

Next Meeting  
16 July 95



Issue No. 21  
July 95

**Meetings are held at 10am on the third Sunday of every month at 81, Greville Street, Chatswood and are open to anyone interested in the possibility of working out whether, through the process of DIALOGUE, transformation of consciousness, awakening to what we really are, or whatever we want to call it, can come about.**

### May Meeting

The May meeting started with a question Margaret D raised two meetings ago. This was whether, in agreeing the existence of physical, mental and spiritual components, i.e., the pre/trans framework, we could justify the inclusion of the spiritual and, if so, why. I'm doubtful whether we advanced this enquiry very far but we followed some interesting side-issues including whether we can separate teachers from their teaching and whether it is possible or desirable to be concept free. I never know how others feel about a particular meeting and tend to judge them by my own experience. On this occasion I was compelled to redraft my assumptions on the value of concept and review my dogmatic rejection of 'shonky' gurus. This I choose to see as evidence of 'Dialogue' in action. Margaret is going to put her response together and I hope to include in the next letter.

Barry H. feels that there is 'unfinished business' which is blocking us and sent me the following comment:

*What started as an opinion from my collective observations at the previous meeting led to a dialogue with myself. The description of this activity as dialogue is, of course, my assumption. As thoughts were being put together in mind, as a framework of how I would express the opinions I had formed at the Sunday meeting, some questioning started. Is there another way of communicating? What is headlessness? My view of the group having unfinished business was formed by my two-eyed seeing and by filtering the incoming messages by listening through my ego*

*hearing aid. So, yes, my head was indeed present at the meeting and limiting the thoughts that formed the opinions. Another question:- Is the I needed in true communion and headlessness? Although the speakers at the meeting were interesting, it came across as a for and against debate. Not quite a full-on discussion with winners and losers but still a debate. This falling back into debate is what I mean by unfinished business. Discussion enlarges the gap of separate opinions and lacks collectiveness. (Collectiveness does not mean acceptance. What does it mean?) Dialogue may be a PROPOSAL of how to tackle this unfinished business.*

*Barry Hora*

We are making good progress towards 'Seeing' workshops and the Nohead email conference is a very interesting and lively forum. Apart from what I find to be very stimulating exchanges I 'met' someone else, Chtis McLean, who attended the Douglas seminar in 91 and who has already run a workshop. I am hoping we will see him at our monthly gatherings.

Last month's issue of this letter included most of the USA quarterly Newsletter. This is a major copying job and I don't think I can maintain this on a regular basis. In future I will make my copies available at Greville St and Ryde meetings unless anyone has a better idea.

### **Ryde meeting**

Ryde meetings continue on the first Saturday of every month and continue to be well attended.

Barry plans to add a monthly meeting to be held at the Theosophical Society rooms in Kent Street. This will provide a convenient venue for people living in Sydney and South and easy access by public transport.

### **Alister Hardy Society**

After all our talk about the possibility of joining the Alister Hardy Society, following Margaret A's suggestion, I find that Halcyon is already a member. She left me a copy of the Alister Hardy Lecture for 1994 by Lord Rees-Mogg from which I lifted this story, he says:

I have, myself, had quite an interesting experience which shows one of the ways in which mind works. I went to my doctor thirty or forty years ago because I was feeling a bit deaf in one ear and he found my ear had lots of wax in it and syringed my ear out. And immediately after, but only lasting for a very, very short time, I could hear with a singular acuteness. I had aural high frequency. I could hear my suit, and it sounded like canvas rubbing together in a gale; it was making an enormous noise. And my mind then adjusted the noise down, having turned some knob up as it were, when I was half deaf because of the wax. It had to turn the knob down when it would be very unpleasant: I can't go through the rest of my life hearing these sounds at this volume. And it seems to me likely that there is a similar process of a reduction of our contact with the "Other", in order to allow ordinary life to proceed.

This has echoes of the Colin Wilson approach we looked at a couple of issues back and the JW-L story. The idea of turning down the "Other" knob has interesting applications to the "Headless Way".

### **Bees of the Invisible....**

Enid continues to remonstrate gently with me about my promotion of the idea of a needy God. This in response to my endorsement of Traherne's concept of humanity as the means of returning to the creator the fruits of its creativity and the belief that god is highly desirous of our participation in this process. I think Blake's "Eternity is in love with the products of time" is expressing the same understanding. Is this just a romantic Western notion or does it appear in Eastern thought as well? I'm sure I could find

parallels in Hindu scriptures. What about the Bhagavad Gita? Buddhism might prove more of a challenge and that, perhaps, is the source of the resistance. But what about our new friend Thich?

The connecting link between Western and Eastern spokespersons of all ages is their emphasis, often in the midst of great misery, on the essential wonder and joyousness of being. This is something from which we become estranged; we have learned to turn the joy knob down. We talked about the parable of the prodigal son at the last meet. I think this is the real meaning, the love of creation for its constituents, the misunderstanding arises from the idea that we are separate from God rather than an expression of God. Tom said it much more clearly:

*His name is Now*

*His essence is all Act.....*

*His name is Now*

*His nature is for Ever*

*None can his creatures*

*From their maker sever*

The difference between West and East is that when we come to the point when words are more likely to confuse than clarify, the West keeps talking or writing in the hope of some miraculous breaking of the conceptual barriers.

*"Where trusting heart and mind are not estranged, Words fail, and cannot tell of THAT which has no yesterday, tomorrow or today."*

This much loved quote is I think from the same being who said "The purpose of life is to see", very Hardingesque, and Seeing is, I think, what Tom means by returning the creation to its creator. All very simple really, but in his words *'we are out of frame'*.

My desperate search for supporting, Buddhist evidence was rewarded by this quote from "Zen in English Literature" p261. The aged Komachi, in *Sotoba Komachi*, says,

*Though I too am a withered tree of no worth, my heart has flowers that may be offered to the Buddha.*

Perhaps the use of the word god is the problem. Elsa found this contribution from Rilke in the latest ATPA journal

*"We must try to achieve the greatest*

*consciousness possible in our existence, which is at home in both unbounded realms , inexhaustibly nourished from both...The true figure of life extends through both: there is neither a here nor a beyond, but a great unity, in which the beings that surpass us, the 'angels' are at home...We of the here and now are not for a moment hedged into the time-world, nor confined within it ...we are incessantly flowing over and over to those who preceded us ...We are the bees of the invisible; we deliriously gather honey of the visible, to accumulate it in the great golden hive of the invisible."*

### **Seeing**

There is a lot of seeing going on. Donald sent a couple of pieces from California where he is up to his ears in Krishnamurti centenary activities and Dialogue meetings. I continue to wrestle with my particular worry and had just completed item 3 when Don's letter arrived.

#### **Item 1 - Donald**

This evening, an hour ago, came a sudden realisation that when I want to achieve whatever I happen to desire, be it worldly or spiritual, I need time and effort to gain that end: thus do I predetermine a "gradual" approach to the production of that goal. It is this very way of looking (and so seeing) that perpetuates and strengthens my enslavement to time and self-perpetuation. the very placing of my present objective "out there" , as though it were away from me, at a distance, and so requiring effort, practice, time to get it reveals the falseness of that perception and that process.

Seeing this, understanding that seeing is ever immediate, (i.e. now) and so, timeless, is to be aware that perception is always sudden, in the sense that it can only occur NOW-HERE.

And so, the wiping away of 'the idea of time' as a means to calculating and using methods for achievement permits direct perception of all that is going on in the mind, allows depth and clarity and the real possibility of an ":Ah, yes! That's it!", sudden insight.

#### **Item 2 - Donald**

I was watching small children in a pool in the river below the Matilda dam near Ojai and saw that a child learning to swim involuntarily fears

that it might sink; a large expanse of water has not been its experience, nor is it sure of its own buoyancy.

Awakening to LIFE on land is like learning to swim in water and to enjoy the wonder of being alive without it going through the frantic thrashing about in an effort to stay afloat or make a living .

Learning to swim, like learning to live in calm awareness, means neither being afraid to act nor wilfully determined to get the experience.

Healthy, confident swimming or living depends on a primary awakening - that capacity is inherent in human beings, in each one of us. Trust it!

#### **Item 3 - Alan**

My hang-up is the transitory nature of 'seeing'. The fact that it seems to be so easily overtaken by the self-centred vision of life.

I have long thought this to be the result of trying to put 'seeing' into a context of time; the failure to see that time is in the 'seeing' not the other way round.

If this is so, any expectation of a continuity of seeing is absurd. When a moment of seeing is enough, the problem is no more. The idea of continuity of seeing is the attempt of the ego to take over. To establish the new skill as another reinforcement of its self. For this reason, I am uncomfortable with the use of the word see to describe humans open to seeing. We are the 'seeing', the 'seeing' is not something we are doing. Seeing is what we are, not what we do? Is that so?

For me, stabilisation of the 'seeing' may follow abandonment of my obsession with stabilisation which, I now 'see', is to do with sustaining a continuity of seeing. When the problem is seen, it is seen to be me - as usual.

If there is a stopping in the moment of seeing, content with that, an opportunity may exist for timelessness to expand.

Finally, an insight into my condition. I saw myself as a man with good eyesight wandering around with closed eyes pestering everyone I meet with the question of why I do not see.

There's none so blind as those who will not see. (Where from that quote? It is most appropriate) The earliest version I can find is John Heywood, Proverbs, 1546 who said:

*Who is so deaf or blind as (is) he  
That wilfully will neither hear nor see?*  
The following is an extract from a recent exchange on the Nohead Conference and is written in response to a question about practice which I now cannot find. It is very interesting in its own right but also underlines the dangers we face when trying to capture these matters in words, covers an aspect of Dialogue we rarely touch and introduces a new friend. I had to shrink it a bit as I was limited to what is left of page 4.

*Truth being what it is, it can't be practised - it includes the practitioner. It's just how it is - profound, mysterious, still, silent, full of potential, or whatever we discern about it - it can't be grasped. So what is it we <do>, we who practice the way of <Seeing>? What sort of effort is involved? And, Who's doing it? The self that I find that <does> things is all outward display - the ceaseless display of appearances (phenomenon), in a dynamic continuum with the so-called <not-self>.*

*Isn't it on this level that what we call attention, so important to our practice, exists? (I like Bohm's word, if I've understood it correctly - <holomovement>- for this dynamic continuum.) However, as a number of you have so nicely expressed it this week: at the centre is a vast, unfathomable Emptiness.*

*Now, and here's my offering to the discussion: isn't there a danger - a danger supported by language - of creating a <something> out of this intelligent mystery? We step into the realm of Spiritual Ego - a something inside separate, though related, to the outside.*

*For example, isn't there a danger of taking the language too seriously when we say - as is natural and proper, when held lightly - "What I am is the space that contains all things."*

*(Most of us can relate to this description, eh?) In fact, is there a difference between the space and the phenomena; between the container and the contained? Isn't the difference only apparent?*



## DIALOG MEETINGS

These are more truly DIALOGUE meetings There is no agenda, explicit or implicit For more information Ring

### RYDE MEETING

12-30 pm on the first Saturday of every month at 1, Avon Road, North Ryde.  
Next meeting ...Saturday 1st July

### CITY MEETING

6.30 pm Theosophical Society 484 Kent St  
The first meeting is planned for  
Monday 7th August Confirm with Barry

*Annual Subscription to the NOWletter \$10*

