an external position – then you have to find that external position. You have to get behind yourself, so to speak.

Now you can't do that deliberately. There's no blueprint or path that says, "Here's how you get behind yourself." But strangely enough, the records say that people who do this type of introspection do get behind themselves. They do get behind, until a point where their whole perspective of their physical body and a physical universe takes on a new and valid meaning.

Well, whether it does or not, this is the thing that we have to do: we have to find out who is thinking, what is thinking, and what thought is.

## Method

Now of course, a lot can be said about method. This is an outline of basic meditation:<sup>46</sup> Meditation should never be carried out for the purpose of quiescence – unless that's what you want: if you want to sing a lullaby to yourself, you can chant a mantra and it will quiet you. But if you're looking for value, if you're looking for mental understanding, for understanding of your own mind, then you have to look inside your actions, to challenge and question why you acted in a certain way. And as you do this you'll start to see that there is a controlling force of some sort, or at least an umpire. And then you simply challenge: "What sees the umpire?"

There's a whole system of Zen in Japan that does nothing but ask a question. There's hardly any ritual – some of them throw in a bit of religion. But basically there is one *koan*,<sup>47</sup> and that is: "Who am I?" Or, "Who's doing this? Who's thinking?" And by continually attacking that, it provokes a person to look inside. Now this to me is the true psychology.

And from this it evolves. Once you know who "you" are, then you're able to judge what's good for you. And nine chances out of ten you'll be able to see inside of other people a tremendous lot more clearly. I was downstairs at the Student Union before coming up here, drinking coffee, watching the people go by and talking to one of the boys. And I said that you can sit here and point out these people's hangup, their chief feature as Gurdjieff called it.<sup>48</sup>

You can see what it is. Generally it's expressed in their hairdo, the type of clothes they wear, the nervousness of their laughing and this sort of thing. And they're all frantically trying to adjust to the student body, or trying to fool the whole student body. They're trying to put something across. There's the struggle for individuality, the struggle to remain themselves, the struggle to expand themselves, while all at the same time pretending that they're an

<sup>46</sup> Also see Rose's paper *Meditation*.

<sup>47</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Koan>

<sup>48</sup> See P.D. Ouspensky, *In Search of the Miraculous*, Chapter 8. Pdf: <http://selfdefinition.org/gurdjieff/>



inconspicuous little homogenous entity – that is so wonderful in his inconspicuousness that he's famous. But all of them have their own little egotistic bent. And they're different, they're highly different. And possibly the greatest virtue would be the ones with the sharp teeth showing their sharp teeth, you know, instead of trying artfully to cover up.

But this is what goes on. And the reason you can see it in your fellowman is that you can see it in yourself. Because generally what we do is we collaborate. We don't understand people, we collaborate. For the ones who think like we think, we say, "Hey, you and I had better team up against the rest of this rat pack." We don't try to understand the rest of the people.

And once you're able to get inside, there follows from this an ability to actually see this umpire at work. You see these people juggling their energies. How much do they have? Five pounds for school and ninety-five pounds for fun? Or ten pounds for school and fifty pounds for power and forty pounds for fun or whatever. But you see all these things as they manifest in their attitude, the way they walk, whether they're shy or determined or sneaky. They're different. But that's all visible – because it's all visible in yourself. We are all these things.

I'd like to make some comments on the method of searching for an anterior observer. I don't have much time to get into it but I'll make a few comments. Here are some general principles:

There is no sense in looking for anything but the observer, for he who is looking.

We should not try to define something and then try to find it.

The anterior observer must be discovered and not just substantiated by evidence.

We can't just say there's evidence; we've got to find it.

We begin the adventure of inside investigation from the basis of no conviction.

No conviction. Not saying, "I believe this or that," or even believing what I'm saying.

The average psychologist does not take this stand. He accepts with conviction testimony of predecessors in the field of psychology; he accepts the definition of mental attributes as laid out by fellow psychologists. Very few scientists go back to the roots of their field and prove to themselves step by step the postulations that are the backbone of their own work or experimentation.

When I was studying chemistry, somebody says, "Hydrogen has a valence of so-and-so." And I say, "How do you know? Where do you get this from? Who discovered the valence for all these things?" And they say, "Don't pay attention to that. C'mon, you'll go on and you'll be working these equations. You just accept this. Hydrogen has a valence of so-and-so." And that's the way I went through chemistry. I never found out. I would like to go back and see who discovered valences and the relation of valences, to really understand it.

In psychology, somebody says, "He's a manic depressive." A manic depressive is what you are if you don't agree with whoever is in the White House. A paranoid schizophrenic also. And they throw these out: I hear psychologists on television say, "He's a manic-depressive paranoid-schizophrenic." And people say, "Boy, that guy knows everything. He's really got it. Who's going to argue with him?" But go back to where these definitions come from – and how did they know in the beginning? You know what I think about schizophrenia: that possibly 75%

of all the cases that medically are listed as schizophrenia are possession, not curable with drugs but with exorcism. Possibly 50% of all the hopeless dope cases we have in this country are possessions.

In other words, much of scientific work is the acceptance of previous ground work, even though the ground work is admittedly only conceptual.

As I said, science is an agreement, conceptual.

### **What do we know for sure?**

When we are looking at ourselves, we have to take into consideration just what we know for sure. We mentioned previously that there are three major explanations for the existence of the physical universe: One is that the material is the real substance of our possible experiential field. Another is that it's all an illusion. Another is that any definition of the physical universe must be and will be qualified by our position and our ability to understand.

To the ant, the universe might be an acre of ground. To an insane person the universe might be something inside the core of an apple. So we must get a clear idea of he who is looking. We do not know who is looking, and we are not too sure of that which we see, especially after we have been hallucinated, or have seen a hologram or a mirage.

So we start with nothing, deciding to look inside. We know nothing for sure. Descartes had an urgency for self-definition not based upon simple internal observation. Much of our thinking is forced upon us.

We don't think; we are forced to think. I've said this repeatedly. Try to stop it, if you think you are thinking. Try to start it, if you think you can. When you get up in the morning do you start thinking? Try to wake up some morning with a blank mind and start thinking. And then try to stop the trend. You say, "I'm going to stop the trend," but that's part of the trend. The thought of stopping the trend is part of the trend. So where do you stop it? But yet that's what we're faced with. If we want to do something, we have to get into a position where we can stop the trend. Find some method of the zombie reaching back there and twisting the transistors, and getting the thing working the way *he* wants it to work.

We have little choice in picking a thought or claiming it as our property if it is caused by previous thought, previous determinations, previous situations forced on us, and by present environment influences that afflict us before we can prevent them.<sup>49</sup> Many of these environmental influences exist in the body, or they affect bodily reactions that we do not completely understand or endorse.

We cannot start by negating our presence. This would be absurd.

I say, "Start from nothing." But you can't say, "I'm not here." You've got to accept your presence.

<sup>49</sup> See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neuroscience\\_of\\_free\\_will](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neuroscience_of_free_will)

And in this reverse searching we must always retreat from the absurd, in favor of things or ideas that are manifestly less absurd.

There's nothing really wise. It's just that there's garbage and there is stuff that smell worse. Some are more orderly, and if something's more orderly we say it's more reasonable. But be careful when you say it's more reasonable: it might be something you want to believe.

When we ask ourselves, "Who am I?" we take an initial step. We do not begin by saying, "I am this or that."

Modern psychology says, "We are a body," and I say this is a mistake. *Find out* who you are before you say who you are.

We explore the fields of possibility: We may be only a body. We may be a soul or spirit housed in a body. We may be a body with a mind separate from the body and still separate from the spirit. Or we may decide that we are something that we really cannot identify properly. We may conclude that we are an awareness that witnesses a mind and body functioning in some relation to our individual point of awareness.

Now we go back again to the curve, an answer that is not a consistent, definite pointed answer. But all these things are very possibly true. This material dimension is very real. And this dimension is very unreal. We have inadequate methods of looking at it. We have a limited number of rods in our eyeballs; we have a limited hearing capacity; we pick up only certain vibrations. Our perception of certain things can easily be fooled. You can touch a certain point of the tongue and regardless of what you touch it with, they'll feel acid or sour. They'll say it's sour, but it isn't; it's just where you touched him on the tongue. I used to do some work with hypnosis and there are little things you can do to show this.

And that's what happens with everything you see; the universe may well be entirely different. J.J. van der Leeuw<sup>50</sup> brings this out better than I ever could. I was really amazed when I ran into his book. And as a result of that, we've been dragging van der Leeuw's books around with us, making them available to the public. Because he has this ability to expound pretty much the same thing I'm talking about, except for the procedure for going inside and looking at yourself. We have a couple of books on the table back there that relate to this type of thinking, like Bucke's<sup>51</sup> *Cosmic Consciousness*.<sup>52, 53</sup>

## **Six types of vision**

Now I want to leave you with a formula that will be explained extensively in a later lecture. I'm just going to give it to you briefly tonight. And that is, in this business of observing yourself, it isn't just a matter of sitting and looking. I used to say that the human being is like a camera

<sup>50</sup> *Conquest of Illusion*, full text: <http://selfdefinition.org/van-der-leeuw/conquest-of-illusion.htm>

<sup>51</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard\\_Maurice\\_Bucke](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Maurice_Bucke)

<sup>52</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmic\\_Consciousness\\_\(book\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cosmic_Consciousness_(book))

<sup>53</sup> Full text in pdf here: <http://selfdefinition.org/christian/>

that takes in pictures, and with a certain mysterious energy which we call light, projects them upon the void.<sup>54</sup>

Basically, the whole of human existence can be discovered by using what I call the camera analogy: knowing that these things come from outside, are reinterpreted by the mind, a sort of mental refraction, and are then projected back outside. And strangely enough, we all agree upon this projection – except for a few who are color blind or a few who can't hear. But there's a prenatal agreement: people seem to agree upon colors and that sort of thing before they're born. You don't have to train a child to believe that a thing has a certain color; he accepts it automatically.

But the field of vision – just explore this and spend yourself a few hours looking at some of the things the mind does, meditating on them until you get the answers. I have six categories of the things that a person sees or apprehends. And in my estimation, when something is visualized it is the same as being seen.

[The six categories of visions were later revised.<sup>55</sup> ]

First of all we see physical objects: this is *physical seeing*: Now as we know, the lens of the eyeball turns things upside-down; the image in the eyeball is inverted and then it's readjusted by the mind. This is not fiction I'm talking about, this is all scientifically demonstrable. Somewhere inside of the mind that image is readjusted – so we don't reach up here for our toes; we look into a mirror and we see our feet down there. The eyeball being curved or the lens being what it is, the vision would go to the brain inverted and the world would be upside-down. But because of the ability to "umpire" and adjust, we see it as it's handy for us to see. Otherwise we'd be reaching in the wrong place for things. This is the type of physical vision we have, and if you want to start from there it will give you something good for examining yourself.

The second type is *visualization*: You can close your eyes and see a tremendous lot of things. Now you might say you're just remembering, and sure, all this stuff comes from memory, in visualization – but this type of visualization is different from the others. These six different types of visions don't seem to harmonize, but there's an explanation for all of them. Visualization is memory either in new arrangement or in old arrangement. For instance we can visualize an apple: What are you looking at, a green apple? Okay, how about visualizing a set of stars all around that apple. You can see them, but there's no apple with stars all around it, or polka-dots. But we can visualize that. And that is memory: we saw stars before and we put the stars on the apple, in our pattern thinking. So this is drawn somehow from memory.

#### *Capabilities of the mind:*

Now as a side note, let me say that there are three basic capabilities of the human mind, plus the possibility of a fourth, which is an action of extendability or projectability. The mind can 1) receive or perceive, 2) retain, and 3) react. All of your psychological terminology, you can throw it out the window and take these three words. All human mental activity comes under

<sup>54</sup> In this analogy, a camera combined with a movie projector.

<sup>55</sup> When published two years later, Rose's book *Psychology of the Observer* listed six types of visions as follows: 1. Normal Sensory Perception; 2. Abnormal Sensory Perception; 3. Mental Visions; 4. Visions Without Projection by the Perceiver; 5. Visions of Mental Processes without sensory percepts; 6. Deliberate Mental Projections.

them: perception, retention and reaction – and then *extension*, whether you call this ESP or psi.<sup>56</sup> Where you're inhibiting the dice from rolling,<sup>57</sup> that's an extension of mental power. Or you're creating a tulpa or something that appears in front of you, that's an extension of power. The mind can extend itself.<sup>58</sup> Now, taking those four powers of the human mind and applying them to this, you'll begin to see how they cause the different types of visions.<sup>59</sup>

The third type of vision is *visitation*: The eye sees nothing, but the mind projects a vision into seemingly physical but not tangible dimensions or atmosphere. You can't get to them. A visitation is like a ghost or a spirit. It projects us into a physical space of some sort, but when you go to check it out, it doesn't answer to our material checking systems. And this differs from the hallucination.

The fourth category is the *hallucination*, in which we know the vision is not real. The ghost or visitation we don't know: it seems to be there, it may even talk to us and tell us something rather valid. But this fourth category, hallucination, is imagination. Imagination and hallucination come in the same category. This is direct affectation of the mind by non-physical sources. The eye seems to see, but other people around us don't see the same thing. So the vision is our own. Whereas a ghost may be seen by a whole room full of people. I saw a materialization one time and everyone in the room saw it.<sup>60</sup> But that was what you call a visitation [the third type].

The fifth class is *revelation*:<sup>61</sup> true visions projected upon us but not projected *by* us, like the vision of Attila.<sup>62</sup> When Attila moved into Rome, some celestial army appeared against him in the sky, and he turned around and left.<sup>63</sup> But he didn't project it; he wouldn't project something to destroy his own army. There's a record of these. If they weren't in history we would say they were concocted. But there's evidence of visions of marching armies yet to this day in certain areas, at certain times, especially in old battlefields. People will see armies marching.<sup>64, 65</sup> And sometimes it's just an individual seeing them. This is what we call revelation.

<sup>56</sup> See <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parapsychology>

<sup>57</sup> Reference to J.B. Rhine's experiments at Duke: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph\\_Banks\\_Rhine](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Banks_Rhine)

<sup>58</sup> Franz Hartmann, *Magic White and Black*, chapter 7: "Perception is passive imagination, because if we perceive an object, the relation which it bears to us comes to our consciousness without any active exertion on our part. But there is an active imagination by which we may enter into relation with a distant object in space by a transfer of consciousness. ... but this requires that spiritual power which resides in the heart." <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/hartmann/magic-hartmann-chapter-07.htm>

<sup>59</sup> Types of reaction from *Psychology of the Observer*: "Reaction is of various kinds. There is the automatic or programmed type of reaction which is somatic and largely reflexive. Then there is the mental reaction, which is unconscious, which is an Umpire function, which is the projection or perception to suit the universal-mind-paradigm. This is an Umpire-adjustment ... (etc.)."

<sup>60</sup> Details below.

<sup>61</sup> In the sense of the revelations of St. John, not an inferential, "eureka" type of revelation.

<sup>62</sup> Rose erroneously says "vision of Fatima". These were visions seen in France by children and later by crowds estimated at between 30,000 and 100,000. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Our\\_Lady\\_of\\_Fatima](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Our_Lady_of_Fatima)

<sup>63</sup> Depicted in a fresco by Raphael, it was not an army but St. Peter and St. Paul in the sky bearing swords. Attila was meeting with Pope Leo, and only Attila saw the vision, not his entire army. After the vision Attila left the battlefield. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Meeting\\_of\\_Leo\\_the\\_Great\\_and\\_Attila](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Meeting_of_Leo_the_Great_and_Attila)

<sup>64</sup> Numerous examples are given by Charles Fort in *New Lands*, chapter 18, pp 420-422, <http://www.sacred-texts.com/fort/land/land18.htm>

This revelation involves not only entities projected, or scenes projected, it involves dynamic messages projected. It involves say something projected upon us that changes us, like Saul, or Paul, when he was knocked off the horse.<sup>66</sup> He was blinded, so he didn't see too much with his eyes. But he saw something interiorly that changed his life. So this is another category: it was projected upon him but it was not his projection; he didn't blind himself. Of course, someone might argue that he did by his prior bad habits. But the interior revelation is what counted. He got a new look at the universe, which corrected his old perspective.

The sixth is *introspection*, which we talked about a little while ago. This is a unique quality: The human mind can watch itself. We're still talking about vision, but this is the mind's ability to watch itself. And there's no way to really describe this when it goes on, because you can't really picture a process. And each one is different. You see the process working and you can name it, you can call it a *gestalt* or something. But you can only say, "I've got a certain syndrome," or, "I watched this syndrome," and then you name the syndrome, and recognize that you're watching that syndrome, and that's the process.

These six different types of visions are all distinct and different from each other. They are all capacities, things that the human mind is capable of seeing, of apprehending. There is little or no explanation for them [in contemporary science]. But there *is* an explanation for every one of them from the point of returning, of going behind the umpire, and taking into consideration the part of the person that sees, the part that retains or reacts, and the part that extends.

## **Mind dimension**

And of course we have a faculty in the mind that the anterior observer is capable of. The mind behind the umpire is able to pick up on the mind level, or the mind dimension: things in the mind dimension, for instance what we call telepathy. Where you don't have to see something or read a book, or read a letter – somebody may project something into your head.

When one of the Roman emperors was killed, Apollonius of Tyana was supposed to have been walking down the street, and he stopped and said, "Good, stab him again."<sup>67, 68</sup> He was witnessing an assassination. And we've heard these accounts frequently, where a person would actually at the moment witness something going on someplace else. This is because he's able to pick up – not through his eyeballs, through his senses, but directly mind-to-mind. There are numerous instances of this. And where are they mentioned and explained in modern psychology?

---

<sup>65</sup> Paul Wood was supposedly able to tune into scenes such as the battle of Gettysburg.

<sup>66</sup> More under the heading "Mind dimension" below.

<sup>67</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apollonius\\_of\\_Tyana](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apollonius_of_Tyana)

<sup>68</sup> Philostratus, Book 8, Chapter 26: "Although this deed was done in Rome, Apollonius was a spectator of it in Ephesus" [in Greece]. ... "And with an awful glance at the ground, and stepping forward three or four paces from his pulpit, he cried: "Smite the tyrant, smite him" – not like one who derives from some looking glass a faint image of the truth, but as one who sees things with his own eyes, and is taking part in a tragedy." [http://www.livius.org/ap-ark/apollonius/life/va\\_8\\_23.html](http://www.livius.org/ap-ark/apollonius/life/va_8_23.html)

[The next paragraphs are indeterminate as to whether Rose is still talking about the process observer. If this mind “communicates with ultimate mentality”, it would not yet be ultimate mentality. But in his schema, the process observer occurs between the umpire and the final self.]

Okay, now there’s a dimension behind this yet. There’s a mind behind this, and you’ll know it by its predictability, once you are able to tap it. That behind the physical mind, or what I call the manifested mind, there’s an anterior mind that we might even say communicates with God, or communicates with ultimate mentality: unmentionable, indescribable mentality.

And from it we get such revelations as Paul got when was knocked off the horse.<sup>69, 70</sup> There was no logician or philosopher who came out there and said, “Now Paul, let me prove to you that you’ve been doing wrong; you’ve been voting on the wrong side of the ticket.” No, it was *boom* and he knew. That’s all there was to it. And this can only come about by some traumatic act that would divorce him from all previous forms of thinking, so he would be able to know beyond the interference of all this process thinking. You can’t think too much when you’re thinking about processes. But this is the basis of direct-mind communication.

Incidentally, when you heard Mr Khourey talk about the mental confrontation, the workshops that they’re getting ready to do,<sup>71</sup> this is one of the end results: The more you work with each other on this, the more you’ll be able to communicate directly. Lots of times we have sat in a circle and we’d be able to pick up what a person is thinking. One person will say, “You’re thinking *this*.” And then you become adept at that just by allowing yourself to do it. Don’t try, just allow yourself to do it and you can do it more frequently.

Now we’re running late on this, it’s been over an hour and a half, so if there are any questions I can answer or if there’s anything you’d like for me to explain ... yes.

## Healers

Q. They said Rasputin<sup>72</sup> could manipulate ... do you think what they say about him is true?

R. Well, I don’t know. He was a healer, and of course, the impression I get about all healers who are able to use mental energy to heal physical bodies is that it’s a debasement of energy. But I don’t doubt that he was able to do this. Some of you may be acquainted with Norbu Chen, a fellow in Texas. It was written up in the *Fate Magazine* a while back.<sup>73, 74</sup> He was supposed to have been working for one of the Governors of Kentucky in an underground capacity and he had to get out of the country. He got interested in healing and went over to Tibet, and they taught him how to heal. They call it *zapping*<sup>75</sup> – instantaneous healing: they

<sup>69</sup> Acts 9, 22, 26 and Paul’s letters. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion\\_of\\_Paul\\_the\\_Apostle](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conversion_of_Paul_the_Apostle)

<sup>70</sup> The vision was a bright light accompanied by a voice, also seen and heard by Paul’s companions.

<sup>71</sup> Should be mentioned in the October 1977, *Pyramid Zen Society Newsletter*.

<sup>72</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori\\_Rasputin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grigori_Rasputin)

<sup>73</sup> All of Rose’s points on Norbu Chen are included in the *Fate Magazine* article (Aug 1974), reproduced here: <http://selfdefinition.org/norbu-chen/norbu-chen-fate-magazine-august-1974-full-article.htm>

<sup>74</sup> Also at that link is a skeptical and extensively researched account by William Nolen, MD (3 chapters from his book on faith healers). Norbu Chen was written about in *The National Enquirer* and other tabloids, and appeared in various seminars and TV shows.

<sup>75</sup> The word *zapping* is used by Rose’s and possibly other healers he was in touch with, but it does not appear in the articles about Norbu Chen. Rose also uses the term *zapping* to refer to Shaktipat. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shaktipat>

just shout or point a finger at them and they'd be healed. Sometimes it takes two such charges of voltage.

I maintain that this is done with what is called *mental quantum*.<sup>76</sup> The mind is a substance. The mind is a dimension, much more real than this dimension. When you learn how to manipulate it you can change it – to a limited degree. As I said, faith can do a lot of things, but it can't move mountains unless everybody believes that the mountain's going to move, not just you.

But there's a proportional control over the physical environment, that you have by use of this power. So you can throw out a certain amount of energy. This fellow, Norbu Chen, paid them a certain price – his name might have been John Anderson or something like that<sup>77</sup> but he calls himself Norbu Chen because he studied under some Tibetan or Hindu. But they locked him up in a cave until he was able to summon this energy. Because we don't summon it by working or by dissipating.<sup>78</sup> Or by talking even. Talking is a tremendous outgoing of energy.

Rasputin did it the same way, incidentally. If you read the life of Rasputin – he would go into a town and he would lock himself in a cellar for two or three weeks. He wouldn't eat, he would deprive himself of any pleasures, and then he would come out and he would look like a messiah: pale looking, holy, ascetic, all this sort of thing. And he would go around through town healing everybody. Then he would wind up in a big debauch with all the women in the town. And then he would repent. He said salvation was proportional to repentance, and you can't repent unless you sin. So he sinned like hell, went out and repented like hell, and went down into another cellar, come out and healed a batch of people. And that's the way he did it until finally some of the boys caught up with him. [laughs]

But he was a healer, and he was a genuine healer. And so is Norbu Chen. It had nothing to do with God or anything else. It has to do with the ability to project energy from the mind. This is the amazing thing. I don't hesitate to rap modern psychology, because I am acquainted with the systems and techniques of tremendous results or power from the mind.<sup>79</sup>

I'm not saying that you can start your car up – some people think they can, you know, keep the tire from going flat. That would be a waste of it. It's a waste to heal people who dissipate. It's a

<sup>76</sup> Again, *mental quantum* is Rose's term. In 1989, Deepak Chopra used the term "quantum healing" in a book by that same title, but with a different meaning. Rose refers to a human charge of energy capable of a quantum leap, and also uses the term *voltage* in this context. He mentions a quantum of faith in *The Albigen Papers* and in *Energy Transmutation, Between-Ness and Transmission*. And in various places he uses the terms "spiritual quantum" and "intelligence quantum".

<sup>77</sup> Norbu Chen's given name was Charles Vernon Alexander II. The article in *Fate Magazine* says they were still trying to determine his identity at the time of publication; they knew him by an alias.

<sup>78</sup> In an informal talk, 1981-0809-Mr-Rose-Talking-at-the-Farm, Rose states that intellectual work of the academic variety does not result in the transmutation of mental energy. He does mention, however, that this type of work is typically combined with dissipation.

<sup>79</sup> From 1981-0809-Mr-Rose-Talking-at-the-Farm: "It's like the pictures you see of Flash Gordon or these guys in Star Trek where they stand in a machine and a certain condition is developed by electronics in which they are projected into another dimension. This is caused by another form of tension. Of course, this is fiction, but this is what happens. A man can be studying algebra in school and his head will light up. You labor with a problem and then it becomes apparent to you, *boom!* you know the whole pattern. This is your quantum leap – through that quantum energy, leaping into another dimension, and that's a mental dimension."



waste to heal *anybody*, unless you're keeping that person alive for some spiritual purpose, because they're just going to go back and get sick again.<sup>80</sup>

Q. [heavy accent] Can that work the other way, where you can get somebody to commit crimes, with this type of energy? Or use it to kill somebody. To influence them.

R. To kill them? Maybe I don't understand you.

Q. You could order somebody to commit crimes?

R. Sure you could. Sure. It can be done. But it's in a limited capacity and it's a fool's game. The egotistic use of that energy is very foolish because you only have so much. Norbu Chen himself said he'd only be good for two years; he said he'd be burnt out.<sup>81</sup> Because you don't get something from nothing. And basically the modern psychologists are correct about one thing: we have nothing to start with but a body. Our great mentality is *generated*, and we've got only a lifetime to do it in.<sup>82</sup>

## Transmutation

We eat food, and the food is broken down into several capacities: muscle, bone, nerves. Very little goes to the nerves once they are developed; the cells of the nerves don't reproduce, they just have to be fed.<sup>83</sup> But our intelligence is based upon the amount of energy that we can project into that nervous system. Not into the muscles. So that the whole system of education depends upon what I call the transmutation of food and fat and muscular energy and glandular energy into what I call *neural energy*. [diagrams<sup>84, 85</sup>] This is done by concentration: in yoga it's the raising of the kundalini. This is how you learn algebra. Everybody who becomes an astute mathematician like Nicola Tesla or Einstein, whether they believed in yoga or not, have had to raise some kundalini energy to become geniuses.<sup>86, 87</sup>

It's by concentration, the focusing of their energy upon their head, making the head think and ignoring the rest of the body. This process comes from food, basically. There's proof of this; it's not just an easy explanation. For instance, if you're in an accident: You have a certain amount of muscle that you can lift a weight with; you go down to the gym and maybe you can lift 200

<sup>80</sup> See *Richard Rose Biographical Notes* (anonymous) for an account of Rose's attempt to heal-exorcise an alcoholic friend, which had disastrous results for Rose. In the lecture 1975-1012-Cleveland, Rose describes how his father-in-law, a preacher and healer, saved a man from tuberculosis, but the man later "backslid" and as a result became ill again.

<sup>81</sup> Norbu Chen died in 1977, only three years after the article in *Fate Magazine*, according to JoAnne Parks, a former employee.

<sup>82</sup> Alfred Pulyan: 'We are perhaps puppets. We are perhaps even "nothing." But we are "nothings" that can be "something."' <http://selfdefinition.org/pulyan/letters/1960-1012-pulyan.htm>

<sup>83</sup> Need reference.

<sup>84</sup> Mind potential diagram via John Kent: <http://www.searchwithin.org/johnkent/fig2.html>

<sup>85</sup> Transmutation diagram via John Kent: <http://www.searchwithin.org/johnkent/fig3.html>

<sup>86</sup> Tesla explicitly stated that celibacy was essential to his scientific abilities.

<sup>87</sup> Torkom Saraydarian: "Every real genius and server of humanity has control over and sublimation of his sex drive." <http://selfdefinition.org/celibacy/quotes/torkom-saraydarian-sexual-abuse-and-its-effects.htm>

pounds. But a car is laying on top of somebody and it weighs 600 pounds [per person lifting, in the example he gives]. You don't have time for the blood to circulate through those veins and feed the hormone in there, the adrenaline or whatever. You do it instantaneously. So there's only one answer: that energy is communicable through the nervous system, instantaneously, like electricity.

I have done this, which is what made me think about it. I picked a truck up, myself and another fellow one time – we picked up a two-ton truck that was filled with junk. A taxicab had hit it, there were eight people in an overcrowded cab, two or three in the truck, and two of them were pinned underneath the truck. Another fellow and I picked it up and put it back on its wheels, a dual-wheel truck.<sup>88</sup> We got excited, that was all. We started to pick it up and we couldn't budge it. And we got ahold of the edge of the truck bed and I started cursing, and we cursed in cadence. You know, "Come on, dammit, one, two ...," and up it went, that was all. The woman who was in the truck was pregnant and she was dying, she died later. I thought we could save her by getting it off of her. But the funny thing was, we didn't look over on the other side. It was night time and I didn't even bother to go around to the other side and see if anyone was laying over there. We could have dumped it right on somebody, we were so excited.

But this energy can't come from your muscles. You'd rupture yourself picking up that type of weight. I'm not a weight lifter. But picking that type of weight up would rupture a muscle. I've seen fellows who lift weights, who are scared to death of lifting a weight a certain way. I watched one bust a muscle – it turned his arm purple – and he was only lifting 125 or 150 pounds. What would happen if he lifted a truck? I didn't bust a muscle. I wasn't even tired afterwards.<sup>89</sup> But of course I had that extra energy behind it to depend on.

But it was from this that I maintain that energy is transferrable instantly. Now if you can project that into your hands or arms, you can also project it right out of your body – with the same type of synthetic urgency. Somebody needs to be healed, *boom*, you heal them.<sup>90</sup> And this is nothing new; this has been practiced in India for hundreds of years. They call it zapping.<sup>91</sup> These gurus come over here and they have somebody trained that can zap. The twelve-year old guru<sup>92</sup> had two "mahatmas" with him;<sup>93</sup> they were professional zappers. They study this

<sup>88</sup> See image: <http://selfdefinition.org/rose/images/talks/1948-Chevrolet-2-ton-dual-wheel-truck.jpg>

<sup>89</sup> In 1981-0215-Psychology-of-Miracles-Akron (in *Direct-Mind Experience*) Rose tells the story but says the following: "Afterward we were totally weakened, to the point of collapse from the strain."

<sup>90</sup> Gurdjieff was reportedly capable of this, as told by Whitall Perry: "[Fritz] Peters tells how he in 1945, in a state of shock and shattered nerves managed to obtain military leave at Luxembourg to go to Paris, obsessed with the idea of somehow finding Gurdjieff in the war's wake. Summoning the last ounce of energy he finally located the man's address and apartment, where he arrived ready to collapse. Gurdjieff immediately ushered him in, preparing a coffee upon observing his visitor's condition: "I remember being slumped over the table, sipping at my coffee, when I began to feel a strange uprising of energy within myself – I stared at him, automatically straightened up, and it was as if a violent, electric blue light emanated from him and entered into me. As this happened, I could feel the tiredness drain out of me, but at the same moment his body slumped and his face turned grey as if it was being drained of life". From *Gurdjieff in the Light of Tradition, Part 3*. This account is followed with a similar experience J.G. Bennett had with Gurdjieff.

<sup>91</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shaktipat>

<sup>92</sup> Maharaj Ji, aka Prem Rawat. Divine Light Mission. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prem\\_Rawat](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prem_Rawat) Also see: <http://www.prem-rawat-maharaji.info/index.php?id=24>

<sup>93</sup> Mahatma Gurucharnanand (aka Charnanand) and others.

stuff for ten years, projecting their mental energy, and they could knock a person right off their feet.

And in India or some primitive country – I shouldn't say primitive, they're further advanced than we are – but what we consider a primitive country, these people have such a respect for this type of psychology that they worship the person who's able to do it. And so *do we*. They come over here and we worship them; we put up a false vision. It's strictly just a technique that anyone can learn if they wish to.<sup>94</sup> Of course, it means sacrificing something else, that's all. You can't do everything.

## Tulpas

Q. You were speaking of thought-forms or tulpas.

R. Yes.

Q. Could you maybe explain a little more about that?

R. Well, you could get – some of the other boys here have read that. Wasn't that Alexandra David-Neel's *Magic and Mystery in Tibet*?<sup>95</sup> (Andy, did you read that? Isn't that the book?) You can get that in nearly any library. A lot of phenomena – for instance a materialization – come under one of the categories I just spoke about, visions of entities. You'll see them walking in the room in front of you. So you have to be able to determine which of those are your own creation and which are projected in from someplace, by someone else who has created them. But you can create with your mind things that are physically visible. In this case, these fellows devised this system – I don't know, there are probably tricks they used inside their head.

I don't like to get into this too much because I don't want anybody to be too successful at it. There's no real reason for it. It's just like astral projection. Astral projection *can* be done, it can be demonstrated, you can by trial and error succeed. It's very easy in fact. But the time that it takes to learn to do it, versus the benefits from it, you could be studying something else that's more valuable. And then get a bus ticket to go wherever you want to go. Because – you might be able to perfect it to a point where you can go look in somebody's bedroom, or check the bank account in the bank when the guy's writing a check or something. But if you want to really do those things, it takes so much of your energy and time it's not worth it. You can do it physically cheaper. And the same thing with the tulpas.

They have a system in Tibet of materializing different things. And one of them, the one I heard of previously, was the materialization of Yama.<sup>96</sup> Yama was the king of hell, and once a year these monks would get together and bring this demon out to where everybody could see him: he would materialize in the circle of the Tibetan monks. A couple of times Westerners were

<sup>94</sup> Rose was an expert hypnotist, using what he called a direct-mind method.

<sup>95</sup> See footnotes 25 through 30 above.

<sup>96</sup> God of Death. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yama>

Image of Yama: <http://selfdefinition.org/rose/images/talks/yama.jpg>

allowed to sit with the monks and watch it happen.<sup>97</sup> They said that what would appear first would be two eyes, in the center of the thing, and then the face would build up around it. It had extra arms and a few other fringe benefits as far as capabilities, and it was really a hideous-looking creature. And then after it became fully visible – they began to chant to dissolve it. They would force it back. One fellow who observed it said he could feel the tremendous amount of concentration and force, almost desperate force by every monk present, to lean on that thing and dissolve it. So it's not easily done either way. It's not easy to produce and it's not easy to dissolve.

Q. Can you take a picture?

R. I imagine you could. Because they can take pictures of these ectoplasmic things.<sup>98</sup> William Crookes,<sup>99</sup> in physics, is supposed to have been responsible for quite a few discoveries. He did a lot of research with materializations, and he photographed spirits. Katie King was produced. I've seen a copy of the photograph.<sup>100</sup> He even classified the type of entity it was, and he too didn't believe, incidentally, that it was a spirit of the dead. He believed that it was an elemental in human form. But if you can take a picture of that sort of thing, using a sensitive type of film and a certain type of light, a red light or whatever they use.<sup>101</sup> So I think that you could take a picture of the other as well.

Now of course as I said, there are categories of visions that you see, that only you see. But this was seen by anybody who was sitting around that circle. Even the man outside the circle could see it. And this would be interesting, of course, if you could get a photograph of it. Because the Indian rope trick<sup>102</sup> they say is not photographable; this is strictly a mental projection on the part of the people there, on their minds and by their minds.<sup>103</sup>

Q. Which kind of vision would you classify the tulpa as?

<sup>97</sup> Rose's apparent source is a dramatic account in Harrison Forman's *Through Forbidden Tibet, An Adventure Into the Unknown*, (1935) in the chapter "I See the King of Hell", pages 238-259 (pages 268-294 of the pdf) located here: <http://selfdefinition.org/tibetan/>

<sup>98</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ectoplasm\\_\(paranormal\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ectoplasm_(paranormal))

<sup>99</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Crookes](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Crookes) This was 1871-1874.

<sup>100</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katie\\_King\\_\(spirit\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Katie_King_(spirit)) The photos were hoaxes although Crookes said that regardless of this, the phenomena he saw were real. Crookes had witnessed a materialization of Katie King by Florence Cook. Subsequently, a married couple, Nelson and Jennie Holmes, also claimed to have materialized Katie King, but photographs they sold of the spirit were discovered to have been posed by an actress.

<sup>101</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spirit\\_photography](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spirit_photography) ; [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kirlian\\_photography](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kirlian_photography)

<sup>102</sup> Reported as far back as Adi Shankara, 9<sup>th</sup> century. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian\\_rope\\_trick](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indian_rope_trick)

<sup>103</sup> Franz Hartman, *Magic White and Black*, chapter 9: "The magician forms an image on his mind and makes it perceptible to others by projecting it into their mental spheres. Uniting his own mental sphere with theirs, they are made to participate of his imagination, and they see as a reality what he chooses to fancy and think." <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/hartmann/magic-hartmann-chapter-09.htm>

R. Well, the tulpa is a deliberate projection of yourself out of the matrix of your imagination. This is where a man attempts to be a microcosm; he finds the formula for creation and exerts it so he can create something.<sup>104</sup>

Q. So it's not really one of those visions?

R. Yes, if he sees it, it's something that he projects. Basically it comes under the category of a visitation, but not from the same source. Some visitations can come from outside of you, and some from inside.<sup>105</sup> But evidently his mind projected. The definition for it, for a visitation, is something the mind projects outward. Now how it gets into the mind is the other thing, whether it's coming in there from a true source, or it's coming in from your creation. But people can see it, besides yourself.

Q. If you wouldn't go to the bother of trying to dissolve it away, wouldn't it gradually dissipate by itself anyway?

R. Well, you remember I was talking to you about this materialization I saw.<sup>106</sup> The fellow who was the medium had a familiar spirit – they call it a cabinet guide in Spiritualism – and he called this thing “Midget”. He also had two children. Well, the first time we checked him out was something like thirty years ago. And the last time we checked him out was about ten years ago. [actually 19 years]. Well the first time, he was a rather young man; his children were small. He came into Steubenville and a minister<sup>107</sup> put him up at his house.

But if you want to know something about somebody and you don't mind being sneaky, talk to his kids. So, we're all curious about the real nature of this character, and the minister says to the children, “What do you think of Midget?” And the children said, “We don't like Midget.” They saw it. “Why don't you like Midget?” “Because he won't let Daddy sleep. When Daddy's trying to sleep, Midget comes out and jumps on his stomach.” You know, tugs, pulls at him, touches him and stuff.

And this is somewhat of the answer: that once anything like that is encouraged and created to the point where it seems to have a separate existence, it *takes* a separate existence. And this was the story that Alexandra David-Neel brought out about the tulpa, that this thing became typically feminine, and start nagging. This fellow couldn't put up with it; he thought he had a

<sup>104</sup> Paracelsus: "All the imagination of man comes from the heart. The heart is the 'seed' of the Microcosm, and from that seed the imagination proceeds into the Macrocosm. Thus the imagination of man is a seed that becomes materialised or corporeal." *Life of Paracelsus* by Franz Hartmann MD, chapter 6, <http://selfdefinition.org/magic/paracelsus/hartmann-paracelsus-06-magic-and-sorcery.htm>

<sup>105</sup> Dion Fortune: “Now there are two such elementals, one kind being ensouled by the invocation of elemental essence into a thought-form, and the other by the projection of something of the magician's own nature into it.” <http://content.yudu.com/Library/A18lyh/FortuneDionPsychicSe/resources/90.htm> *Psychic Self Defense*, page 90

<sup>106</sup> In 1958 by Rev. Aldred of Michigan. This was the materialization at White Lilly Chapel near Columbus, Ohio. See four-page letter by Rose dated Sep. 3, 1958 for a description of the event (requires password, send email for access): <http://documents.direct-mind.org/rr-letters-scanned/>

<sup>107</sup> Rev. Alfred D'Alibirti. <http://tatfoundation.org/forum2002-08.htm#1>

docile creature, but he created a truly feminine form, and it found its value. Seemingly he couldn't live without it. So he decided he'd better get a dissolution of some sorts.<sup>108</sup>

## Spiritual energy

Q. You talk about healing and other things as being possibly a waste of spiritual energy – what is the value system you see as *not* a waste?

R. Well, healing was done in the old days – because there were no newspapers – if somebody wanted to reach prominence as a philosopher or as a leader of people. There are different forms of power: In India for instance, there's a tremendous power involved in being able to zap people. If you get into the right country, where their money's worth something, you can make a million. So consequently, you become powerful, you become famous.

But if you had a philosophy that you wanted to put out, you had to first become a magician. So the purpose of healing was to attract the multitude, so that the word was put out that this man was what? – possibly what the Bible had prophesied, or that he's the reincarnation of Krishna or some person. But regardless, it gives this man a good start in publicity. And the consequences were pretty bad, because he had to get his point across before he got burnt out too bad, or even killed.

But today, unless you're out for something of that sort, unless you're out for just using it as an egotistical direction, you're wasting it. In the transmutation of energy you're starting off from a lower level, from a physical quantum of energy, and working like hell to build up a spiritual quantum. And then you're throwing it back downhill into the garbage can. Now, I maintain that if you're able to develop this energy and you're able to influence people, you do it on a spiritual level. You use that ability for direct mind-to-mind communication, and communicate your spiritual truths. Which is difficult in itself.

## Voices

Q. There was a book, *Three Faces of Eve*, and not long ago there was a movie made on this. Do you believe that this happens?

R. I don't know anything about the book. I heard the title, that's all. There's a book called *Sybil*,<sup>109, 110</sup> it's a good little study in psychology. [gap in tape]

<sup>108</sup> Alexandra David-Neel, *With Mystics and Magicians in Tibet*, page 283 (or 223 of the pdf): "Once the tulpa is endowed with enough vitality to be capable of playing the part of a real being, it tends to free itself from its maker's control. This, say Tibetan occultists, happens nearly mechanically, just as the child, when his body is completed and able to live apart, leaves its mother's womb. Sometimes the phantom becomes a rebellious son and one hears of uncanny struggles that have taken place between magicians and their creatures, the former being severely hurt or even killed by the latter."

<sup>109</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybil\\_\(book\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybil_(book))

<sup>110</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybil\\_\(1976\\_film\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybil_(1976_film))

I don't doubt, as I said before, that with schizophrenia, perhaps about 75% to 90% of the real serious cases are possession. They are *possession*. This is the point from these notes I was reading to you: the fact that we're able to have something projected directly into our mind. If we're able to see a vision – just like somebody appeared to St. Paul and knocked him down – if his mind is capable of taking that in, without first learning it through the physical senses ...

Or maybe you're capable of dreaming at night that a dead relative comes to you and says, "Hey, go down to my house and dig up the third board from the wall and you'll find my money there, and give it to so-and-so." You never knew it was there, but you go down, dig up the board and you get the money. This is proof, this is science. It was predicted. Whether you learned it from inside your head – you can get all sorts of explanation – but your vision predicted and came true. That means that something was able to come into your head besides through your senses. Well if it can come into your head as that, it can come into your head as a real entity. Now this is something modern psychology doesn't bother to contemplate.

Q. [strong accent, same man who earlier asked about power of suggestion] What happens if I go to the police and they take a lie detector on me, and [rest is inaudible].

R. Like that boy in Chicago, William Heirens,<sup>111</sup> who always said, "George did it." He killed Suzanne Degnan [1946] and said, "George did it." Well, we never know whether George did it or not. First of all, I don't believe that people commit crimes as much as people are the victims of the crime they commit.

Q. My question is, do you have to cooperate? Or does your mind have to be disposed or weak for somebody to influence you?

R. No, no. I wouldn't say that. A stupid person cannot be hypnotized. A retarded person cannot be hypnotized. I have never been able to hypnotize retarded people. They have to be highly sensitive, people with sensitive nerve ends, people with a high degree of perception, learning ability, imaginative ability, this sort of thing. These are the people who are afflicted the worst. The idea is that you've got to be able to balance that. People who are too sensitive sometimes don't know what to shut out.

## **Possession**

Q. What leads you to believe that about schizophrenia?

R. You mean possession? Because of the testimony of a lot of people who are schizophrenic. And they talk in different voices – sometimes even in languages that they don't know themselves. And this is all just brushed aside. To me, the evidence that they give you is enough. And then you read the case histories that are available. Sybil was one, supposedly. The book was written with the idea that there were many entities or demons afflicting her. It wasn't, it was all coming outside of the girl herself. [?]

Q. Where do these demon mentalities come from?

<sup>111</sup> William George Heirens (1928-2012), serial killer. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William\\_Heirens](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_Heirens)

R. Well, this is another thing – remember when I was talking about defining the universe from inside the universe? There are more dimensions than man has dreamed about. And this is where we limit ourselves. The psychologist says, “Anything that I don’t know, it doesn’t exist. Anything that I can’t see doesn’t exist.” How do you know it doesn’t exist? We can’t see electricity. How about an electrical dimension, as well as a mental dimension? They come from other dimensions. How do you prove dimension? That which vibrates at a different rate. It is real, but vibrates at a different rate.<sup>112</sup>

Now this vibration or substance difference can be of a wide range. We don’t know how wide the range can be. But we can take the same atomic or electronic bits, pieces, and slow down or speed up their orbits, and you’ll have an entirely different appearance. You might be able to walk right through them, like gasses. You breathe the gas in, instead of bumping into it like a brick. But it’s there, nevertheless. Or like electricity: you touch it and it goes through you, because it’s another dimension, like an electrical dimension. It’s something that we accept by virtue of what it does, not by what it is or looks like.

And this is the same thing as *thought*. We accept thought by virtue of what it does, by its effects, not by pointing at it physically. And by that same token we have to accept the *possibility* – I’m not saying it’s proven – the possibility that there are dimensions that exist parallel to this dimension but invisible to this dimension. And I say this because things show up and go away and we can’t chase them. They’re strategically superior, incidentally. We’re so proud, saying we’re the king of the earth. But anything that is able to make a disappearing act on you – if it wished to it could destroy you, because you couldn’t stop it.

But yet we choose to just say it doesn’t exist. And this is the reason we can’t approach a lot of these phenomena, incidentally, flying saucer phenomena and that sort of thing. Because until one of them comes down here and tells us in English that he’s from another dimension, we’ll not believe him. He’ll have to do it in English and he’ll have to use our atomic chart, and he’ll have to define things according to our understanding.

## LSD

Q. You said something, kind of a cryptic statement, about where an LSD trip comes from.

R. It’s another dimension. Whenever your mind sees detailed, not just haphazard stuff, but detailed, exact, precision type of creations – it’s not imagination. What I saw, my imagination is unable to produce or create. What I saw was real. I also have another conviction: not only was it real, but also there was a pimp who was engineering the whole thing, projecting it. The price

<sup>112</sup> Thomas Edison: “I don’t claim that our personalities pass on to another existence or sphere. I don’t claim anything because I don’t know anything about the subject. For that matter, no human being knows. But I do claim that it is possible to construct an apparatus which will be so delicate that if there are personalities in another existence or sphere who wish to get in touch with us in this existence or sphere, the apparatus will at least give them a better opportunity to express themselves than the tilting tables and raps and ouija boards and mediums and the other crude methods now purported to be the only means of communication.” — excerpt from an interview in *Scientific American*, October, 1920.



to get into the theater is your energy. This is the price we pay for all entertainment: physical energy, quantum energy.<sup>113</sup>

Q. If uneducated people talk about this dimension, people say they don't know what they're talking about. If the highly-educated talk about it, people believe it.

R. Well I think there are a lot of enlightened people in nuthouses. I don't doubt that there are a lot of enlightened people. But they give up trying to communicate. In my life, I've never denied what a man says. If a man says to me that he sees a certain thing, I say, "Tell me more." I don't say, "You're crazy." Because if a man has an LSD experience and he comes back and he's able to go back to work, he's not classified as crazy. But some of the visions that are seen in LSD are far worse than what the insane people in the asylums see, or what their conclusions are. Basically I think that a lot of people who are in asylums are the result of philosophic convictions: it's better to be crazy. If you don't have the courage to commit suicide, go nuts.<sup>114</sup> Get away from this absurdity by some means or another. So that might be a philosophic step, freedom of a sort.

### **Adverse forces**

Q. From what you say, there seems to be an indication of some force, trying to divert our attention, or make it hard for us to arrive at spiritual truth. Could you tell us more about the nature of this?

R. I had this conviction myself when I was younger: As soon as you start working along these lines, as you start on a spiritual path, everything seems to be working against you. And in the lives of the saints, the so-called holy men, they talk about this wrangling with temptation, fighting with this and fighting with that. What they're doing is, they're fighting with what they don't know. They're fighting with elements within themselves that they don't understand.

The solution to the problem is *understanding*, not controlling, not conquering. We got this thing handed to us: The blueprint's already drawn and we're not going to change it. But the thing is to understand it. And in the process of understanding it we realize that there are forces, very strong forces. We also realize that it's possible, as I said, that there are fleas on the dog's back. And the flea is an entity, a seemingly unnecessary entity. But there's a kind of symbiotic value to the flea: the dog scratches and he doesn't get constipated or something. It keeps him moving.

Nature has to be continually afflicted to keep itself from degenerating into mud. Protoplasm has a tendency toward inertia. Part of him wants to lie down and just become a mud puddle –

<sup>113</sup> From 1974-1112-Obstacles-Cleveland: 'Incidentally I was conscious of an entity. You know how Don Juan talks to Mescalito – there's one for LSD too, believe me. And as I was coming back I saw the fellow in the room who had given me this acid. I said to him, "Where is the pimp? Where did the pimp go?" Because this is a super-sensual experience for which I paid a price, and I knew that something picked it up. Somebody picked up that tab, I was sure. ... So this is where a lot of your primitive theologians got the concept of demons and devils. They are real. They're just as real as this floor or that table.'

<sup>114</sup> Rose reported extreme trauma on coming back from his enlightenment experience, but obviously he neither committed suicide nor went insane. So this might refer to special cases.

except for a program-injected system of irritation, continued irritation. So that the flea is an irritation, the entity is an irritation. The entity gets *paid* for irritating – but we look upon him as a devil. He is a symbiotic creature. I don't say now that you have to go out and make friends with an entity, because they can drain all your blood if you let them. But once you realize this, then you put nature in its proper place.

But you do have an energy struggle, in my estimation, to clarify yourself, especially if your mind is upset. You can't confuse yourself just by taking on more entities. Like the fellow says, "I'm going to cure myself of smoking cigarettes." "How?" "I'm going to start chewing. I'll quit smoking." So the next time I see him, he's chewing and smoking. He's going to cure himself of doping by drinking. So the next time he's a drunken dope. You just get more bugs, that's all. More confusion, not more clarity. You can't annihilate things, like with that type of medicine, homeopathy, curing with more of the same: if you freeze your foot we'll put it in ice water, something like that. This doesn't work with the mental adjustments. You have to *know*. Once you know things, they dissolve, that's the amazing thing. The more you know about them, the more their power dissolves.

### **Familiar spirits**

Q. This is an interesting concept, that as one progresses towards spiritual understanding, he's beset with all kinds of forces that tend to keep him from achieving this.

R. Right.

Q. And then some give in entirely to these forces, and go over to their side, so to speak. So you have this kook in California who has the Church of Satan who deliberately worships evil. And I can't really understand that.

R. Well there are some boys sitting right here who have come down from Kent, when we still had a group up there in the university. Between the university at Kent and the University of Pittsburgh we had a half dozen to a dozen people who were possessed and didn't mind telling you they were possessed. And some of them came for help. They said, "Hey, I know it and I've got to get loose from it."

And one of them was a teacher at Kent State.<sup>115</sup> He was a teacher of anthropology. In fact, I spoke in his classroom the first time I was in Kent. And somebody asked him why he was interested in hearing me talk, and he said because I had the highest form of Magick. But he had spent years – he had been consulting these old books and they said you have to get a spirit, a demon, as a familiar. And then this demon will guide your life. He'll tell you what to do, he'll tell you how to play the stock market, how to get rich, whatever you need.

There were two of them who were into this and both of them became fried. They were nervous wrecks: they can't get the cigarette into their mouth and they're shaking all the time. I saw this fellow last year in Kent.<sup>116</sup> And I said to him – I knew him really well – and I said, "Why don't you come down sometime?" And he said, "I won't come near you until I get cured." He realized

<sup>115</sup> TM died in Canton in 2007; write for details.

<sup>116</sup> Two years prior: 1975-0206-Kent-State-University

it. He had been down there one time and I wasn't aware of this myself. But there was another fellow there who was more psychic, a fellow from Pittsburgh, a guy about 30 years old; he looked right at him and said, "You have a demon, don't you?" And he said, "Yes."

Q. How did they get rid of them?

R. Well, I think the majority of them – you know, the Oceanside Rosicrucians, that's Max Heindel's group,<sup>117, 118</sup> believe that they just stay with you from incarnation to incarnation, which is quite a bit of baggage to carry around with you, from one bardo<sup>119</sup> to another. They claim they stay with you.

Q. Then everybody has them.

R. No, I don't say that everybody has that type. This is a conscious thing that is actually visible. I had a girl come down from Pittsburgh to my house, and the first thing I noticed that was strange about her was that her eyes weren't under control: one of them would look in this direction and one would look in that direction, and I thought for a minute she had a glass eye. So I said to her – I apologized first for asking her – and I said, "Do you have a glass eye?" And she said, "No, they operate separately." And I didn't think too much of it, except that it was strange because she had to be able to see out of it; she could see out of both eyes.

Well she and another girl came down to my place and they were going to spend the night. And she was sitting in the kitchen and I *thought* I saw, over her left shoulder, something standing there. I couldn't see a distinct form but I knew something was there, and I thought I'll check it out. So I said to her, "Are you aware of the fact that you have an entity?" "Oh," she said, "yes, I had five of them; I'm down to one." I said, "Where is it?" And she said, "*He* is right here." [pointing to the same place] So it validated the hunch that I had. I couldn't draw you a picture of what I saw but I knew something was back there, the exact position of it.

It scared everybody in the house. A bunch of people had come down from Pittsburgh and nobody slept that night. Everybody was waiting for all hell to break loose. But the funny thing was that this girl with her, now, had been into murder, and told us so. But dope and sex and murder, all at the same time. She was with the man who bombed a laboratory in Wisconsin and killed a man.<sup>120</sup> She was in on the bombing. They had played with everything, thinking that the human being is immune, he's God, you know. All you have to do is believe you're immune. That's what the psychology book says: you can do anything, just don't believe there's any harm in it. So why not kill a few people? – try that. Try it with dope, or try killing them mixed with sex, something of that sort.

And this was the direction. You'd be surprised at the college-level people who are into witchcraft, demonology, and they think it's a sport. They think they're brave, or – it isn't quite the idea of being brave, it's the idea of being impudent in the face of nature. They're saying, "We can do this," the human being, "We've finally liberated ourselves from all fears and all superstitions. And if there's anything out there, we're going to run it." So you see something

<sup>117</sup> <http://www.rosicrucian.com>

<sup>118</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max\\_Heindel](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Heindel)

<sup>119</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bardo>

<sup>120</sup> Weathermen bombing (1970). [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sterling\\_Hall\\_bombing](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sterling_Hall_bombing)

limping home, it looks like it's been in an atomic explosion, and that's the magician coming back – begging for help. But you can't help them. Because there's where your psychic energy – you talk about healing somebody – I've been close to them and watched the energy, watched the people around them losing energy. You can't have them anyways near you. They just drag all your energy out.

## **Absolute**

Q. This is something that maybe we haven't covered particularly in this lecture, but I've been to a couple of Zen gatherings. I have a little question about what absolute truth is ...

R. I imagine you would have. [laughs] I've got one myself.

Q. Well, everybody who was at that meeting was convinced that there was such a thing as absolute truth. But I'm not convinced that there is. And I'm curious of your views on that.

R. Well I feel you've got the right direction.

Q. [laughs] That there isn't such a thing?

R. No, no. That you should not be convinced that there is. This is a danger, and I've often said this to people in the group: Don't go around talking about enlightenment. Don't go on talking about absolute truth. To you it does not exist until you've been there. It's a postulation only. That's all you can accept it as. This is the mind, taking in infinite varieties of possibility, and that's one of them, that's all. That's something let's say that would happen by gravity: If there's something behind everything, then that which is behind, when there's nothing more behind it, that's absolute. And that in turn could not be definable, by virtue of the fact – remember what definition is? – that it cannot be compared from the outside; because there's no other plane or field from which to describe it.

Q. Okay. So you feel or you say that you have achieved enlightenment, right?

R. Yes.

Q. ... or that you know absolute truth?

R. I've been there.

Q. Okay, now do you say that you have experienced the absolute truth at some point in the past, or do you constantly know or experience absolute truth?

R. I *became*, for a very short period of time.

Q. You became the absolute truth for a very short period of time?

R. I became everything.

Q. [laughs]

R. See, you know what you're doing, you're doing the thing that I'm advising you not to do, and that is to try to define it. The only thing I'm trying to do – I don't want to lie to you, and I run the

risk immediately of trying to define something to you, and that's no good. Now maybe there are words that I can use that will lead you to believe something about it, but that's not important either. The important thing is that maybe by some intuition you pick up that there is a direction, and you perceive that direction, that's all.

It's good if things inspire you. Now I never ran into anybody until after I had my own experience. I only ran into one other human being who I was convinced that reached it. [Paul Wood<sup>121</sup>] Well, I met another fellow too, a Zen master [Alfred Pulyan<sup>122, 123</sup>]. I was pretty well convinced that he knew the answer. But the majority of these Zen teachers are strictly phonies. They haven't had any experience, they're just into dogma, they're just drum-pounders and mantra-chanters and koan-chanters and that kind of stuff.

But you don't have to study Zen to be enlightened; you don't have to study anything to be enlightened. You have to study *yourself* to be enlightened. You don't have to go to any church or any religion. I don't want anybody to ever believe you've got to study Zen to get enlightened – this is nonsense. Zen is a good psychological system. But enlightenment comes to anybody, anyplace in this world, by looking inside yourself with honesty.

Q. Enlightenment then in your definition would mean being everything at some point in time?

R. Yes, well, actually there is no point in time. There's a point in space-time. There is no time, in the final analysis. When you reach this there is no time, there is no space. There's nothing but yourself and you are everything – and you are nothing. If you can comprehend simultaneously being everything and nothing – knowing the nature of nothingness and knowing the nature of everythingness – then you've got a rough idea.

Q. In this concept of the absolute, is it all-pervading, all-powerful?

R. It might be all-pervading but it's not all-powerful. The thing is, immediately you get back to the question, "What can the absolute do?" And I know nothing about what the absolute can do.

Q. You were talking about "everything" – would you say that you know everything?

R. Well, this is a term – for instance, I might tell you I know everything – but I don't know how many hairs you've got on your head, so I don't know everything. But I mean, you have to pick this up intuitively if I tell you that I know everything: It means that I don't have a desire for any more questions, any more self-questions. It means that I don't look inside myself any longer, that I found what I want to know. Now, in finding what I know, there are certain experiences that you get into. And it involves being one with God, if you want to call it that. This is speaking loosely now, almost poetically. Because God is not what people think it is.

The concept of God is an externalized, bewhiskered old man, or a benign force running the universe and observing the fall of the sparrow and everything of that sort. Because the sparrow is God. But these are difficult media of expression, to try to describe what you realize about yourself. And if you read the different accounts: Bucke's *Cosmic Consciousness* has some accounts of people who have reached different phases or stages of this. And they're all valid.

<sup>121</sup> <http://selfdefinition.org/christian/paul-wood-story.htm>

<sup>122</sup> <http://the-wanderling.com/pulyan.html> and <http://www.selfdiscoveryportal.com/Pulyan.htm>

<sup>123</sup> <http://selfdefinition.org/pulyan/>

They're perfectly valid and they all sound different. Because when you reach something that's indescribable you stumble a bit with words, trying to give meaning to it. And as soon as you say something you're back in the relative dimension. You're trying to describe an absolute condition again with relative words. And the best way you can describe it is to say that it is nothing and it is everything. You have to realize you're nothing before you realize you're everything.

## Levels

Q. Are you saying that these guys who call themselves Jesus or Krishna are impostors?

R. No, no. They're very sincere. I think they're valid in their dimension.

There are different levels of experience. We have to go through these different levels. And the first level that a person gets into when he leaves the instinctive level, he does it through his emotional surrender. He surrenders his instinctive level to an emotional level. And that's when he finds his Jesus or his guru. He becomes saved and he is genuinely exalted spiritually. The only thing is, he doesn't think anyone else is there. That's the difficulty. People get on these different levels and they think nobody else is there: we've got to go out and save the world. Some of them may have transcended that already; they've given up the emotional level. They may have gone to the intellectual level, and by the study of kabala, astrology, fundamentalism or lord knows what, with the use of the intellect – popped through to another level which we call the satori level, or the eureka experience: "This is it, wow!" Suddenly a realization that their mind is able to grasp something.<sup>124</sup>

But this they have done with the intellect. And then after a few years of meditation they realize that the intellect is a vanity. They too think they're above everybody. They see this guy down in the emotional-salvation level and they say, "That guy's nuts." But they should have compassion and realize that they were in that same category.

These are *gradations*. And at each of these levels the person is right. It's just that he thinks he's at the last rung on the ladder – but there's still a few rungs to go, that's all. I think that in all levels there are people possibly who are trying to fool the public, I don't deny that. I think that there are a lot of people who use religion as a method of making a living, or even a big killing, getting really rich. But I don't deny the existence of these levels, and I don't deny that we've got sincere people.

Q. Is there any value in worship?

R. Well, there's a value in all that stuff if you know the directions. It's like praying. When I first divorced myself from organized religion I used to think, you know, "I'm through with that stuff; I don't have to go praying anymore." But I think there's a value to praying. Because these vocal things, like the mantras, I kind of joke about them, but at the same time they have their value. That's a form of prayer. If you challenge the inside self, if you pray and hear Yourself (that's capital "y" You) it can answer. And small "y" you can acquire, grow. You pray and hear

<sup>124</sup> This is a rare case where Rose spells out what he means by the *eureka* experience, which he equates with contemporary usage of the word *satori*.

yourself. The God within hears you. That's the value. That's my idea of the value of prayer, if you want to really grow.

Q. You see something in Leroy Jenkins?<sup>125</sup>

R. I don't know him.

Q. Many people go to him.

R. Oh, there's lots of them, what's his name, Oral Roberts.<sup>126</sup> Up there in Ohio, there's Rex Humbard,<sup>127</sup> he built a big tower up there in Akron.<sup>128</sup> Yeah, there's lots of them. I don't know. You have to know them personally to know if they're running a racket. Some people just run a racket. They don't believe in life after death, they don't believe in anything – except money, so they go after it, that's all.

## Trauma

Q. After you reached the state of enlightened, wasn't it hard for you to come back?

R. It's as hard to come back as it is to go in. Both are very traumatic. There's no bliss involved in it, so don't let anybody ever kid you into believing that the other dimensions are associated with bliss. Bliss is a relative experience. In the absolute there is no bliss and no pain. These are keynotes. As long as you're in cosmic consciousness, the description is bliss, beauty, union with the world – this is relative experience. In enlightenment there is no bliss, no pain, no hope, no despair. There's nothing to despair about because nothing seems to be going nowhere. And you are nothing. And it's only from that profound abysmal bottom that you're able to bounce back and have the peak experience.

Q. As you progressed on the path toward your enlightenment, how did you deal with the elements of fear?

R. Well, I think you have to make those decisions. There are a number of things that you do. It's not a question of just reading a book. First of all you make a decision: are you going to get married, are you going to get yourself attached to a mortgage on a house or something that you're going to have to worry with? Are you going to be afraid of losing your health, your sanity? A lot of people you hear say, "Oh, they go nuts thinking about religion." I contemplated that: so I'll take the chance. You can get killed robbing a bank, too. But you have one life and how are you going to use it? Are you going to sit around and be a slave, or are you going to rob the bank? Are you going to go for the jackpot? So I said I'll go for the jackpot. So I'll go nuts? So I die of cancer from acetic practices or a vegetarian diet? I was trying everything. So you take the chance. You make up your mind, and then you cancel things out, you never look back then. From that time on, that's behind you. You've made up your mind. You're either going to be successful or you're going to be a dead man. And it's better to be a dead vector than to be no vector at all.

<sup>125</sup> Faith healer in South Carolina. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leroy\\_Jenkins\\_\(televangelist\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leroy_Jenkins_(televangelist))

<sup>126</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oral\\_Roberts](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oral_Roberts)

<sup>127</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rex\\_Humbard](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rex_Humbard)

<sup>128</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cathedral\\_of\\_Tomorrow](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cathedral_of_Tomorrow)

## After death

Q. Do you consider it true that what happens to you after death is determined by the condition of your soul at the time of death?

R. By the condition of what you are now. This can be explained: if you hear me talking it sounds like a different language, of what I expect to be the permanent state of man's being. Now what do most people expect when they die? It's very possible that this world is an illusion – suppose this world is an illusion, don't accept it, just suppose it – that these bodies *are not*. Accepting the fact that our eyes don't see clearly, that orange is not orange, that legs are not legs, and as J.J. van der Leeuw says, we might be a point in space about which all this other stuff is interpreted: beauty, ugliness, all this sort of thing. That we might just be a point, the end of a ray of God, but we put all this coloration on it by virtue of mutual agreement.

Now, here's another party, way down the other end of the spectrum, and the only immortality he or she understands is: "Is Granma going to be there?" And when they die, if Granma or Grandpa isn't there, and nothing is there – what type of immortality would they have? They'd have oblivion. That would be identified by them as oblivion, because nobody would be there. Consequently, the only other type of experience they can possibly have, that has any meaning to them, of a continuation of life, would be that Granma has to show up. And that's what we call a bardo. Or they have to be reborn – if they believe that – that that's a resting place and they're going to come back and go through this three-act play again.

I maintain of course that this is part of the ability of mankind: to create a certain amount of things, and to delude and limit themselves too. So if this person did enter the absolute – he would never know. It would be the equivalent of oblivion. He would never know where he was. Because his whole method of cataloging things would have to be by orange and yellow, good and bad, age and childhood and all that sort of thing.

To give you an example, some people say that when a baby dies, in the next dimension or the purgatory or whatever is in between, he grows to be an adult. Now I've got a brother and he died at the age of 64,<sup>129</sup> and I've seen his baby pictures at the age of 2 or 3. Suppose he had died at 2 or 3 and he showed up in heaven as I knew him at 64 – I would never recognize him. So we've got a lot of wild concepts. And it really becomes confusing when you think that you're going to have a heaven according to your beliefs. And we do. We're incapable of taking into account every possibility that might happen after death, and say, "I better look out for that; that's liable to be what it is."

Q. In your idea then, it's not a very desirable thing to go into oblivion after death?

R. Well, that's what it is. Never put any qualifications on it. When you look for the truth, don't say, "I want the truth as long as it's not oblivion." Because if that's what it is, that's what it is. You want the truth for what it is.

Q. Won't you have any choice?

<sup>129</sup> Joe Rose.



R. [laughs]

Q. Like for example, if you concentrate on going to the sun or something, wouldn't you end up going there?

R.. Well, you know, you might talk yourself into something. I knew a woman one time who believed that she could believe, that she would be what she believed. And before she died she was in diapers.<sup>130</sup> She didn't want to grow old, so she went back the other way. But I'm not saying that's an ideal state of mind for you to have, because you'd still be lost. You wouldn't know who went to the sun, whether it was the real you or a desire-projection. But I doubt seriously whether you'd be able to go exactly where you wanted to go.

I believe that there's a very good possibility [to predict a person's experience] just from the observation of the type. For instance, are you acquainted with Kübler-Ross's stories on life after death?<sup>131, 132</sup> Raymond Moody also wrote on it, *Life After Life*.<sup>133, 134</sup> You'll find that there are categories of stories about life after death. I've noticed this myself. I've watched them over a period of a lifetime, of different accounts, the relatives talking about when they watched so-and-so die, or a man who was in an automobile wreck and was dying.

And you'll find that there's one category in which they actually see their relatives; their relatives come and get them. Then there's another category where there are no relatives, nothing but beautiful scenery, vistas, colonnades, nobody there. And then there's this other one, that is like the cosmic consciousness experience, or an enlightenment experience, in which they realize that they are one with God. And yet when you say, "What's God look like?" they're not able to answer you.

Now these are cases that are actually corroborated, people who have died, dependable people, who have been written up. I think it was in October, 1974, *Readers Digest*, the name of the article was "I Died at 10:52."<sup>135</sup> This man had a heart attack in an automobile and it was two hours before they could get him to a hospital or to an ambulance. He was pronounced dead and came back. Theoretically, his brain should have been gone but he came back and was in perfectly good shape, and he described his experience. And he wasn't too keen about them bringing him back. But he realized that he was safe. Beyond a doubt he was safe. And it was entirely something that he had never expected.

Consequently, you find people on a certain plane. If a person has a certain hunger, I think the hunger is answered in this lifetime. Now I don't know what chance we have in another lifetime. But a smart gambler doesn't wait. You don't wait. If you can break out now, you'll break out now and see what's outside.

Q. How should we live our lives? Should we just satisfy our senses and live for today ... ?

R. [laughs]

<sup>130</sup> An apparent reference by Rose to his devout mother, who suffered a debilitating stroke late in life.

<sup>131</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elisabeth\\_Kubler-Ross](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elisabeth_Kubler-Ross)

<sup>132</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/On\\_Death\\_and\\_Dying](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/On_Death_and_Dying)

<sup>133</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raymond\\_Moody](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raymond_Moody)

<sup>134</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life\\_After\\_Life\\_\(book\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life_After_Life_(book))

<sup>135</sup> "I Died at 10:52 A.M." by Victor D. Solow <http://tatfoundation.org/forum2003-12.htm#5>

Q. ... or should we try ... ?

R. That's up to you. I never tell anybody how to live. Your intuition has to lead you.

Well, I see some of us are leaving – so, it's been nice meeting with you. Maybe I'll see you all again sometime.

[end]