

Next Meeting  
21 January 96



Issue No. 26  
December 95

**Meetings are held at 10-30am 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.**

### November Meeting

We had a mini-dialogue at the end of the November meeting - when most had left. I think it was Graeme who questioned whether it is meaningful to talk of timelessness when duration seems necessary for anything to happen at all. I won't attempt to summarise the discussion here. I recall it seemed to be resolved for me in the moment but it keeps popping up so maybe it would be a good subject for a full Dialogue meeting.

### December Meeting

The December meeting was the biggest we have had and, in anticipation of a multitude, I decided to experiment with a tent on the lawn. It seemed to work quite well. We talked of education and the fact that wonder seems so easily driven out of our lives. After the event, I had a strong reaction to the effect that we are not attentive enough to the process of Dialogue. I think we spend most of our Dialogue time in good old fashioned discussion. For example, whilst the general tenor seemed to be regretful about the absence of wonder and the wonderful someone asked the question, 'does life have to be wondrous?'

I thought that a particularly pertinent point and I withdrew from the 'flow' to contemplate it. By the time it had sunk in and I had watched the strong reaction of my assumptions wrestling with this notion I returned to find myself well downstream with no opportunity to explore this question in the group without persuading you all to row back up the river with me. So how can dialogue ever work if the real challenges

evaporate in the speed of the movement? Or was it important only to me? It seems like a fundamental flaw in the process. Perhaps our insistence on not having an agenda, agreed subject of discussion or any form of coordination is becoming ritualised into a dogmatic obstacle to the dynamic.

On the other hand, the talk of wonder and 'magic moments' led to a number of such events on the day. I was reminded of Maslow's claim that when his students became interested in and enquired about peak experiences their frequency increased.

I wonder whether there is any non-personal indicator of the effectiveness of the process of Dialogue. Perhaps the frequency of the group, as as a whole, falling into silence as opposed to individuals. Maybe Dialogue is just another mad idea that will never work?

I think another possible obstacle to Dialogue is the assumption that there is no way that intelligence can function other than through the rational, be it the individual or collective brain. In this scenario, thought comes to be regarded as "source" rather than expression of source and the idea arises that it is necessary to think our way through rather than see. I intend to devote an issue of this newsletter to "Why Dialogue doesn't Work". All contributions, for and against most welcome.

Donald gave me the following extract as an interesting commentary on the assumptions which may be lurking behind our group title

which, you may recall, is taken from Traherne's poem 'The Anticipation'.

### **Law & Spirituality**

From the August 1929 issue of The International Star Bulletin - Vol 1, page 9. The following extract is the last six paragraphs of this piece.

Liberation is neither in the future nor the past. It is not something to be attained in some distant future nor does it lie in the past under the control, under the domination of those who have already attained. I maintain that the now, the eternal now, holds the entire truth. The past is the ever changing present and to that past belong birth, renunciation, acquisition, and all the qualities that you have gained.

The past will not solve your problems nor establish harmony within yourself; so you look to the future which becomes for you the great mystery. The future is the mystery of the 'I', the 'unsolved 'I', because whatever you have solved of the 'I', of the self, is the past. So whatever you have not solved is the future, and hence a mystery. The future will always remain a mystery because the more you enter the future, the more mysterious it becomes and the more you are held within it.

The establishment of inner harmony is to be attained neither in the past nor in the future, but where the past and the future meet, which is now. When you have attained that point neither future nor past, neither birth nor death, neither time nor space exist. It is in that "now" which is liberation, which is perfect harmony, to which men of the past and men of the future must come. You, who aim at bringing about that harmony in the future must realise this eternal moment.

To me, the future is not at all important neither is the past. What is of utmost importance is what we are in the now. Your ideas, your love, your whole being must live in the immediate which means that you must put your theory into practice now. It matters what you are "now", in what manner you live and treat other people, not what you are going to be in the future. Who cares what you are going to be? The seed that has life in it wants sunshine and rain immediately not in

some distant future - by then the seed may be dead.

That eternal moment is creation. I dislike to use the words 'active' and 'inactive', 'dynamic' and 'static' - pass the words by and see in them something potent. If you do not live in that eternal moment, you are dead to the self, to the 'I', to the immensity of life. Unless you free yourself from all outside authorities, conventions, rights and wrongs, philosophies and religions, you can never come to that immediate now, which is creation.

To be liberated, to live in that realm of the eternal, to be conscious of that Truth, means to be beyond birth and death - because birth is of the past and death is in the future - beyond space, beyond the present and past, and the delusion of time. The man who has attained such liberation knows that perfect harmony which is constant and eternally present; he lives unconditionally in that eternity which is now.

*Jiddu Krishnamurti*

## **Enlightenment**

### ***1 - Handbook Of***

As an extension of his campaign to get to the bottom of this troublesome issue, Peter has produced a glossary of the terms most frequently used to describe enlightenment. In addition, he has pulled out a few descriptions of breakthrough experiences. He has also attached an analysis of the Enlightenment spectrum we talked of in the last NOWletter. It is too long to include here but copies are available on request from Peter or myself.

### ***2 - Letter from Rome***

Voila, the Cutting Edge at last!

"What is involved in seeing the fundamental I-amness as it really is rather than what the 'I' thinks it is". (Question in Nowletter 25) As always, the answer is in the question: the question cannot exist in the hologram without the answer'

Consider: I look in the mirror. What I see can only ever be the reflection. I am aware that

what I see in the mirror is not me so why the confusion? "I" can never see I-am-ness. I am that so why the acceptance that 'I'/the reflection/ego/thinker can think itself into actuality?

If I continue to consider my reflection is what I am, surely I am in deep trouble? If the reflection thought it was me, you would send me (or you) to the funny farm; yet that is what these discussions infer.

---

Somehow there is a compulsion to complicate simplicity and it is here we should draw the line:

In the space between the line and this writing exists the gap, the synapse in the holographic universe, where the quantum leap takes place. It doesn't take time but a shift in perception.

Whenever I have said: "I knew as a child, I was somewhere else between breaths", I have failed to make it clear that I did not 'know' this between breaths but only when breath, the thinker, resumed.

The space between breaths, between notes, between thoughts, is enlightenment. One can act from this but not in it. Show me a single 'guru' whose life, in and out of relationships, has been perfection and, only then, would it be logical to question this perception.

Probably the greatest barriers of all to overcome are the traditional concepts of time and place, and also the radical difference between reality and actuality. Once these are 'clear' so is everything else.

You state "The best way to resolve the issue would be first to demonstrate the actuality of it...then reveal the mechanism by which it is obscured". Life is the demonstration. Thought creates the obscurity....Surely??

**Rome Warren**

(This was extracted from a much longer contribution From Rome which will provide material for future editions- Thanks Rome)

### **Spontaneously Arriving**

Some of you are aware that I have suddenly

discovered Tarthang Tulku. I was told by one of the correspondents on the NoHead e-mail conference that I might benefit from getting to know him. So I have been reading a book he wrote called Time, Space & Knowledge. On first reading I was very resistant because Tarthang seemed determined to drag me into the imagination which I have long regarded as a 'no-go' area as far as these matters are concerned. On second reading I am beginning to review this hasty response and finding quite a number of my cherished assumptions under threat. Anyway, this is just a lead in to this quotation from his final chapter:

**"Given Being's endless play, there is no fixed way to 'get' this fulfilment, since it is too 'near' to 'get', and is so ever-present that no particular approach is necessary or possible. There is no way for us to walk out of this fulfilment -it is always spontaneously arising.**

*Tarthang Tulku*

I thought that a wonderful way of expressing it and highly relevant to much of recent NOWletter content. However, that is all very well but, in addition to the "Spontaneously Arriving", there is also an apparently inevitable *spontaneous arising* (of ego) to meet it, and therein the snag. The person who introduced me to Tarthang is Thomas Petruso who agreed to let me use the following which was one of his recent contributions to the conference.

### **Godzilla**

*(By way of introduction - Thomas's comments follow a NoHead discussion on the monstrous or evil aspect of human behaviour which was prompted by the assassination of Rabin. What was our reaction, what had 'Headlessness' to say about it, etc. I thought his contribution a very eloquent expose of the arrogance which seems to underpin the usual responses. The assumption that we, the problem, are also the solution.)*

Remarks prompted by recent observations on "monstrosity":

In the interests of stimulating thought, maybe even shifting viewpoints, I act again as Lucifer's Lawyer. It seems to me that one's perspective on "evil" and such is one in which a little humility is in order. In other words, nothing reveals cosmic presumptuousness more quickly than the scope of one's formula for "saving" humanity from itself.

What I mean by this is that there seem to be two scales of interpreting existence: the Big Human mode, and the Little Human mode. The first of these is that (quintessentially Western) viewpoint, that makes us out to be free agents subjected to some kind of testing in this life - whether one sees this, in a traditional Judeo-Christian sense as having to answer for oneself at the Final Exam, or whether one sees it in an existentialist/secular sense of having responsibility to base one's presumably free actions on the exercise of intelligence, mutual self-interest, etc. In either scenario, one presumably recognizes the presence of evil or whatever you want to call it, and does what one can to avoid participation in and propagation of it oneself, in the first place, and apparently does what one can to extend the benefit of one's practice to others, on the presumption that if everyone behaved as I did things would be just ducky.

What I called the Little Human mode, which in the West has often been viewed as unconscionable passivity in the presence of suffering, might also be seen as deriving from a more complex view of the cosmos, or at least a view of a more complex cosmos, in which the apparent causal connections of things rarely pertain at the next level of perception. This viewpoint does not mean that one necessarily stands back and accepts any and every behaviour (this has nothing to do with Nietzscheanism). Compassion and recognition of the principle of reaping the fruits of one's actions still apply.

The difference I am trying to get at is seen more on the level of a "worldview," or opinion about what others, or Humanity in general, ought to be doing, and this is what I mean about lacking humility, namely presuming that one's intellect or conscience is vast enough to comprehend the unfolding of It All and make prescriptions for it.

There's an assumption hidden under here that the Creator, Gaia, Nature, the Tao, Mr. God, or whatever is either a screw up or a sadistic testmaster that gets its jollies by creating puny creatures, sticking them into a puzzle and watching them squirm out of it (or not). I find both of these interpretations repugnant in the extreme.

Let me attempt an example. Common "thought" has it that here's global warming going on, caused by misguided Human endeavour, and it's imperilling the planet itself, which presumably waits like a dumb lump for enlightened Humans to come to its rescue by behaving themselves. Isn't just another (back-door) version of the old-fashioned (presumably deplorable from a Green point of view) notion of Christian "stewardship," as in go forth and subdue everything you can and have charge of it? What if What Is, which evidently pre-exists or comprehends or is the condition of possibility of Human life, isn't as dumb as it looks, and in its unfolding requires Human shenanigans just as it requires cockroaches and the fungus that grows on Hummingbird beaks if otherwise well-intentioned people don't take care to boil and replace the solution in their feeders. We have example evidence of the genius, elegance, and wonder (sorry but I can't find a word grand enough for it) of What Is, and I fail to understand the pretension of the view that it needs to (and can't) save itself from one of its small phenomena (us), or that it is dumbly awaiting us all to save from ourselves, in other words, from its own carelessness in letting us bring it to such a pass. Or is this part of the Big Test, namely that the necessity of acting consciously or facing destruction is providing the friction to evolve the species to a higher plane?

I realize the risk of misconstrual to which I expose myself here. I'm not advocating passivity or tolerance of warfare and genocide, etc. I don't think I'm offering any opinion on such things (by the same token, I don't participate in them, either). Rather, I'm offering an opinion on what passes for

thought and conscience, and what I think is a necessity to be unemotional and rigorous about examining unarticulated assumptions that underlie it. An exaggerated opinion of oneself and one's species wears many costumes - the old Crown of Creation business. In other words, is one's sense of morality and a simplistic notion of cause and effect really what one wants to identify as the highest part of oneself?

In short, then, I don't see that David's detached recognition of the factuality for him of assassination makes him a monster. Rather I think that the self-declaration or accusation of monstrosity itself is presumptuous and counter-productive. Another way to say this would be that the whole contemplation of one's stance vis-a-vis a presumed "evil" is another kind of objectification of oneself that is counter to all present evidence.

("If everything's right side up in this world, I want to be upside down in the next." - Mulla Nasrudin)

Thomas Petruso

As a post script to the article by Thomas, I

include the following extract from *Microcosmos*" (Four Billion Years of Microbial Evolution) by Lynn Margulis & Dorion Sagan provides an example of the earth taking care of itself long before we started to contribute to the processes.

*The oxygen holocaust was a worldwide pollution crisis that occurred about 2 billion years ago. Before this there was almost no oxygen in the earth's atmosphere. The earth's original biosphere was as different from ours as that of an alien planet. But purple and green photosynthetic microbes, frantic for hydrogen, discovered the ultimate resource, water, and its use led to the ultimate toxic waste, oxygen. Our precious oxygen was originally a gaseous poison dumped into the atmosphere. The appearance of oxygen using photosynthesis and the resulting oxygen-rich environment tested the ingenuity of microbes, especially those producing oxygen and those nonmobile microorganisms unable to escape the newly abundant and reactive gas means of motion. The microbes that stayed around responded by inventing various intracellular devices and scavengers to de-toxify -and eventually exploit-the dangerous pollutant.*

## LISTENING



This ideogram, describing listening, is borrowed from a TAFE publication on teacher effectiveness training. The inclusion of 'heart' caught my eye.



## MEETINGS

### Regular Dialogue Meetings

#### Monthly:

**First Saturday - 12.30pm** Swedenborg Centre, 1, Avon Road, North Ryde.

**Second Saturday - 2.30pm** Theosophy House, 484 Kent St., City

**Third Sunday - 10.30am** 81, Greville St., Chatswood (off Fullers Road)

#### Enquiries:

Saturday meetings Barry Hora (043) 622843 (home) 9997 4412 (work)

Third Sunday Alan Mann (02) 419 7394