

Transcendental Meditation

# **TRANSCENDENTAL MEDITATION**

## NOTE OF THE TRANSLATORS

The following translation of "Transcendental Meditation" is an attempt to accurately record a series of discussions which took place in conversational Spanish. The use of certain words, the sentence structure, and the particular conversational style of the speaker in these discussions often differ from those in common Spanish usage. This was intentional. Consequently, the corresponding translation into English often retains elements of this unusual rendering of sentence structure and word usage. The English speaking reader should, therefore, be careful to observe these juxtapositions when they occur.

Although as much of the original conversational style as possible was retained, in certain cases where it was felt that too literal rendition of the Spanish into English would distort the meaning intended, departures from the original style were made for purposes of clarity. Attempts have, however, been made to keep these stylistic departures to a minimum.

## EXPLANATION

The four conferences on transcendental meditation were held by Silo in Buenos Aires on August 16, 17, 18 and 19, 1972.

In Santiago de Chile, on the 12th and 13th of October of the same year, he was only able to develop the first two. The other two were suspended due to the following inconvenient circumstances.

The meetings were held in the auditorium "La Reforma", under the jurisdiction of the Universidad de Chile, at that moment controlled by the Communist Party. At the end of the second conference, a member of the central committee demanded a list of six hundred persons that "were to be responsible" in case of rioting. There were responsible people, of course, and in sufficient number, since the place had been rented by a group that satisfactorily fulfilled all the requirements; there was sufficient security and finally, the place had been used with no problems up to that moment.

This case was no different than another one back in 1969, when in Punta de Vacas, the armed corps of the Gendarmerie demanded the documentation of all in attendance at that historical speech. At that time, this measure was put forth by the fascist right in power. Now, by the reformist bureaucracy. Impartially considering both cases they can be reduced to the same authoritarian and stupid attitude.

In conclusion, the conferences on transcendental meditation were suspended in Santiago; the rental money was returned to the organizers, who in their turn, donated this money to the Communist Party's Central Committee as an "acknowledgement of their effort in backing the free expression of ideas."

The four conferences published herein were extracted from recorded tapes. The first two resulted from fusing the ones developed in Buenos Aires and Santiago.

As far as questions and answers of the second conference are concerned, the most meaningful ones in both places appear with no distinction.

From those from the third and fourth conferences, only the questions and answers related to the central theme were selected.

## INTRODUCTION

The four conferences can be ordered according to the following scheme.

FIRST: Encompassing the theme of transcendental meditation in the present historical context. Social escapism and the growth of superstition in a world that "is fetishized" from day to day. External and internal fetishes. Secondary reveries, the reverie nucleus and the different forms of hypnosis. Distinctions among the different pseudo meditative propositions: prayer, concentration and fantasious meditation. Characterization of simple and daily meditation as "a learning to see through the illusion of the reveries."

SECOND: Distinction between simple or daily meditation and transcendental meditation. Characterization of transcendental meditation as a process of surpassing the perceptions, images, representations and the tendencies of the structure of the consciousness. "Transcendental meditation does not work with objects of representation, but with acts of consciousness." The twelve progressive steps of Transcendental Meditation:  
First step: "To learn to see," as observation with attention. Discovery of the "reveries."  
Second step: "To see in everything the senses," noticing that in perception, the data are modified by the senses. Discovery of "identification."  
Third step: "To see in the senses the consciousness," comprehending that the perceptions are organized by the structure of the consciousness. Discovery of the "illusions."  
Fourth step: "To see in the consciousness the memory," since the structure of consciousness works with data recorded in the memory, and since the related activities depend on data as "raw material." Discovery of "comprehension."  
Fifth step: "To see in the memory the tendency." The mental form is intentional and works by actualizing memory. Discovery of the intentionality that binds acts to mental objects and of the action of the memory over all "act-object" structure.  
Sixth step: "To see in the tendency the enchainment, when noticing that consciousness cannot exist empty, but is completed by acts, be

they retentions, actualizations, protentions or expectations.  
Discovery of the mechanism of determinism of the consciousness.

THIRD: Considerations about the first six steps.

Seventh step: "To see in the enchainment the permanent". In spite of the variation of the acts and objects of consciousness. Discovery of the mechanism of determinism as a permanent condition for the existence of the consciousness.

Eighth step: "To see the permanent in one and in all." The mechanism of determinism is valid not only for consciousness in general, but also for all the particular cases in which it acts, for example, in perception. This permanence of the mechanism of determinism is valid for all possible consciousness in spite of the occasional variations produced by different perceptions. Discovery of intersubjectivity and of the permanent essential structure, "consciousness-world." Observation of the fact that the "permanence" is structural and dynamic.

The permanent structure does not depend on phenomena. On the other hand, the "consciousness-world" structure correlation indicates to us that the "world" has in itself a necessary structure to produce an impletion in the "consciousness." The consciousness is the "act" of the world and the world is the "object" of the consciousness.

Ninth step: "To see the permanent form "in action." The essential structure "consciousness-world" is designated as "form." The form appears behind all particular phenomena and does not depend on them but provides the structural possibility for them to arise. Discovery of the organizing action of the form over the phenomena, of the structure over the compositive elements.

Tenth step: "To see what is not movement-form." The ambit or realm alien to "movement-form" is not "nothingness" but its complement. Discovery of the ambit independent of form, independent of structures.

Eleventh step: "To see what is and what is not as the same". Form and its complement are related at a level that assumes them to be structurally the same-fused. Discovery that form and the independent ambit are necessarily identified in so far as expression is concerned. At another level, this can be comprehended with the example of color and the extension of the visual representation.

Twelfth step: "To see in one and all the same." The correlation between consciousness and the world and the structure form-complement can be reduced in their ultimate root (and independently of the particular phenomena) (can be recognized as) ??? to the same.

Discovery of the essential identity of everything that exists.  
Impossibility of another substance that is not in ultimate reduction  
the only one, and the same for every being.

FOURTH: Consideration of the three previous conferences and a  
synthesis. The real transcendental world is both the world of the  
mind, and of things in their ultimate root.

The questions and answers appearing in the four conferences  
contribute to clarifying the problem of the levels of consciousness,  
of the secondary reveries and of the nucleus. This discovery of the  
reverie nucleus seems to me of revolutionary importance in the field  
of psychology. The astonishing thing is that no one has ever become  
conscious of its existence. It is not the same as the case of the  
subconscious, of which a perfect notion was had by many civilizations  
and currents of thought until finally it was refloated for the West  
by the action of Psychoanalysis.

Just taking into account the discovery and the mechanics of the  
reverie nucleus, a new Psychology will surely be developed in the  
future.

But that is not the only contribution made by the four conferences in  
the field of discoveries. In effect, the idea of "structural form"  
sheds light on the research presently being carried out by the  
disciples of Tenhaeff. The Russian Vasilieff, the North American  
Rhine and the Italian Servadio have taken paranormal phenomena to the  
laboratory, trying to measure them and to obtain constants. Thanks to  
the photographs of S. Kirlian (taken with high frequency fields) it  
is possible to visualize an energetic "plasma" that surrounds every  
living being and that shows variations in the zones that will later  
express themselves as sick or altered parts of the physical structure  
of said being. These and other investigations have enabled the  
launching of the hypothesis of the "form-structuring field." Such a  
hypothesis states the possibility of a sort of form empty of content  
which is the one that later organizes the structure of the living  
being.

In the field of Philosophy contributions and clarifications are also  
made. Such is the case of the third conference (eight step) which  
makes use of a veiled criticism of Husserl's "Cartesian Meditations"  
to break the solipsism to which the phenomenological description (so  
bound up with Kantian schemes, in ultimate instance, Platonic)  
necessarily led. The leap towards intersubjectivity, towards  
historicity and definitively towards the world does not have the  
character given to us by Heidegger's analysis of the "being-there,"  
but rather is related to the transcendental vision of Reality proper  
to Buddhism. In the third conference (tenth step), the idea of "that

which is alien to movement-form, and which is not nothingness," makes us remember Heidegger's study "On the Question of Being" in which he preoccupies himself with the blotting out of the Being, without affirming because of it the existence of an ontological "Nothingness." But, closer to this conference from my point of view, is the distinction established in the Tibetan Bardo Thodol (first part of the Chikhai Bardo), when it says: "Your intelligence - whose true nature is the void that must not be seen as the void of nothingness but as intelligence itself, without hindrances, brilliant, universal and joyful - is consciousness itself: the Universally good Buddha. Your own consciousness, not formed in any way, in reality empty and inseparable from the Great Body of Splendor, has neither birth nor death, and is the inimitable Light Amitaba Buddha."

The contributions to the field of Psychology, Social Psychology, Psychology of Religion, Philosophy, and Science in general are (if important) of scarce relevance compared with the contributions made to those who faithfully attempt to develop their best evolutionary possibilities as human beings.

In this part of the Introduction to the present book, seeing on my work desk the schemes of the four conferences; the Vedas; the Bible; the Epic of Gilgamesh; the studies on the Jainas; the writings of Plotinus; the American Popol Vuh; Hegel's Philosophy of Religion; and the recent studies of Structuralism; seeing them, being able to establish internal unequivocal relationships among all of them (so far apart in their cultures and times) I stop and ask myself: "All of this, for what?"

When the preaching of Silo, something unusual on this American continent, something completely out of place in this colonial cultural context, was blown to the four winds, what did our intelligentsia pick up? It picked up a mockery of journalism and informed itself about Silo's shoe size, his height, his weight, his favorite football clubs. Up to today I haven't read one intelligent or at least erudite criticism from our intellectuals. Everything has been out of proportion and ridiculous.

The cultural colonialism to which our America is subject keeps us from seeing that something new has arisen here, something that gives it meaning. As usual, our intellectuals continue to look at Europe, the USSR or the USA, and it is curious that there (and not here, of course) the contributions of Siloist thought are studied.

Having seen all this and, not from lack of faith, but because of a sort of moral fatigue, I abstain from further deliberations that



would end up being useless at present to our scholars in Latin America.

Those strange associations bring to mind this phrase: "If your kin reject you, dust the dirt off of your sandals and go and preach to the gentiles in my Name."

H. Van Doren  
October 1972

## FIRST CONFERENCE

Three years ago, we had, in this country, the privilege of speaking publicly for forty-five minutes. In effect, those forty-five minutes which many of you may still remember were possible amidst high elevation in mountains, under the most unfavorable conditions of climate and of modes of communications. In any case (and even though those gathered had their documentation investigated as if they were criminals instead of peaceful listeners, in spite of the pressure "of the security corps, who made an exhibition of their weaponry) we had the privilege of speaking for forty-five minutes.

Later, the same was attempted in different places of Argentina, but always with the afore known results: gas, clubbings, shoving, bombs, people detained and things done with the same style. From those resulted not only the physical aggression described, but also the psychic and moral violence that corresponds. when the press in general (the mass media controlled by the system) slanders with impunity and breeds fear into the population, distorting images and distorting doctrines.

That was in the year 1969, when we spoke about the origin of violence, about suffering and about the healing of suffering. It is good to know that, in those moments, not one politician manifested himself publicly; that in those moments, no present hero displayed himself before public opinion... and it could not have been in another way, faced with the dictatorship that ruled over this country.

Through those paradoxes proper to historical processes, from those moments, physical violence manifested itself and continued to grow until today. Today it is clear that the system itself has turned one hundred and eighty degrees and preaches non-Violence and pacification. Good for the system! Let us expect then to count on the privilege of speaking, from now on, for more than forty-five minutes.

Even today, had the organization of this cycle has been set up on a massive level, with adequate diffusion and in an open place, still we would not be speaking. But since these meetings count only on the attendance of qualified spectators, almost specialists I would say, since they are not publicly known, since even the entrance restricts the audience, in principle, it seems, we will not be interrupted. What does this introduction comes to? It comes to prepare the terrain to develop our exposition on transcendental meditation.

Through the irrational and poisonous type of reaction which has corresponded to our preaching, we can start to comprehend certain defensive mechanisms of a mentality, of a society and of a man, that are old.

If we were men from the East, if we displayed the same principles of what today is given the name "mysticism" in general, and our clothing, aspect, gestures and form of exposition corresponded to the "spiritual" as accepted, surely we would not have had problems. The persecution did not remain back there in sixty nine and after those forty-five minutes. The doctrine was distorted with all the means which a more or less technical society can count on today. In several countries the system resented the doctrine and thus new detainees entered the cells, newly shot and clubbed went to the hospitals, new jobless pilgrimage in search of work, new people persecuted by the pressure of the "aseptic" diffusion lost the warmth of relatives and friends. Parents who denounced their sons, teachers who expelled their students, neighbors who participated in police "razzias" against the propagators of the doctrine. Well then, if what we spoke in its moment had been a fallacy and outside of all historical need, it would have succumbed before such pressures. To be exact, precisely the opposite seems to have happened.

In those times we were qualified as "healer" or "miracle worker", later as a "guru", still later as a "prophet". Nowadays some Uruguayan radio station defined us as "mystics". This promotion in rank is not disdainful... (LAUGHTER)... but it is always degrading and basically a distorter of meanings.

Any incoherent person is today presented as a philosopher, doctrinarian or thinker. On our side we cannot aspire to such honors, we have enough by being "gurus", or "prophets" or even "healers" of a new doctrine, if that doctrine serve the human being.

Why is it, my friends, that to our action corresponds such a disproportionate reaction? As Physics tells us: could it be that to our action corresponds the exact reaction. If it is so, let us be careful because our action develops and expands...

Isn't it true that when one listens to talk of meditation, one imagines a certain system of practices that have something to do with oriental postures and very wise venerable masters lost in the clouds of the Himalayas?

Isn't it true that for some kind spirits, meditation so imagined is cut off from everyday activities? That it doesn't mix or lose its purity? That it doesn't touch the social problem, and that it doesn't mix with the life of relationships?

Isn't it true that these charitable souls feel that they can better themselves and better humanity, through the magic art of concentrating their attention on a point between their brows?

It is clear that there are people who divagate in that way and who need not revolutionize the system in which they live, since they themselves are parts benefited by the system.

There are others, more modest in their ends, who do not need to learn or recite among their acquaintances a bewildering Hindu jargon and who think that meditation can help in alleviating nervous tensions, in making a better digestion.

For all of them we must also explain our point of view, but without the hope of pulling them out of so deeply rooted beliefs, almost religious, mainly taking into account that true meditation collides with their interests because it revolutionizes their mental form and their relation with the world.

Let us now try to encompass the ambit in which the need for meditation surges. Let us make an attempt at comprehending how that activity is not cut off from the world, but precisely the opposite. Later on we shall study what is not meditation and the consequences brought on by all false meditation, reserving for the end of today's exposition the characterization of simple and daily correct meditation. On the following days we shall talk with technical precision on transcendental meditation.

When at times of crisis such as the present one, the system of values that is fundamental to a society loses its meaning, when the whole social structure revolutionizes itself from the form of production to the relations of production, when the class dialectics intensify, when the generational dialectics opens its way, when everyday activity becomes rarified and lacks rationality, when the sensation of general and particular asphyxia becomes evident, the phenomenon of social "escape" usually occurs.

The social "escape" is expressed in the ritualization of peripheral elements which have nothing to do with what is essential to human activity. Sports, sex, games, fads, music are ritualized. All those elements acquire value as fetishes, as if in them is the power of resolving internal conflicts. The entire epoch becomes strongly messianic and salvationist theories spread. Old myths are unearthed and adapted to the moment. Blind faith is deposited in men as escaped as the rest, but who appear haloed by a property difficult to define. This property of difficult definition is, precisely, that which identifies the fetish as such. In its presence the diffuse sensation that it has the power of resolving anguishing situations is experienced. Be it games, a leader, a spiritual master, a magical system, even a scientific one (in this level it is indifferent), be it an object of status, or a flying saucer, all these entities appear as insinuating the salvation searched for by the consciousness in escape mode.

In those curious historical moments, we can say without error that superstition spreads and is justified in one thousand different ways. Now the extraterrestrials cease to be a more or less probable hypothesis, to become converted into the grandsons of the angels who come as an embassy of the divinity. . . (LAUGHTER). . . Observe in some people, or in yourselves, through the scientific coating with which the phenomenon is explained, the more or less mystical background which haloes it. Study in the followers of a leader or of a party, the beatific irrationality which has more force than the logical argumentation.

Sometimes, and to complete the picture, that leader surrounds himself with astrologers, and that party, with an infallible mystique (LAUGHTER).

If given the situation of urgency, the solution for the evils is searched for externally, then the fetishes are also external. If on the contrary the conflict is experienced as one's own and personal, the fetishes are internal. In this last case the terrain is prepared for drugs, mystical disciplines and for the exercise of the different forms of self-hypnosis.

In both cases the consciousness is not in condition to study the problems that arise, but it tends, by means of the relationship with the fetish, to pass over them without resolving them.

That state of the Consciousness, as you know, we call "emotional Consciousness". It is completely useless to try to explain to someone who is in that situation, what is happening in his consciousness. Any rational argument that one tries to present to him will be easily discarded and, in its turn, reinterpreted in a singular way, but without attending to it in profundity.

Let us see now: if what we have been saying finds in some of you that barrier of the emotional consciousness, the explanations that are given will not be received reasonably. . . Are not some of you internally discussing what we say, instead of trying to understand it?. Let us advance a bit further.

Have you observed that when there exists in you one of these fetishes, all or many of your activities tend to gravitate around it? That this fetish become a sort of artificial center of gravity? And that the wearing down of the faith towards it, in the long run, finally leaves the experience of a bitter emptiness? Have you not verified that the loss of faith is experienced as disillusionment? Well then, what happens at a social level in critical times, happens daily in the consciousness of every human being. That in these epochs certain phenomena are accentuated, does not exclude the fact that at every moment the human mind ritualizes, projects, and illusions itself.

All of you must know, through your own experience, of that succession of images in daily life, happening in the moment in which an external stimulus unleashes it. Fantasizing, or "dreaming while awake", is not a rare phenomenon, but it is normal and corresponds to the state of ordinary vigil. Normally, in those images, one may discover a tone common to all of them: one same emotional background. Particularly in oppressive situations, or those of tiredness, these images tend to be reinforced. Now then, if the aforementioned reveries avail of such vigor as to hide and superpose themselves on reality (and this happens everyday), what is not going to happen when a certain reverie is fixed and strengthened to such a point that the personal activities and intimate desires remain, directly, bound to it? I do not believe that the relation between the social illusions, which fetishize certain objects and simple daily reveries escapes you. In both of them, the same mechanism of escape and of emotional background are operating.

Let us go a little deeper. You might have differentiated the simple and occasional reveries which are not repeated, from those other ones which appear frequently and which on occasion, populate even night dreams. These are of greater importance than the first ones because of the fixedness which characterizes them.

Some good observers may have become aware that the desire to fulfill certain reveries of that type has oriented on occasions a pretended vocation which later failed. Aspirations which could not be accomplished, activities that were frustrated when their motivation wore out. This is not the adequate moment to attempt an explanation of the mechanism of the reveries, but in my view, their personal realities and their social projection should be taken very much into account and it should be noticed that even a behavioral description could be outlined based on the activity of the reverie.

When on another occasion we have said that our doctrine is for the ones with failures and not for the triumphant, we have referred precisely to this central point: those who are illusioned in their salvationist fetishes (be they social or personal), those who have a faith, or those who believe that they possess and have not failed. In their expectations can comprehend little of this which is being explained here. This is not, of course, a matter of creating an artificial disillusionment, as false as its opposite, it is a matter of attending to a very profound vital need that cannot be satiated by the false idols, whatever their symbol may be.

Examine yourselves internally and you will verify that what is being transmitted here is of no use at all if your reveries are launched in an opposite direction. You will see how easy it is to erect superstructures which block these statements. If we insist on the same thing and push ourselves further you will verify something that is very curious, that is: a mechanism of misunderstanding will start to mobilize. And in the measure that we advance in our action, we shall obtain a proportionate reaction. Then, the spectacle will be complete, because totally irrational images, which will correspond exactly to the opposite of the social and personal expectations will be elaborated to combat us. This is very interesting, but we must re-explain the preceding from another of view for its better comprehension

Any mystic consulted will tell us that "reality is illusory". But he will not know how to explain to us exactly if it is a matter of the

reality of the thing in itself or that it is the vision of reality which is distorted.

Already Mr. Buddha (who has a lot to do with the origin of these complications) explained that the beings contemplate the phenomenon that corrodes their mind; that the mind is perturbed because of the objects, and the perception becomes variable and is left at the mercy of external variations; but, at the same time he pointed out that you had to learn to see things in their essential character, as if every phenomenon were hidden by a veil. The nature of this veil was lodged on occasion in the phenomenon, and on occasion in the mind. He himself pointed out that the nature of intelligent vision pertains neither to the cause nor to the condition. To no phenomenon, and yet, it unites all phenomena. Finally, that the perception transcendental to causes and conditions was the pure reality.

Simple and daily perception distorted the world; and that in which one simultaneously has consciousness of the perception was the perception transcendental. By the manifestation of their activities he distinguished the two types of mind: the experimental one already mentioned and the intrinsic or transcendental.

Mr. Jesus and many others explained the need of awakening and keeping vigil, stressing the attention on the falsity of appearances. One thousand six hundred years later, in the Occident, the doubt about the exactitude of perception revolutionized the field of knowledge. At that moment, only the immediate act of thought was taken as indubitable and not the object that appeared to the perception. Finally, and already in contemporary times, it was decided (after admitting the contingency of the phenomenon of perception) "to go back to the things "themselves". But after phenomenological reductions which placed us in the presence of a level of transcendental ideas.

When we speak of the illusory of the perception, of the illusory of the perception of reality, we do not preoccupy ourselves so much with pointing out that, in effect, the objects in themselves do not correspond to what is perceived of them, since each sense receives only a singular range of data from the same object. This is evident.

As it is evident also that the ultimate structure of the phenomenon is not within the reach of our organs of perception. This is not the most important aspect of that which has to do with the illusory



apprehension of reality, but above all, it is the presence of the reverie that covers the perception itself.

Having this clear, let us return to our problem. We understand the reverie as a variable fantasizing, although connected with a whole constellation which compensates for the deficiencies of situation. Every reverie is tinted by an emotional tone, which individually and when the reverie is secondary, transitory, is not very easy to notice. Indeed it is easier, on the contrary, when this reverie is projected over a certain object and fetishizes it, as in the case of emotional consciousness, be it individual or collective. Now then, the reverie appears as a response of the memory to new stimuli and the diverse associations which are mobilized in the daydreaming, may be manifested thanks to having been recorded through previous experiences.

So it is that every new perception will be completed by the mobilization of the old perceptions, which instead of rejuvenating the consciousness, will reinforce the old trunk of the already elaborated mental form. This mental form can be identified, even though provisionally, with the reverie nucleus. The reverie nucleus manifests itself as the response of general and diffuse structure, to particular stimuli. The nucleus of reverie is a tone, a climate, a background of consciousness, rather than an image as it could be in the case of any secondary reverie.

This nucleus possesses a certain fixedness and the one that rules the ideals, aspirations and general illusions, in each stage of human life.

When the nucleus wears out, important variations of personality are produced. But as long as that does not happen, the form of seeing the world and of facing life is maintained on the same line, and everyday duties are fed by that background illusion.

The reverie nucleus may also be understood as the compensation for the basic deficiency of the personality in each vital stage. There exists a general nucleus for each vital stage, which each individual colored with particular characteristics. The psychosomatic change from childhood to youth, from this to maturity, etc. is accompanied by the change of nucleus. It may evolve normally, according to the stages proper to the age, but it can also be fixed in a certain moment of life, augmenting the disconnection between the individual

and his environment with the passage of time. There may be regressions of nucleus or accidental displacements. In these cases changes of personality are observed.

As long as the nucleus remains fixed and orients one's own life in a certain direction, every attempt made in an opposite direction is useless. On the other hand, there is never a lack of superstructures which can justify, more or less rationally all activity ruled in truth by the nucleus in question.

So it is, that aside from the reveries which impede a clean perception of reality, there is that nucleus, that internal tone, creator of illusions, which impedes a new vision of the world and of oneself.

When the failure of projects becomes evident, when disillusion presents itself, one could perhaps be in a condition to learn with new meaning.

Let us now see the other face of the reverie. A reverie can maintain itself with firmness and can orient our activities towards its mirage, feeding our desires, our emotions, in that direction. But this desire which feeds the reverie is rarely fulfilled, its result always being dissatisfaction and pain. If the reverie could always be satisfied as happens on occasions, it would bring its pleasurable consequences in that moment and afterwards remaining empty of meaning. Effectively, the accomplishment of the reverie brings pleasure and even though the achievement of that pleasure provokes a thousand inconveniences, one plunges oneself into the task in order to obtain that result.

In this desire. of taking possession of the mirage, is precisely, the root of all pain and suffering. We have distinguished on another occasion between the physical suffering and mental suffering. The first one can be combated, and each time with greater efficacy, as science and civilization progress. The second one, by the measure in which the self comprehension of the human being advances. It is a good step of auto-knowledge to recognize how one's own reveries distort reality, to discover a sort of illusory nucleus which orients us in one direction and finally to comprehend, radically, that the desire to obtain pleasure leads to suffering, even though pleasure is temporarily made effective.

We are talking of comprehending, not of denying or of modifying situations. I stress this last point because it seems to us of capital importance. We are not explaining the form of solving these problems, we are trying to comprehend them; pointing out that only an adequate intelligence on these subjects will allow us to advance.

It happens, however, that on this historical height, one usually expects answers to the problems without having comprehended them even half-way. A success oriented society that searches for results without attending to comprehension, cannot achieve anything but the accentuation of conflicts and of pain. Of course, several recipes could later be given to anesthetize pain and obtain the peace of the artificial paradises. Of course a new illusion, a new opiate of the people could be created. Be it called religion or drug (crudely) as it is happening in the present moment, the system itself is preoccupied with instrumenting the collective hypnosis, with developing its propaganda and amplifying the expectations of the consumer society by promising happiness. But if this brought no results because the conflict would still continue, there will always remain standing the substitute of replacing this corrupt society which does not soothe our pain with a paradisiacal society that will eliminate conflicts.

That being the case, either through the hypnosis of the system which gives incentive to the desire and the search for happiness, or through the illusion of a new society which will also bring happiness, or through religion which will give us the paradise, or through the drug which brings it near immediately, or through the different forms of auto-hypnosis of the mystical practices... be it through one or through all of those possibilities, the problem appears in all of the cases, escaping from the real comprehension of depth, transferring into the field of the easy solutions which ultimately do nothing but aggravate the problem.

As our specific theme is that of meditation, we are not going to explain how the illusions of a hypnotic society, or of a "better" society, escape in their answers from the clarification of the problem. Therefore, we shall leave aside the external illusions of happiness and we shall deal now with internal illusions.

Here is the first one: religion in general. It postpones us until a better world in the future and it shelters us piously in a system organized by means of hierarchies, ritual, precepts, commandments,

etc. For the more intellectual, in addition to the devotional aspect, there is also theology. But, in the devotion and in the practice of prayer, is placed the hope of the solution of the conflicts. The good believer projects his reverie, fetishizes it and later attributes to it the power of solving problems. Prayer reinforces the previous recordings and so it is that with the passage of time the mental form of the believer goes on solidifying itself. If these religious recordings start being implanted in early infancy, then, the results may be so lasting that, even though later the believer becomes disillusioned with the cult and with that religion in particular, his mental form is left molded by the previous experiences. Later we may find him the rationalist, the scientific or the atheist, but managing himself with the same moral presumptions and the same taboos of the common practitioner. On the other hand, for those who lost their god, the consequent void may generate a pain so intense that they will wander all through their existence searching for a numbing of that pain.

And what is for the believer that mystical sentiment of fusion with the divine, but sensuality but artificial happiness and provisory anesthesia?

You will remember that the annulment of reason and of the spirit of comprehension that accompanies the so called "mystical" experiences is not very different from the one produced in crepuscular states. There, there is no understanding (or wanting to understand), there is divagation, there is pleasurable daydreaming and not exactly far from the senses, but precisely at their mercy. It happens then that carnal prohibitions and other inhibitions prescribed by religions become a formidable sensorial incentive around which the daily reveries gravitate in the form of "temptations". That struggling against the temptations becomes very exciting for the fanatical persecutors of the body  
(LAUGHTER).

I use the phrase "persecutors of the body" in at least two different meanings . , . (LAUGHTER) . . .

Some of you, persons of religious practice, are you free from internal conflict? Or do you recognize conflict as a necessary test, as indispensable suffering to gain Paradise? Is it that some of you like suffering? If it is so, beware! Beware because it could happen

that you may wish to transfer that pain to others, in order to purify them . . . We already have experiences of inquisitions and such things. But if any of these believers would not want pain for himself or for others, will he be sufficiently tolerant with those who do not wish to be saved?

I want to point out that I am not trying to weaken religious belief. Neither am I trying to weaken political belief nor that of any other type. Little does it matter that the believers of a social, individual or religious faith continue professing. What does matter is that each one comprehends how the pain and the conflict are generated in himself and in the social body.

I repeat this in another way. It is not for the religious one or the politician to abandon their illusions. It is not for them to struggle against their reverie. This is as inefficient as raising oneself by pulling one's own hair which, sooner or later does nothing but augment the pain.

We are not talking of renouncing anything (this thing of "renouncement" is one more topic diffused with absolutely no understanding) We are talking of the comprehension of pain. Because let us see, nothing impedes these men opposed in their ideologies (without trying to abandon them) from preoccupying themselves with the study of themselves. It is not good to counsel people to impose in their lives a movement opposed to the direction of their reveries.

This, besides not bringing any solution, aggravates things. It is a matter of simply studying the reveries and the direction they have. It is a matter of simply discovering in one's own desires and in the search for happiness, the source of pain. To diffuse these simple ideas among men, independently of their antagonistic ideologies, is to diffuse a point of View which will revolutionize us internally and which will revolutionize society in a profound sense. But it is not a matter of converting anyone, but of respecting and loving people without augmenting their desperation and their pain.

Here is another illusion (and when studying this one we come nearer to the central theme we are developing). The illusion that the practices of concentration, or, as they are called, of "meditation", liberate us from pain.

Thereabout circulate books and masters, swamis and counselors of every kind, who propose to us that we concentrate the attention on some points of the body to achieve quietude of the mind. Very well, we do so... but of course for that we have had to previously adopt some strange postures and to breathe in a certain way. Perfectly. I look at my point with attention: I see nothing. I persist. Yes, now in addition to the point, the reveries start to unfold. I make an effort to make them disappear and here it happens that . . . the point disappears . . . (LAUGHTER). Round the wheel again and thus so for a long time and many days. Until the interest and the expectations of achieving the marvelous peace are consumed. However, I have gradually achieved the opposite: more divagation and uneasiness! . . . (LAUGHTER).

Let us suppose that I am endowed with an exceptional persistence. Then, truly and with the passage of a long time, I achieve a gradual quieting of the mind.

If I would stop there, surely I would have achieved the education of my attention a little and, also, I would be able to extract conclusions about my mental form. But no. In the presence of such an achievement, and because of the time in months or years invested, it is necessary that now this starts to return profits. And, in effect, it returns profits. Day to day, starting from the mastering of the concentration (be it a point, a color, a repeated sound, or a respiratory practice), I start noticing that my mind quiets down. And not only during the exercise, but beyond it. This quietude and lassitude invades me and is already insinuating itself in everyday life.

Fortunately, people in general are not persistent enough that they abandon these practices in a short time and the affair does not go any further. Because otherwise one would be able to achieve the state of peace they promised. If this is so, those masters did not lie in their teachings. It is clear, that they did not complete the explanation, because that achieved state is, precisely, that of auto-hypnosis.

Any devotee of those practices will verify that with the passage of time, not only has he managed to alleviate tensions and to obtain a relative peace, but also that he is already capable of listening to certain internal insinuations and of receiving certain "messages" which will be interpreted with the religiosity that the case requires.

He will have arrived at the internal enclosure of the crepuscular wherein speak not the voices of the divinity, but the voices of the most profound recordings and reveries.

These mystical practices as well as the ascetic and even the mediumnimitic practices, take the most persistent ones to the field of the crepuscular, to the same field which the drug addict penetrates.

Here we are not moralizing, or creating taboos towards all that. We simply say that through self-hypnosis, one achieves a relative peace as well as the access to the crepuscular, to the numbing of the intelligence, and to the loss of the profound comprehension.

There are others who recommend: do not concentrate, do not narrow the field of consciousness to one object, but the contrary. It seems to them that "meditation" (that is the name they give it) consists of the opposite of concentration and that to achieve it you have to loosen the body and the mind without precision with any idea. The mind then, seems to dilate and they experience this phenomenon as amplification of the consciousness.

This system is more fun than the previous one because, at least, it allows you to divagate with no limitations . . . (LAUGHTER). Surely, it accomplished a good social function before the arrival of T.V. . . . (LAUGHTER).

Continuing with it, it seems that from those free associations some meaningful image is perceived and deepening it (as if it was the personal "yantra" or "mantra"), it is flashily worked on, until one falls into the same state as always; autohypnosis!

Well, gentlemen, some call this, precisely, "transcendental meditation". And where is the transcendental? Perhaps (they imagine) it could be in closing the eyes and seeing the internal images. (LAUGHTER).

We do not understand things that way. Neither the described concentration, nor the pretended meditation. In one and the other case, an enclosure of the subject is produced and an insurmountable barrier between the internal and external appears. NO matter how much they may answer with ready made phrases, such as: "the internal equal to external" or something similar. If those-practices were simple exercises of comprehension of the internal mechanisms and neither

attempted to modify anything nor to achieve results, without doubt those investigators would gain in comprehension and would notice many defects. They would verify the structure of their reveries and would see the wheel of desire turning continuously towards pleasure and pain. But it seems. that that is not the fashionable intention of these days.

There are ascetic practices, already more dangerous, whose explanation does not fall into place here because what has been said already illustrates this sufficiently. Enough to warn that: neither the mental effort, nor the moral self-flagellation of religions, nor suffering, nor the sacrifice or voluntary renouncement of the beauty of this life, achieve liberation. All on the contrary. They generate enclosurement, mental fencing, fanaticism, intolerance and intellectual inflexibility.

What is it then to meditate for us? To meditate is: to learn to see through the illusion of the reverie, it is to comprehend the root of desire, of fear, of suffering, it is to liberate oneself and to liberate. We are not talking today of transcendental meditation, which is a specialized theme. We are talking of plain and simple meditation that does not require postures, rituals, sacrifices or renouncements. Simple meditation starts at any moment, right now, when I notice how the images and the reveries impede me from perceiving reality clearly. When I discover that my motivations are under my arguments and when I see that my life is directed by the illusion.

I do not meditate when I try to solve my problems. I meditate when I realize them perfectly. When I formulate them correctly.

It will be said to me: "But in practice, how do I meditate?"

Perhaps you may with all simplicity, without effort, attend to what surrounds you, but without covering it with reverie. It is not a matter of doing violence to oneself internally. It is a matter of learning to see for the first time.

Everything is not learned all at once. Tomorrow we shall talk more about this point.





## SECOND CONFERENCE

A few questions have arrived in my hands. We will try to answer them more or less synthetically.

QUESTION: "Must it be thought that all systems of practices such as concentration and incorrect meditation lead, necessarily, to autohypnosis?" And in the second place: "Can the work of concentration of the mind on different points of the body activate it positively?"

Here we have two questions in one: not all work at concentration nor all work of what is vulgarly called meditation necessarily leads to autohypnosis. You realize that because of the type of exposition we are carrying on, we also fall into certain schematism, it cannot be another way. In general, we say towards where do these practices lead. Working with certain resources of concentration in a moderate way, we may achieve a fair education of the attention and even an amplification of the memory. But of course, these are more or less immediate practical benefits which have nothing to do with the liberation of the internal conflicts.

Works on concentration do not necessarily lead to autohypnosis. We already explained yesterday that people, fortunately, were not very persistent in their practices that such danger did not exist. In a short time, therefore, he who starts practicing that, becomes tired, does not obtain results and this thing doesn't go any further. We spoke of some cases, very special ones, of people who insisted and came back upon the same thing, and of course, went on obtaining their mental point or whatever they chose. And while achieving this mental point and with the passage of time, they started to verify that the mind quieted down, started to experience that tensions disappeared, and that even in daily life some benefits of relaxation, of lassitude were already observed. We said that later they achieved the lassitude of the mind... and the dulling of the mind. So it is that on this point, I don't believe that there are greater complications.

In the same question there is a second part in which is considered the possibility that certain works of concentration or of the vulgarly called meditation may benefit the body itself, may activate some functions.

There are some experiences in this sense which demonstrate that some sounds or some colors, concentrated on with much attention and with much persistence on specific parts of the body, may effectively activate them. The action of the mind upon the body is undeniable.

In daily life, you recognize the action of emotions upon the corporal system. Possibly here, among the present ones themselves, there is someone who suffers from ulcers or a similar thing, and he knows very well that the mood, the nervous state, the state of the motions, acts directly upon the soma and ends up materializing itself in that type of affliction. Thus, how are we going to deny that the mind, working negatively, produces negative results and also that it may positively activate in some sense some functions which are deficient? This is also very true, but we are in 1972. The laboratories are working for that, there is a lot of pharmacopeia in circulation, official medicine develops itself...

Summing up, science can solve these problems for us much faster with a little pill than what we can do with our heavy work concentrating on a sound, concentrating on a point over some zone of the body which is deficient. In such a way that, as we also said yesterday, if science with its advance may go solving our corporal problems (our physical suffering), let us let it then, and let us contribute so it also develops itself. Where science does not reach the solution of the profound mental conflicts, then is necessary for us to appeal to ourselves.

This matter of the action of the mind over the body is an everyday thing and yet it also occurs in some not so usual cases which serve us as illustration.

You know that in states of hypnosis you may induce in the individual, by applying a cold object to his hand, for example (and suggesting to him that this object is burning), you may induce the production of reactions on his skin. The exact same reactions which are produced when a hot object is applied; the same symptoms, the same wounds. Thus, how are we going to ignore and deny this? There are some cases in which some "mystics", to give them a name, are so possessed by their object of adoration, so much is their expectation for it, that they end up physically reproducing the wounds in the side or in the hands proper to Mr. Jesus, for example. And all this is not the work of a miracle, it works through the enormous power of the mind over the body.

In this sense there are also disciplines, such as the yoga disciplines, which may be positive for the ends of corporal health. Also the Swedish gymnastics, the Danish ones, and the gymnastics done on big apparatuses are good, isn't that true? They are good gymnastic forms and they aid the body, and also an adequate respiratory exercise is helpful. Here little does it matter that it is called "yoga". If we use it because it is called "yoga", then, perhaps, there are other types of implications of mystical nature...

I don't know if I'm making myself clear. If we consider that gymnastic like any other one and we practice it, well, surely we shall obtain from it its benefits. In such a way, on this point, I don't think there are more difficulties.

QUESTION: "Couldn't there exist non-crepuscular mystical experiences, but rather, ones of supra-consciousness?"

In the first place, in order to make this comprehensible to all listeners, we should try to agree on what is the crepuscular, what shall be the conscious, what may be the supra-Conscious. But broadly we could say that there exist (and this which we are going to explain is nothing but a didactic scheme, things are not so much like this, so rigid, they are more flexible) different levels of consciousness which are easy to recognize.

You know the state of deep sleep. The individual sleeps, self-criticism diminishes and any suggestion from the outside (any stimulus) is amplified, is modified, covers the consciousness, and one believes in it. In a dream anything can happen and what happens there is not criticized. In that profound sleep, the most enormous contradictions can appear and one believes them. It is the field in which self-criticism and reason are reduced almost to a minimum.

Contemporary psychologists have pointed out some mechanisms such as dramatization, secondary elaboration, displacement, etc. in which all the irrational mobility of the dream, the transformations it suffers, are seen. In conclusion, the most retrievable aspect is to advert in them the diminishing, the narrowing of the power of reasoning. And the great power, the great susceptibility, the great suggestion exerted by the images upon our consciousness until they cover the will. That is a level of consciousness we all recognize.

There is another level which we could call semi-sleep. It is not the state of ordinary vigil, such as the one we are in now. It is not the state of deep sleep either. It is an intermediate state. That state becomes evident when we enter deep sleep or when we go out of it. It is a state in which a little of reason and a little of complete onerism are mixed. It is a state in which the reveries displace themselves at a very high speed. And become evident to us in a very picturesque way. It is a sort of transitional state.

Semi-sleep could be (let us use a figure) the "ceiling" of sleep. But, although it appears as the ceiling of sleep, it also appears as the "floor" of vigil.

The state of ordinary vigil, in which We are now, I suppose . . . (LAUGHTER) is mounted on that floor. It is not disconnected, therefore, from that floor, but this floor serves it as a base, as a support. And so it is that in our state of ordinary vigil, we are bombarded by the contents of the underworld. Those contents which, in the first level of consciousness were very strong, very suggestive (one blindly believed in them), covered our consciousness, caused our self-criticism to diminish. In the second state, in the intermediate state, they went on diminishing in their intensity. And in the third state, even though they do not disappear totally, they have markedly diminished their suggestive power.

In such a way, the images which populate our consciousness now while we talk or while we listen sometimes escape us, but with a little attention and a little practice, we see them fleetingly passing through our consciousness. These images are still acting. These images normally, especially in oppressive situations and in situations of tiredness, are superimposed over the very perceptions which one has of what is happening. They cover them in such a way that a fantasizing or a reverie is generated which completely distorts reality for us. Due to that fantasizing and that reverie, we do not have correct perception of reality, an adequate perception: And this is our problem. There exists the possibility of a state of consciousness which would not be touched by these images which erase perception for us.

There exists a new state of consciousness which we could call of "consciousness of self" and not of altered consciousness, not of consciousness distorted by the images of the reverie which come from those depths. Maybe that state exists, maybe it is nothing out of

this world. But, be it whatever it is, it is not the state we live in usually and daily.

The question is: "Couldn't there exist non-crepuscular mystical experiences, but of supra-consciousness?" If we understand by crepuscular what happens in the levels of deep sleep and what happens to some extent in the levels of semi-sleep and, on the other hand, we consider as supra-conscious that which is above the level of ordinary vigil, then we start to understand each other a little. Perhaps in some mystical experiences, these hypothetical levels of supra-consciousness are barely touched upon. But what we are certain of is that in many ritual operations of many religions or pseudo-religions, the infra-consciousness bottom or crepuscular state is indeed touched. If someone among you has been to a macumba or to some type of ritual accompanied by music and motivated by lights, incense and whatever, and has seen the officiants in action, he will have verified how much they "worry" about not rationalizing their acts, about letting themselves loose, of relaxing themselves, of losing the vigilic consciousness.

In such a way, thanks to certain rhythms, certain repetitions, through certain emotional tensions (but, above all, because of the reduction of the field of consciousness), the subject is overcome. "Overcome" whether it is a macumba, or a seance session, possessed directly by a "spirit" which comes to incorporate itself in his body.

In that type of mental state many odd things happen, not only by the hysteric-epileptic external symptoms which are manifested (tumbings, screaming and all that), but because on occasions these subjects unfurl a certain very uncommon potentiality. There are those who, for example, can speak in languages foreign to them, and this is very flashy. There are others who seem to perceive the thoughts of those who are present. And, similarly, phenomena which fit into the field of that which our scientific psychologists today call "parapsychology". A new label for something that is very old!

Well, let us suppose that this happens. If this is so, gentlemen, something happens, something very serious. What happens is that a quantity of potentialities are being developed which, for us, normal people in a state of vigil, are very remote. We have no way of putting our hands on them. If we get into that type of ritual, (we get into it through drugs, or we get into it through some religion) we shall perhaps encounter those evidences. My friends, one may

obtain proofs of other realities that one does not have in conscious thinking. But of course all of this is very flashy. But it is not our line of work. Apart from not being our line of work, we would not consider those phenomena (no matter how brilliant they may be) as supra-conscious phenomena. There consciousness is totally annulled. We could speak of phenomena of infra-consciousness of very curious manifestations which endow man with such power that one does not think of the descending line, but of the other one. In front of such aptitudes we believe ourselves to be in the presence of a sort of superman.

Nevertheless, there are phenomena which we could call mystical and which are produced not in the line of the loss of consciousness, not in the line of the crepuscular. If you read some mystics, you will discover in them an enormous comprehension of reality. In them there is a great work, a great kindness, a great amplification of the consciousness. We are not in the presence of the state of the macumbero... (LAUGHTER).

Now then, there may exist states which elevate our consciousness, which amplify our consciousness, which allows us a greater range of knowledge about external reality and internal reality

When we read Mr. Buddha, we cannot see in him the minimization of the consciousness. On the contrary, it seems that we find ourselves confronted with an enormous and complex computer or something like it... In such a way that there we are in the presence of another phenomenon. Sometimes to us, common people who occasionally deal with these things, perhaps because of our desire to quickly obtain results, it is very probable (almost sure) that we should direct ourselves in the easiest direction, in the direction of the fall, in the infra-conscious direction, in the crepuscular direction and in no case in the other direction. That is the reason why, although it is schematic, we allow ourselves to throw our darts against all that sounds like religion and mysticism. I hope that this answer may have satisfied the question.

QUESTION: "Which are the differences between reverie nucleus?"

There is a dynamic difference, basically. Let us say in general that the reverie is mobile and that the nucleus is fixed. In principle. We know that in time the nucleus also goes on moving. The reverie manifests itself as a response to any stimulus of perception.

Example: I am riding a bus and then a car passes by it. That stimulus is received, rapidly it is interpreted, activated, codified, and internally it arouses a series of associations. These associations have been classified as: associations by similitude, by contiguity and by contrast. This is arguable, but let us keep it this way. Then, by similitude: If they tell me house, I think mouse.

By contiguity: if they tell me spoon, I think fork. If they tell me door, I think window. By contrast: if they tell me white, black; tall, small; fat, thin. Well then, the car that passes by me while I am riding the bus, "gets into" my consciousness as a stimulus. With that stimulus I do my internal elaboration and a response is produced and I do not necessarily manifest that response but an internal response to that stimulus is produced. A response which has gone in the chain of contiguity, of the similitude, or of the contrast. A subjective chain is let loose. Then, I forget all that surrounds me: the car went by, the chain was let loose, and I start to fantasize, to daydream. A quantity of mechanisms are unleashed.

These mechanisms may have sequences that may be followed very well, or there can be another type of phenomena such as those revealed in the tests of free association. For example, in Jung's test, stimulus-words are given and responses are gathered. Many of them correspond more or less to the level of the stimulus-words, but others have nothing to do with it. In such a way there are responses which move within a more or less ordered sequence of the three forms of association. And there are others which, apparently, have nothing to do with it, but which (as our psychologists have discovered) have more profound motivations.

All the responses given to the stimulus have to do with the previous recordings, with the memory. You know that perceptions are recorded in very different ways. One records, not only through different perceptual channels, but also one records with different intensity: according to mechanisms of repetition, according to the mechanisms of reminiscence, according to whether one acts upon one sense or one acts upon all the senses simultaneously. One records with very different intensity and very different form. And besides, not only does one record a given perception, but many others that may be going around it. In such a way that sometimes, not only does one record one thing, but one records a whole climate.



Who among you don't recognize, for example going through an attic and because of a smell you perceive, a climate of youth, of a long time ago? Sometimes those small details arouse not only associations in the same line, but the whole structure of situation.

In that way the reveries, in principle, surge as responses to the stimuli which have mobilized a quantity of associative chains. But we say of these responses (which somehow are in the memory) that they have been recorded in different ways, and then some stimuli touch not only the chains, but touch entire constellations, entire structures of situation.

The stimuli that are launched in a deficient situation, in a situation of difficulty, are responded to in a structural way which is very different from the simple, occasional stimulus. In one word: if I am very hungry and very thirsty and they pass a good dish and a good glass in front of me, surely the internal response that I am going to produce is not going to be that of a simple associative chain, but a whole structural response which will answer my personal deficiencies, the deficiency of that moment.

From the point of View that we are studying, the reveries, apart from being simple responses to stimuli of situation, apart from that, usually are structured responses of compensation for the deficiencies suffered in that moment.

If we interpret the reveries as responses of compensation for the deficiencies, we shall understand each other better. Whether these responses appear compensating or as a simple association, all the fantasizing is there and there it works in front of us. And it goes on modifying, as the impressions we receive go on modifying,

But there is a certain psychic background which does not modify itself at the same speed at which the reverie displaces itself. At times, that background surges as a fixed image (almost obsessive it could be said) and is maintained throughout time. There are those who elaborate sorts of internal archetypes which are maintained throughout the years, which surge in deep dreams, which surge in daily life. But this is not the frequent case, what is frequent is a mental "tone", a certain mental background.

If you were able to perceive the mental background or tone that is always working as a back screen in the consciousness, you would notice, approximately, What the nucleus of reverie is. So don't try

to characterize that nucleus as one more image, like the other images which, displacing themselves, have gone on presenting themselves to you. We somewhat have Bohr's atomic scheme: here is the proton and here are the electrons. The electrons gravitate around and the proton is still. The nucleus of reverie would be the proton and the reveries would displace themselves. This figure is good in principle, only that in the case of the proton we have 99% of the mass of the whole atom and in this case we do not have something as solid or manifested, but more like a background, a climate.

If you investigate in depth the vocation or the general tendency and you see how all of your life is oriented to accomplish that vocation, that tendency, with that project, with that image and you feel that tendency with strength, you will be able to comprehend (in a roundabout way) what thing that nucleus of reverie is.

Now then, this nucleus which seems to be a bad person pulls us and carries us everywhere. It is, nevertheless, one of the great aids which the consciousness has to maintain its structure. Thanks to a certain fixedness which exists in the background of consciousness, the human being can maintain himself in a line, maintain himself in a direction. Thanks to the reverie nucleus of, not only the individuals, but also people and entire nations pursue ideals, pursue a form that they never reach, but which nevertheless motivates them and enables things to continue progressing.

The reverie nucleus is What gives direction to the life of individuals and of nations. But, this thing of speaking of a "collective reverie" sounds a little strange, so let us leave it aside. We, in order to answer this question quickly, explain the reverie as the simple response to the stimulus which presents itself to us; a response which surges in the form of an image, so to speak.

We explain the nucleus as a background which has a certain permanence, which lasts quite some time.

A closer thing is this: observe that, when in a person the same attitude is maintained for a long time, his activity is directed, and that person will perhaps be productive. But when in that subject a rupture is produced and he orients himself in another direction, all his activities cease, become disarticulated. I return to this matter because, many think that in the internal work, it would simply be a matter of destroying that nucleus and remaining in the void.

Possibly, if they could manage to destroy that nucleus, they would be left in the void, but in a scarcely positive way.

This nucleus has its duration, its cycle, to give an analogy. This nucleus, with the run of time, wears out. And when it finishes wearing out, another one comes, piously, to fill the consciousness which cannot be left empty and to orient our activities in another direction.

Yesterday we were saying that the different stages through which man passes: the transition from childhood to youth, to maturity, etc., are accompanied by psychosomatic transformation. There is a different corporal work and also a different mental work. The kid will no longer want to play cowboys and indians... he already wants to go to parties. Later, with the passage of time and when other psychophysical modifications are produced his interests also vary. But these interests vary not only because of the education he goes on receiving, but they also vary because of his internal transformation. It is as if, for each age, existed a characteristic nucleus of reverie which afterwards went transforming itself into another one. Of course in each child in particular there are modifications of this nucleus, but it is as if there existed a background proper to that age. Sometimes in a very short time an extraordinary transformation of personality is produced. And on the other hand, there are subjects who, in spite of the passage of time, remain as fixed in a stage of their life as if crystallized there. Then they are forty or fifty years old and have an infantile character, as if their nucleus had remained fixed in an earlier stage.

At times contrary to the evolution of the reverie or contrary to the crystallization of the reverie is produced. Real regressions are produced. Our psychoanalysts have spoken of the fixation and of the regression of the libido. Very well, this approximates it perfectly. Dissociations of personality, regressions to infantile stages and even autism are then produced.

Without changes of nucleus there would be no changes of personality. If we could modify the nucleus, we would concomitantly change the personality. And this is the curious thing.

If we meet a friend we have not seen for a long time and he has not worn out his reverie, we say to him: "But you haven't changed! You're still into the same thing! You still think the same way!". If we meet that same friend a year later and we tell him: "But how much you've changed!", it is because we observe a profound change in him. Of course, it depends on what moment of the cycling of his nucleus of

reverie we find him. And the reverie wears out, it goes on modifying. If it remains fixed it does not vary. If it regresses, it changes, but in another manner. We cannot now dwell on studying how those nuclei are produced and their localization.

QUESTION: "Does the crepuscular correspond to the unconscious?"

Of what unconscious are we speaking? Of the one discovered the day before yesterday, or of the unconscious which has been studied very much, since long ago, by the Hindus, among others?

As you perfectly well know the unconscious was not discovered by Psychoanalysis

We are not speaking of a personal nor of a collective unconscious, with a preconscious barrier, with an ego, with a super-ego, with a mechanistic dialectic appropriate to the steam engine. Where the super-ego, which is morality, is opposed to the identity, which represents the instinctive forces. We do not adhere to that type of statement. We speak of the crepuscular, and, in effect, we recognize it as related to the unconscious in an ample sense, outside of the Austrian scheme of the past century and far away from the literary influences of Sophocles and of the recent European neo-Hellenism.

QUESTION: "It has been said that instead of solving problems we must go deeper into the problems themselves. Is this the same statement made by Krishnamurti?"

Yes, and it is a statement similar to that of many reasonable people, who notice this Tower of Babel in which we find ourselves dwelling. Let us see this thing of the problems and that which refers to the answer to the problems.

A asks B, B answers things that A did not ask him. A does not take into account the answer and throws out another question. In conclusion, if no attention is given to the question, little may be answered. There are many logicians who study the problem of the questioning because if the questioning is incorrectly formulated, every answer given will also be incorrect.

After this small deviation and to answer the question, I say, yes, it is similar to the statement of Mr. Krishnamurti. And that, effectively, if the problem is not attended to carefully, the answer cannot be correct. And as we in general are success oriented people, when faced with a problem, we quickly try to solve it. And as we do not comprehend the structure of the problem, it goes on working. Then we search for palliatives, anesthetics for problems: distractions, deviations, drowsiness; anything you want, but the problem goes on working. What Mr. Krishnamurti says about attention to the problem, instead of seeking the modification and the solution to the problem, is very reasonable.

Let us get into our theme now.

Yesterday we said what was not meditation: meditation is not concentration. It was not that sort of "meditation" like divagation. It was not a prayer, it was not ritualization. Indeed, instead it was to try to attend to the facts without reverie. But since we must be practical, we have to explain some small trick to carry this forward. Perhaps the simplest thing would be to review the daily happenings, (at the end of the day if you wish), but attending especially to how one has daydreamed during the day. To see how one has been carried away by things that have nothing to do with one's own reason, but with irrational contents of fantasy, etc. One also meditates in that sort of review, when one tries to inquire into that problem which brought us suffering during the day. Investigating the root of suffering, the root of pain, and investigating the reveries of daily life, we do not obtain fantastic and immediate results. Indeed, instead, we go on amplifying our consciousness of ourselves with the following result; that on the next day, or in the following days, or later on, precisely because of knowing that later I review my daily reveries and because of knowing that later I study the origin of every conflict and of every suffering situation which I have, I start to be more alert each time. This is a trick which acts by rebound. If I tell myself: "From now on I am going to think with no reverie, from now on I am going to think with total and absolute consciousness of myself, from now on I am going to interpret the conflicts that present themselves to me and the suffering I may have at each moment..." it will happen that, within half an hour, I have forgotten myself. I have followed those who proposed those terms, verifying that they are not practical.

The good monks of yesteryear made a review in their spiritual exercises (Ignatius of Loyola gives us a system of lists to review our daily events: sins, defects, temptations. A sort of catalog where a computation is done to improve oneself day to day). Well, it interests us to review daily events... but, in another sense. Not all daily events. If you want to review all you've done in sixteen hours, it would take you approximately another sixteen. No, it is a matter of finding the moments where in reverie has become manifest and has made me deviate. And the moments of the day where internal conflict has been produced, deepening into the root of that conflict.

That simple and humble work, done without rolling up the eyes or great decorations, allows us to go on amplifying the consciousness from day to day. Because in the following days in the measure that we carry out our daily activities, we put on them much more attention

because we need them as raw material for our later review... I don't know if I have made myself Clear. (AFFIRMATIONS).

The mechanism in itself is very simple. And it is of such utility (now perhaps it is not noticed), that it can modify our field of consciousness and it may produce revolutionary transformations in oneself. But it is so bland as we know it! Who is going to think that a revolution can be produced in such a way?

Yesterday we made an outline of the different levels of consciousness. We spoke then about the level of consciousness of self. Let us say now that, characteristically, it is achieved by means of a work of consciousness, where the reverie disappears and where you have a perfect knowledge of What is being seen. Well, it is nothing extraordinary to go from the state of ordinary thinking or ordinary vigil as We are now, to the state of consciousness of self. Try doing it yourselves.

I'm speaking, you're listening. I see you, you see me... but while all this happens, you and I, are also into other things. A little in the necktie. A little in the microphone and its wires. Or thinking about the time and what we have forgotten. That's very well: it's funny. But all of that is divagation.

You observe that that is the state of ordinary thinking process, of ordinary vigil, it is not conscious at all. Of course not. Try now (while you listen to me, and I am going to try doing it while I speak, let us all try then) doing what we're now doing but without losing consciousness of ourselves. That is: you see here the gentleman who is swiveling, and while he speaks, I attend to what he says, but without forgetting yourself. Now you're not so worried about the necktie, or if the lecturer takes out a cigarette.

Do you notice? We are not any longer in that issue. But now we are very attentive to what is being said, and also we know that we are listening. Do I make myself clear?

If I walk, I know that I am walking and while I walk, I do not think about my grandma.

This is how easy it is and without greater complications.

Well then: that and not another marvelous and thunderous thing is consciousness of self.

It is that simple, but however, not so easy to maintain.

Did you try it while we were speaking these last five minutes? Did you notice how much you and I daydreamed? A lot was daydreamed here.

We were not very attentive to what was going on and to our own consciousness during all that time. As you shall see, it is that simple, but not so easy to maintain.

Thus, consciousness of self can be progressively achieved, consolidated, with the passing of time. But, I was telling you, this system is not so practical as that of the review. It is not so practical because here in less than five minutes we have forgotten to continue to practice it.

Meditation instead helps, prepares the terrain for that state of "awareness", that state of vigil (not only over things, but of vigil over ourselves), which makes us more ductile, more flexible, more intelligent, with more amplitude of consciousness.

We have spoken of simple meditation.

Now we are going to talk about another thing which is not of so much practical utility for us, which has very little to do with us. It is a system of technicalities, but it probably may help some studious person who wants to comprehend, experimentally and by himself or herself, how his or her internal mechanisms are and how far one can reach. This explanation we are going to make is on transcendental meditation.

Transcendental meditation is a type of passive meditation, which enables me to reach the roots of thought. If, ultimately, the thought and the world about which it is thought to have the same root, this identity between the internal and the external (not in, the jesting sense of yesterday), this identity must surge into transcendental meditation. In such a way, we will encounter a type of reality different from the illusory reality which presents itself to us in the perception. A reality in which the consciousness and the things are identified, a reality of vision without partitions where in the world would be without an outside and without an inside.

Transcendental meditation becomes effective transcending the perceptions, transcending the images, transcending the memory, the enchainment of the memory, the tendency of the structure of consciousness and so on.

Transcendental meditation does not work with objects but rather with acts of consciousness. Let us come to an agreement: a microphone, an object. I have the perception of the microphone. I close my eyes: I have the remembering or the representation of the microphone. I notice now that I am thinking of that image which I have of the microphone. I observe that without the image of the microphone there would not be an act which refers to it and without the act of consciousness there would not be an object which relates with it. That structure given in my consciousness between act and object (which has been consciously studied by certain contemporary currents of thought), is the one which is going to interest us for our work.

In such a way that, even if at the beginning and as a material support, as a physical datum, I may take the microphone (this microphone or a watch or a frying pan), this simply serves me as pretext for me to work with my mental acts.

All of you must have understood that this thing of transcendental meditation does not provide an immediate service. Somebody will be interested in delving into the question because of something very special, but while the need does not surge, until this is not experienced as something important which is worthwhile, its meaning will not be understood.

It will be important for us to make descriptions in order to see experimentally, internally; to see how certain phenomena of consciousness is produced. This is not the case of saying as many people say, for example; "Well, the problem of the human being is that he becomes identified, that he becomes adhered." Anyhow, it is probably one of the problems. But from where does it surge, this thing of becoming adhered? We have to see it, experimentally and from within.

We say: "The world is illusory". But how is this possible, how does this illusory phenomenon surge? I need to understand this mechanism. Likewise there are many other cases. In each step that we will go on taking, in each step of transcendental meditation, we will try to find the mechanisms that start playing in it.

We are going to use methodically twelve steps. There could be more. It is not because the horoscope has twelve signs... (LAUGHTER). Or there could be less. We are going to designate the first step as: To learn to see.

To learn to see is to attend to the perceptions without any type of consideration about them. Simply to attend. If I attend to the microphone and I think something about the microphone, or I start to divagate about the microphone, in reality I am not learning to see. Now I am only preoccupied with the first methodical step of simply attending.

I walk and I attend to what I perceive. This is not as easy as it seems. I become distracted right away, I start making considerations right away. To learn to see the microphone, may seem to me to be: to start thinking on how the microphone is composed; to make a description of its elements, to do a study of it. None of this is to learn to see!

To learn to see is, simply, to observe with attention... period. It is precisely in the learning to see, without any type of criticism, without any type of considering, where I discovered the presence of the reveries.



If we had not paid attention to some object of daily life, we would never have been able to discover the existence of the reveries. And it is there, in the first step, in the act of simply fixing the attention on one given perception (and in the difficulty produced by fixing the attention) where I discover the reveries. I do not speak of the reveries because somebody told me so. It is because if I try to fix my attention on an object, in a short time the reveries appear. And there we have experimentally perceived them in ourselves, and not because somebody told us about them.

Very well. If this is so, I have already discovered something in the directed attention. Surely, in every other type of attention the reveries always surge.

In the second step I am going to try to: See in all things the senses.

In everything which is perceived, there is the sensation, plus the thing. Therefore, if I do perceive the thing and I become identified with it, I notice that my senses filter it and modify it. We must know that this natural fusion between thing (object) and sense provokes already the first false impressions of the world. Here I discover the mechanism of identification.

Let us see the microphones. If somebody asks me for the microphones, I answer him that the microphones are there. The perception is as though in the middle, and the consciousness reflects the microphones which are still outside. There seems then to be an external object, a system of filters and of collation, and in the back; a sort of screen. Perhaps, it is not so. But this I can say thus (improvising), is not in reality how I experience the thing. If someone asks me, I say that the microphones are there. But in the perception that I have of the world the idea that the senses exist, that the consciousness exists, disappears and I only experience the things, but I am con-fused with them.

We are not speaking of the "being-in-the-world". We are speaking of how I experience things in daily life.

This false fusion between consciousness and thing makes me depend on things as they present themselves to me. If these things (because of the repetitions, because of the habits, because of the proximity) have been incorporated in me in a strong way and these things fail, I fail.

If I become identified with an object, which may be a person... if I become deeply identified with an object, and that object dies, an enormous void is produced in me. And What has that object to do with me? Surely, it must have something to do, because When a failure is produced there, I feel the dart here.

In such a way that, in this matter of seeing in things, the senses (but separating both terms), I am able to establish differences, as opposed to daily experience in which I see both terms as fused. In this separation that I do between "that which provokes in me the sensation" and "I who perceive the sensation" (in this separation and in this difficult operation) I discover the basic mechanism of identification.

In the third step I am going to try to see already in the senses, the consciousness. I am going to try to see the senses in the consciousness. I am not going to try to see in every perception, the action of the consciousness.

We are not speaking of the theory of the sensualists where the consciousness is nothing more than the sum of external sensations. No, we are speaking of another thing, we are trying to see behind each perception, the action of a structure which permits the perceptions to become organized. I am going to try to see an ambit which is, precisely, that of the consciousness.

See in the senses, the consciousness. Every perception has a structure which is not in the senses but in the consciousness.

Let us agree on questions of terms, to begin with.

You distinguish what is sensation, perception, apercception, all of this... Let us say, very elementary, that sensation is the isolated data I have through a sensory track. The eye, or the ear, for example. A vibratory rate of color and form, or of sound. But it happens that, this isolated sensation never exists in isolation. It exists in structure. In reality, there exist perceptions and not sensations. I could speak of the particular sensations of each sense, but even there, structured perceptions exist, even in each sense. In such a way that the sensation is a sort of atomic element, divided for its greater comprehension, but which does not exist in reality. Well, already apercception would be something very different. It would be the consciousness that I have of the perception... Which is not consciousness of self. It is simply, to listen to a ring and to be conscious of that ringing, but not in consciousness of self. The apercception is consciousness of the perception.

Then: sensation, perception and apercception.

The microphone is for me a microphone, because all of the sensation and the perception that I have of it become organized in my consciousness. There exist some pathologic cases where the perceptions are confused by the internal structure.

There is a book out there by William Faulkner in which he speaks about certain strange fellows. In it the speaker asks: "Haven't you smelled a golf-ball pass by here?". There (although the perception

and the organs of perceptions, which are correctly placed and without distortions) the data is interpreted, classified and ordered in a structure which does not correspond to the norm. That type of patient is known as disintegrated eidetic. Even in normal people, these phenomena of illusory type (which also correspond to errors in the interpretation of the perception) happen.

Well, the matter is then that in front of this microphone which I have here, it is such for me, because all the data of perception are structured in my consciousness. In no way am I going to allow myself to say that the microphone is exactly as I perceive it. For example, what would a physicist say when speaking of the atomic speeds, of the molecular structure and of the greater part of space which is empty within the solid body which we perceive in such a full and immobile way.

We talk of that perception which we are used to. Very well then, the microphone presents itself to me with such characteristics. But, does this perception depends on the perceptual organ only or does it depend on the structure of the consciousness? You will tell me: at the beginning, the first perceptions and sensations go on organizing themselves in the child, and all of this continually structures itself: But am asking at this moment, if it is that the consciousness, besides receiving the impact of the external object, is inactive. Or is it that the consciousness itself structures the external data in a very active way? Because if so, this has great importance.

In the case of LSD, for example, it is not that the object has changed externally, nor that the "doors of Perception have been opened" Huxley would say citing Blake. Wouldn't it that the structure of the consciousness is modified and that this consciousness which has modified its Structure, permits it to notice in the sensorial data, things which before it did not notice? And inversely, it blocks out things that it noticed before? Or rather, it points out or displaces some phenomena which in any case, arrive inverted?

This thing of recognizing at the back of every perception the action of the consciousness is of vital importance for our study. Because, depending on how this consciousness is structured, thus will also be the perception that one has of the world.

In such a way that, to a consciousness in deep sleep, corresponds an image of the world very different from that of a consciousness of self. And if the possibility of a new level of consciousness could exist, surely that new level of consciousness would perceive things which also arrive through all of our senses and through the senses of those asleep, but which none of us organizes or discovers.

Reality will appear different to me if I vary the structure of the consciousness.

Let us not go far. You distinguish between illusion and hallucination. You know that this often happens in the mountains, through phenomena of anoxia and of weariness. I have an acquaintance who wanted to wait for a streetcar at the top of Aconcagua mountain and he was convinced that the streetcar would pass by there, because he "saw" it coming up. That is a case of serious hallucinations which happens to many people at seven thousand meters of altitude. I do not believe that his mechanism of perception has varied, nor do I believe that the rocks have varied. Something must have happened in his consciousness, basically in his brain.

Then, if we set ourselves in the presence of illusory and hallucinatory phenomena, we realize that the problem is not so much in the perception, but in the structuring of the consciousness. This fact is the one which approximates what interests us. This step is the one which makes us discover how the illusions may be generated. In the previous steps, we have discovered other presences, other mechanisms, which we could have developed laterally, but which we have simply noted. Now we discover the mechanism of the illusions. And there we leave it and we do not criticize anything, we say nothing in favor or against it, neither do we develop it. We limit ourselves to contemplate it, to notice how, and at what level of work, the mechanism of the illusions surges.

We take one step further inside and we say: fourth step, to see in the consciousness, the memory.

It is observed that in every perception are the senses. That the consciousness organized this sensory data into a structure. And finally, that the structure depends on previous data, on data of the memory.

Let us make the perception of the microphone disappear. I close my eyes... I do not perceive the microphone any longer. But I can remember the microphone, I may evoke the microphone. I have the representation of the microphone. I discover that in that image of the microphone that corresponds more or less to that of the perception, there is a different act referred to that object. In the-act of perception is the object - microphone, .but the act of perception is different from the act of representation. The object appears more or less in the same way to me, but I recognize that they are very different acts. In no way could I confuse the object I represent to myself with the object that I perceive, unless I am dreaming while awake. I notice that difference and I notice the difference in the acts which are referred to the same object. Thanks

to the previous acts of perception and of the representation based on the memory, I can recognize the new perceptions. In all recognition, therefore, are perception and representation. Even the perception of entities that are totally new for the consciousness are apprehended in relation to representations of similar environments.

I discover that the activities of the consciousness: relating and comparative, in general, have to do with previous recordings.

If it is true that the memory works with the raw materials (so to speak) of previous perceptions, the acts of relating, comparing, etc. are not derived from that raw material, but are related to it in an inseparable way. I discover in general, that the mechanisms of comparison and the mechanisms of relation of the consciousness have to do with the previous recordings.

Between the inhabitants of the Malayan Archipelago, for example, and, an Occidental, of the center of Europe, both contemporaries, there is a great difference in their ways of relating things, and there are differences in their form of perceiving the World. Those different mental forms depend on the data of perception assimilated by one or the other, and on the interpretation forged in the mind of one or the other because of the type of culture, of education received. Even though the structure of the consciousness may be similar in one and in the other, the relations that they each establish are different, thanks to the data received and to the processing of that data done by their cultural systems

You observe that there is a different logic in the aboriginal and in the Occidental man, also between the Occidental man and a Hindu. A formal logic, a dialectic logic, a phenomenological logic, is not the same as a Hindu Nyaya logic (that moves through connections of sorites), nor the same as an analogic logic, proper to Polynesian people.

Possibly, for a Polynesian, the relations among objects are given above all by the similitude of the forms, according to the associative chains we had studied at the beginning. He can very well establish relationships of this type, of similitude according to the data and the beliefs which are deposited in his memory. According to the type of mental structuring that has been made with them, surges a whole system of relations and a logic that is very peculiar. And we have also a logic and a habitual system of relations; a product of our education and of our recordings.

Observe that the mechanisms of memory are the ones that allow us, ultimately, to compare and relate. And that if we extracted all of those raw materials we would not be able to establish relations of

any type. Whether we like it or not (and here is the interesting fact), we discover that comprehension depends on the memory. In such a way that little comprehension can take place with few data, without data there can't be comprehension. Even if the structure of the consciousness in itself allows for relations, without data, what may be related? Relations cannot be made in the void! We have stated before, that there exists a mutual impletion between the act and the object of the consciousness. And if there exist acts proper to the consciousness, such as the acts of relating and there do not exist objects, the impletion cannot take place. In this way, thanks to the memory, I may comprehend. Of course, there will be more intelligence (so to speak), more comprehension, if the possibility of relations among data is greater. On the contrary, it may happen that I have a quantity of data stored and that I have no capacity of relating.

To the same quantity of data, but with a greater capacity of relating, the matter becomes more intelligible and the operations have more intelligence in them. But basically, without data and without recordings in memory there is no comprehension or intelligence.

This is what I want to transmit to you in reference to the memory acting on and conditioning the consciousness

In the fifth step we shall try to see in the memory, the tendency. What is this thing of the tendency?

Here is already observed what we could call, in quotes: the "mental form". Not as a representation, no. Here the mental form is observed, not as a representation, but as every act of consciousness that tends to bind itself to an object. It is observed that if we try to dispense with the representation, to attend to pure acts, new objects appear to bind themselves to those acts. And representations which complete acts are organized, where the continuous work of the memory is observed, since the memory tends to actualize itself and tends to cover the vacuum produced in the consciousness.

I discover ultimately, what was discovered already by Brentano: the mechanism of intentionality. Also I discover in the consciousness, the process through which the memory tends to manifest itself covering any act of consciousness.

I have the microphone, I close my eyes, I have the representation of the microphone; now I observe no longer the internal image of the microphone but the act which refers to the representation. That act has now converted itself into an object of consciousness; Notice how funny it is! It happens now that the object is not the represented microphone but now the object is what in the previous step was the

act. And why do I say that this is the object? I say it is an object because there is a new act of consciousness which refers to it. Every act which refers to something, refers to an object. In such a way that now I don't even have the image of the microphone, I have now the act of representation of the microphone which I am studying. Is it clear?

I discover the mechanism of intentionality which makes every act of consciousness to have as a reference an object and which causes it to be such that as soon as an object disappears from the consciousness, immediately another one has to appear so as to be covered by that intentionality of my acts.

The sixth step I express as: to see in the tendency, the enchainment, and I say that even in the case of managing to dispense with all representation, I notice the tendency of the consciousness to be completed in acts. I notice this in an effort to eliminate all representation, as those persons addicted to the mental void, or to the blank mind... There are people who do these things!...

(LAUGHTER)... They worry for the mind to have "nothing". And what happens? New "thing's" always show up.

But let us suppose that through a very special effort, I managed to prevent in my consciousness the "entrance" of any type of content; I would be making an effort, More so, I would have the notion of the instant in which I am working. I say: "now I am going to try for no content of consciousness to enter". Now, one content entered, in such a way that I am worrying and have expectations for it not to come in and take care that no object of consciousness enters.

In all these types of work, I am observing acts of consciousness which present me with evidence of an enchainment, of a tendency in the consciousness to be completed by acts. In such a way that, even in the case of the empty consciousness, in the case of the non-mind, even in that case, there exist expectations which tend to fill the consciousness. And it could be in no other way, because the consciousness is a structure. This structure of the consciousness is, in principle, inevitable. It is the one that enables me to think. The consciousness has a structure and I cannot evade that structure. The structure of the consciousness ensures that even if I try to obtain the void of mental content, there exist protensions and retentions, there exist the instants of time, there exists an ordering. All of that exists in the consciousness and I notice it.

Summing up: the mental resistances, those efforts (those practices I do in order to stop all acts of consciousness from manifesting themselves and of all objects of consciousness from being manifested), all those difficulties, I observe, denouncing tendencies

to which the consciousness is chained to and without which it does not seem to possess an organized structure, nor does it seem to be able to act.

This fact has its consequences because it is found at the root of the mental form. This enchainment is that which prevents one from surpassing the structure of one's consciousness and it ties us to a determined form. I discover in this way the mechanism of determinism of the consciousness.

Whenever I speak or it is spoken of freedom of the consciousness, it is good to attend very carefully to see where we discover this freedom, because up to now, whether we like it or not, all that we have found has been the mechanism of determinism of the consciousness. And with this, we end for today. I hope that you have enjoyed yourselves.



### THIRD CONFERENCE

I have a good number of questions here, many of them far from the theme we are dealing with. Anyhow, we shall try to give answers to tonight's "Dear Abby"... (LAUGHTER).

QUESTION: "What sensations of time and space can be experienced with transcendental meditation?"

I think that the best way of understanding this and of achieving such sensations, if interested, is that of starting to experience with transcendental meditation. Given that this type of meditation does not serve so much for transmitting experiences as for achieving them by oneself. It is strictly experimental. In such a way that all that I can say to you is worthless if you yourselves don't experience it.

QUESTION: "To see in all things, the senses: does this mean to take as attentional point of support the sense that perceives the object and, simultaneously, the object perceived?"

As I understand it, no. I understand that that is attentional division. If in this moment I observe the microphone and at the same time that I observe the microphone I take as reference point the sense that observes, I am bifurcating the attention. On this there are many discussions. It is thought that the attention cannot be divided.

I shall give an easier example. Let us suppose that I see the microphone and now I have the sensation of my left hand. I can feel this sensation and I can see the microphone. According to some, such attentional division is not real, but the speed with which I shift my attention from one to the other is so enormous that it gives me the impression that I have my attentional focus divided, when in reality I do not have it divided but instead I oscillate. Well, anyway, faced with his question: to take as the attentional point of support the sense that perceives and the object simultaneously, would be attentional division. In that step it dealt with seeing in all things, the senses. It was not dealing with dividing the attention, nor of utilizing attentional points of support, but of comprehending that, in all perception that one has of an object, the senses are working as filters or working as intermediaries. So it is, that it isn't exactly the practice of attentional division, but the work of meditation and comprehension about senses that place themselves as intermediaries between the objects and my consciousness. That is the idea.

QUESTION: "Is the position of Psychoanalysis in contradiction with the work on self-consciousness? Can Psychotherapy help in any sense to place oneself in daily reality?"

Two questions. From my point of view Psychoanalysis does not contradict the work of self-consciousness, because I do not believe that this matter is in the ambit of the statement proper to Psychoanalysis. It is as if we were working with different ambits. With regard to Psychotherapy helping in some sense to place oneself in daily reality, I think, yes. Now, it depends on what we understand as daily reality. If it deals with adapting the patient to a certain type of social structure, there might be a certain type of psychoanalysis whose manifested or larvated objective is that of adapting to the system. But there can also be another type of Psychoanalysis that, besides resolving some conflicts also tries to locate the patient in front of the real contradictions suffered by the system. Because it is not the case of making him also believe (he who lives in an alienated situation) that his alienation remains in his own consciousness, but perhaps it deals simultaneously with clarifying him in his internal conflicts, and making him see and comprehend that he also suffers the objective reality of the contradiction that is manifested in the world that surrounds him. I don't know if I explain myself. In such a way that, I believe there is "Psychoanalysis" and Psychoanalysis.

QUESTION: "What relationship can exist between transcendental meditation, or rather, the steps of the transcendental meditation and the formation of the bodies?"

Of the bodies... I do not understand well. Maybe he who is asking is referring to certain theories that circulate out there which state that there exist bodies (apart from the natural physical one), that there are a variety of bodies: a mental body, an etheric body and other similar things. About this I cannot answer anything. I do not know what relation there could be between transcendental meditation and that of the bodies. What I do believe is that you can work in an experimental manner with transcendental meditation and to act consistently with the results.

That is: one can go on putting in evidence one's own experiences. As far as this thing of the bodies is concerned, there are probably some "specially endowed" people who perceive them easily, but as long as we don't see them, as long we don't experience them, we shall leave this in suspense. Isn't that true?

QUESTION: "Why am I so extraordinary?" (LAUGHTER)-

In reality I do not know Why this gentleman is so extraordinary . . . (LAUGHTER).

QUESTION: "Can the persecution that weighs over the doctrine be taken as a measure of its historical truth? If it is so, and considering that the basis of our doctrine is non-violence, isn't it

contradictory that the doctrines that preach nonviolence are the most persecuted ones? And with that same criterion, Would any other doctrine have validity because of the fact of suffering the persecution and reaction of the system?"

This requires a long analysis, but in general we can say this: not necessarily does every doctrine that is persecuted (for that fact alone) demonstrate its historical validity. Not necessarily. It is enough for it not to coincide with a number of statements proper to the historical moment in which one lives; or for it not to coincide with the reveries; or with the state of reverie of a society at a given moment for it to be persecuted. In fact a doctrine is persecuted on occasions, later it penetrates into the social body, and that same society, with the passage of time, gradually accepts it. In such a way that I do not think that the fact that a doctrine suffers persecution is a criterion of validity. But it is worthwhile to take into account the fact that a doctrine that preaches non-Violence is persecuted violently. So, one should reflect more on this.

QUESTION: "What difference exists between consciousness of self and objective consciousness?"

In principle, consciousness of self is a new level of consciousness that is achieved when the reveries which cover the field of the consciousness and which end up "covering" (in quotes) the perceptions, disappear through the taking-into-account-of-himself of the subject. While objective consciousness would be a new state, a supposedly new state. A supposedly new state wherein the differences we noticed between things and the consciousness disappear. And where in accordance with this new state, all thinking process would go to the profound root of things, transcending the appearances that things in themselves have. That would be the difference between consciousness of self and objective consciousness. But this of objective consciousness, as I tell you, is not so easy to experience as consciousness of self. In such a way that we put it between parentheses and leave it aside simply as a possibility.

Here there is a girl, a student of geology, and she's worried about the destiny of the planet!

QUESTION: "I have read many books about the processes that are taking place on Earth and about their final breaking-loose, and I feel so impotent that at least I want to arrive at comprehending them and studying them."

If you refer to simply geological happenings which is your theme, the more you study them the more you're going to understand. If you refer to non-geological happenings but human ones that can make "the ball

explode"... (LAUGHTER)... it will be a matter of waiting, isn't that true?

QUESTION: "What is the objective sound?"

If we take into account what was said a while ago about the differences between consciousness of self and a supposedly objective consciousness (in that supposedly objective consciousness) perhaps a supposedly objective sound can be noticed and so on with everything and a supposedly objective look and so on. The problem is that we do not have certainty about the confirmation of the existence of an objective consciousness. That is all that I can say. All of these things have to be experienced.

QUESTION: "What is the best way of managing yourself economically in this society of exploitation?"

In this society of exploitation, everybody is compromised by this system whether they like it or not, through the blackmail of hunger that the system itself makes. In such a way that there are no pure ones in the system. But indeed, there is a way, more or less reasonable, of attending to one's own needs without playing the game to everything that the system requires of you, on one hand. On the other hand, since the system itself blackmails with hunger, with a human orphanage in that sense, one can also liberate oneself of the bad faith that the system imposes, by making use of the system itself to carry on one's own internal revolution and the social revolution. If what is desired is the collapse of the present structures of exploitation and the internal transformation of man, this same system can also be utilized. But each one will see which is the best way of doing it. Anyway it is interesting to take into account this aspect of the system and of the money of the system and of the buying and of the blackmail, to make reference to an aspect which is very important, as I see it. And it is about the things that must not be touched by the infection of the money of the system.

To be practical and immediate, let us give an example here and now. If in this cycle in which a ticket is paid for, any portion of the money collected was touched for personal use of the lecturer we would not only be marketing a certain doctrine, but something much worse: we would be subject to, and conditioned by the demands that would be imposed by each of the ones attending while giving their money. In such a way that what is collected in these conferences pays for this place: that seems alright to me. With what will be left over, the organizers will see what to do: whether they disseminate materials or whatever it may be. But if only one penny were accepted for personal use, we would be conditioned to your good or bad will. In time, we will tend to search for a public with better economic possibilities,

in such a way that the money would tend to impose itself over us and we would, tend to adapt our point of view in accordance with the demands of our public. We would enter directly into the game of the system. While in this way, We can give ourselves the luxury and the pleasure of saying whatever we please and whatever our doctrine proposes to us as true. In this way neither do I owe you and neither do you owe me.

I believe that all teaching or all doctrines or any point of view which exists and does not acknowledge this important problem of the material aspect, easily falls into the conditioning of the system. When a doctrine must be paid for in order to be received, I think that it has to be investigated in its background very well and it has to be realized that in it there exists conditioning.

QUESTION: "What is the doctrine's opinion with respect to sex?"

It has innumerable opinions. What is important is not what the doctrine's opinion is, but what's your opinion. Because, let us see: how do you want to formulate the question? Without a doubt you have some issue with it, if not you wouldn't ask this question. If you formulate your question correctly, perhaps the answer could be in a book on physiology. Leaving aside all irony I tell you that there is a very important energy in sex, maybe the most important one in the human being. Neither does it deal with asphyxiating this energy, nor of dilapidating it. In principle it would deal with channeling it. But how does one do such a thing? One, without any type of excess and with complete spontaneity and freedom should let sex work as it works normally while one investigates the problem that sex, can present to us. This is all I can tell you with respect to this.

QUESTION: "How can the daily alienating work be converted into creative work?"

Do you believe that the paperwork that you do in an office in front of a neurotic boss, a work that in itself is irrational, no matter how much effort you exert, can be converted into creative work? This kind of present society is contradictory and exploitative; work in itself is not liberating. What matters is how you can liberate yourself while you work, which is a different thing. It may be said that artistic work is a liberating work, or that other forms of work are liberating. In reality, it isn't so much through the kind of work that you do, but how you go about working which is going to produce liberation. Unless we are in a situation of needing work therapy, but that is another thing... (LAUGHTER).

If everyday work is understood (almost as in the case of the tenth question) as a possibility of utilizing the system to carry on your own personal revolution and the revolution in all ambits, then that

work that you realize may be converted into liberating work. And in some sense, into creative work.

QUESTION: "May political militancy better society and man?"

I do not believe that any party, nor any movement over the planet, can realize man's liberation nor the liberation of the society. Man has travelled a long way throughout history and always every society has been replaced by another one, and always one alienation has been replaced by another. It is true that in the spiral process of the growth of man (of the advance of the science, of culture, of the civilization) he has also ascended somewhat in the level of consciousness, but as long as it is not taken into account that any type of transformation must be simultaneous and without procrastinating; as long as that does not happen, no type of partial revolution will achieve the total transformation of man and of the social structures.

What do I mean by "procrastinating" statements? That those who announce to us the social change by talking about infra-structures that later, through this change, modify the mental super-structures in man (as if man were a reflection and nothing but a reflection of a social environment); those who announce to us a change in man by immediately modifying the social structure, postpone us. And those who, on the contrary, believe that we have first to modify man, so as to modify the social structures later also postpone us.

It is very hard for us, our mental forms educated in this type of society, in this type of culture, to think in simultaneity. We are still causalist, Aristotelian: "first this, then the other, and later what follows".

We have a mental order that we also try to apply to our everyday life. The idea of simultaneity, the idea of concomitance of systems seems impossible to us.

Answering the question concretely: "May political militancy better society and man?", I answer: Perhaps it can better things, create improvements in the environment for a true revolution, but simple political militancy cannot produce a profound transformation. If there were a movement, a party, or any form that states things in the terms which seem to us to be as they are, obviously we would adhere to it.

QUESTION: "I wish to change and yet I have heard here. that it is. not a matter of changing. Does it deal then with accepting myself the way I am?"

It is neither a matter of accepting or not accepting oneself. It simply deals with noticing that if you feel the profound need (and not the desire) of change, it is because there is suffering in you.

You would not wish to change if you were satisfied with yourself. If there is need of change in you (instead of trying to change, trying to conform to yourself as you are), it would be more worthwhile for you to investigate in profundity the root of that suffering. That is precisely what simple and daily meditation proposes. That is the answer for you on daily meditation.

QUESTION: "How should I educate my children?"

Do you believe that you can educate your children? Doesn't it seem to you that you should start educating yourself?... I tell you this without intending any offense.

Let us see. You seem to think that you are in a condition to do it. You are part of a system. As part of a system, you cannot evidentiate your own autonomous movement. You depend on the system, on the beliefs of the system. Very well. If this system is articulated so, and institutes of education and colleges, and schools exist, and the rest exist, Why don't you use them?

There are schools, there are the universities. Provide for your children to go to school, colleges, and universities. Provide for your children to make the greatest gathering of data possible. The way we explained yesterday, the intelligence that worked with relationships, with comparisons needed by all means raw material. Raw material lodged in the memory. It needed data, conceptualizations that later, in accordance with its level of intelligence, related them in one way or another.

This relating of things may depend on you in the measure that you understand, to later transmit to your children, not "what they must think," but "how they should go about it." And, in so far as data is concerned, there is a lot in the system, and much of it is very useful. So don't worry about which little reading you're going to teach them, or about which one you're going to forbid them.

If I were in your place, I think I would send such children to the institutes of the system, so that they could be taught the greatest quantity of data that they can absorb, and simultaneously, I would encourage in their learning to correctly formulate the profound questions.

As long as this society doesn't change, think that any deviation that you would want to introduce in your children is going to provoke great reactions in them, and in one of those occasions you will probably end up creating neurotic children. What would we gain in producing a very civilized children, very humane, if they are not thriving in the adequate environment for them to germinate? You

could, on the contrary produce incapable children without wanting it. So, it is necessary for us that they gather data.

About some ideas that circulate on education, somewhat in the style of Rousseau's "L'Emile", or about the state of nature in education and things of that style, they do not seem adequate in this epoch of cyclotrons.

QUESTION: "I have detected a very strong reverie in myself about travelling. I want to travel."

Perfectly. Travel then. Or does that bring you problems? If you want to travel and that brings you problems, study why the fact of travelling brings you problems.

QUESTION: "My fundamental problem is of a religious type. About immortality and the existence of God."

Can you imagine how bored you would be if you were immortal? Doesn't it seem to you that with this conditioned mind that you and we have, does it seem to you that some type of permanence after death would be possible if we maintained ourselves in such a state? If Hell exists, that is Hell.

We don't say anything about ultra-worldly existence, but, yes, we say it is a possibility. Why not? And it is a possibility that can be explored and that is worthwhile to study. But it gives us the impression that if, be it whatever it is and if such transcendence exists, it might not be the simple continuity of our present mental structure.

As to the existence or non-existence of god, I am sorry, but there is nothing I can say to you. What good would it be if I tell you: "Yes, god exists!", or if I denied it? Of what good would it be to you?

QUESTION: "Could you develop the explanation about the concept of failure?"

Let us see what has been said with respect to the reveries and the illusions in general.

When my reverie nucleus is so powerful that it appears to me as an image in the future (something that I want to apprehend, something that I want to seize) towards which I direct myself throughout the years, through the passing of the years, for a long time; it is very difficult for somebody to provoke deviations in me, given the tendency in which I am, launched. While I am deluded in that way, While I believe that therein is the solution to all my conflicts, to all my problems, a doctrine such as the one we are exposing could not produce any dents in such an elephantine carcass. What could we do with a person who has the certainty that in some time he is going to obtain some millions of dollars?. What effect could be produced in that person by someone who would stand by him to tell him: "Hey! Why



don't you study your problems?" Do you realize that for somebody who is deluded in that sense, with a line that has nothing to do with the line that we propose, it is possible to reach him?

The concept of failure has to do with this.

Only when somebody discovers that his objectives are not accomplished, when they are no longer going to be fulfilled when he effectively feels internal emptiness...the non-accomplishment of his anxieties and of his desires, only then it is possible to speak to him in other terms.

I am not speaking of resentment. He who gets resentful, or he who is in a state of vengeance with something, he is still attached to something. Observe what happens to you whenever you hate somebody. When you hate somebody you are dependent on the hated object, you are illusioned with that object. As long as you don't leave aside the object that you hate, you are not free from it. Paradoxical situations: the more you hate, the more you depend on that hatred. Somebody taught a long time ago (perhaps for technical reasons rather than moral ones) that hate was mule-headedness... (LAUGHTER). It is better to forgive than to remain tied to vengeance, isn't that true?.

In this sense and seeing it now, it doesn't matter if positively or negatively, in the measure that somebody does not experience in himself the sensation of failure - that is to say: provoke in himself the deviation of the reverie - evolution is impossible for him within the statements that we make.

"Blessed are the poor in spirit," isn't that true? Blessed are those who carry failure in their hearts With no resentment and with no vengeance, because they may evolve.

QUESTION: "How can I distinguish personal hypnosis and hypnosis produced in me by the system, from lucidity?"

Could it mean that he recognizes two types of hypnosis: the internal hypnosis proper to the reveries, for example and the hypnosis already manifested, from the outside, that the system produces in me thanks to tricks such as propaganda, false expectations, etc.

"How can I distinguish the state of hypnosis from the state of lucidity?" Let us see an example: if we go to the cinema and we propose to ourselves while watching the film, not to forget ourselves at the same time that we interest ourselves in the movie (it must be a film that hooks us and that has an impact so that the test works out) we can work around the theme of hypnosis. If I go to watch a film that I do not care about, it is most probable that I will remember myself the entire time...(LAUGHTER).

In that situation and above all in the moments that I am possessed by the film, I discover that I have lost the consciousness of myself. If in another moment, anger, for example is produced in me, and the object I am angry with becomes so important for me that synthesizes an entire situation and the other disappears (and I disappear to myself), there is also hypnosis of the object. In either case I believe in the object and I lose the consciousness of myself. If some of you want to experience more profoundly, visit a hypnotist and ask him to exercise his powers on you. Follow him step by step, do everything this hypnotist recommends to you but do not forget yourselves and you shall see that there isn't one hypnotist in the whole world capable of putting you in a trance. This state of consciousness of self is precisely the opposite of the state of hypnosis.

No matter how many posters of Coca Cola you may see in front of you, and no matter how many undulating girls talk about the "crazy little bubble", if you maintain consciousness of self, you may observe this system of propaganda with very much attention (you may be immersed up to your necks in the system, you may participate in everyday life like everyone else and even more than everyone else), but it will be hard for the system to hypnotize you. Am I making myself clear? Well. We shall leave all of these questions aside and go on into our theme. Yesterday we distinguished between simple meditation and transcendental meditation and we described some of the characteristics of each. We explained that transcendental meditation, unlike the former was of no use except for specialists. Anyhow, we got into our theme explaining that it worked with acts of consciousness, instead of with objects. Later we explained the first six steps, and, summing up, we said this:

First: To learn to see, or attention to the perception. There, in spite of the attention I paid to the object that appeared to me, I saw that this attention fluctuated and that the reveries flourished. There I discovered the surging of the reveries.

Second: To see in all things, the senses. To distinguish between perception and the thing perceived. And to notice that such a distinction does not appear daily, but, on the contrary, both appear fused in one same act-object. There I discovered the surging of identification.

Third: To see in the senses, the consciousness. I verified that the structure of the perception is not in the senses but in the

consciousness, and I inferred that in accordance with how the consciousness organizes itself, the image of the world presents itself. In such a way that if for any reason I vary the consciousness, I also vary the interpretation of the sensorial data. We gave examples, on the way, of what happens in front of the same object, when submitted to different phenomena which can modify the structure the consciousness. Either by drugs, tiredness or by intoxication, it is not the perception that varies but it is the structure of the consciousness. This, on these occasions, points out or attenuates, or puts in relief, or takes out of context some of the stimuli it perceives. There I discovered the surging of the illusion.

Fourth: To see in the consciousness, the memory. At the moment I noticed that the structure of the consciousness depends on previous recordings, and that comprehension depends on it. So, all types of relation and comparison depend on data which serve as raw material for the consciousness. There I discovered the surging of comprehension.

Fifth: To see in the memory, the tendency. I experienced that every representation and, in general, every object of consciousness, is related with acts. And that the retentions of the memory are actualized continually in front of any new act that the consciousness proposes to itself. All acts of consciousness work with retentions, actualizations, or protensions. That is to say, the consciousness works in remembering, actualizing or futurizing. There exist innumerable time combinations in the consciousness. There exist times of consciousness "past-future" but which I actualize simultaneously. For example, at this moment, now, I remember when I was a child what I wanted to be an engineer when I grow up. Do you observe? Combinations of this type are very frequent in the consciousness. Every act of consciousness that moves in the present instant, always goes on involving protentions and retentions. Every act of the consciousness, even when it works in futurizing, does it always by actualizing memory. The data I have for futurizing are also data recorded in the memory, and the image of the future that I can have and the projects that I feed, are based on data of the memory. If you imagine the world of the year five thousand, you imagine it with data you have recorded which you will combine in a special way. Anyhow you will produce synthesis which, of course, do not occur in the everyday life of today, the twentieth century world; but you Will

work with the data recorded in the memory. This tendency of the memory to surge, to complete acts is inevitable. And it does not depend on itself. There I discovered the mechanism of intentionality of the consciousness. Intentionality which is manifest also, above all, in the memory.

Sixth: To see in the tendency - in that tendency of intentionality - the enchainment.

I observe that, even being able to prescind the representations (in an effort to eliminate them, for example), there surge expectations, resistances etc. that put me in the presence of a sort of structural inertia. In there I discovered the deterministic mechanism of the consciousness. A structural mechanism without which the consciousness is not possible. All present or possible consciousness is such, because it has a structure. If you were to imagine a superior consciousness, you would see that, in order to be such, it should also have a structure, also tendency, and also intentionality We are not only talking of the present consciousnesses. but also of all the possible ones.

Let us continue now with our steps.

Seventh: To see in the enchainment the permanent. It is observed that notwithstanding the variation of the perceptions, of the reveries, of the identifications, of illusions, of the diverse forms of comprehension, of the different manifestations of memory, of the mobility of the consciousness with its acts and objects and with its diverse instants, notwithstanding this and all the other variations that we can think up, the permanent is always the enchainment of the consciousness. The permanent is always the inevitability of its own structure. This structural enchainment which we had already noticed, we consider it as a permanent need.

Eighth: To see the permanent in one and in all. This step provokes a strange sensation because of this sort of somersault towards the outside which is effected.

Apparently, this thing of going towards the objects is illegitimate, after the methodical development carried out up to here.

How is it that suddenly now we are going to deal with the objects, if we are entering towards ourselves? Perhaps it may be very interesting to study this from different perspectives.

It is observed that, even though the internal phenomena be diverse, they are all enchained in a structure. Returning to the level of simple perception (returning to the first steps), we see that the perception is also structured by the consciousness. Observing that the different consciousnesses indubitably obtain through these steps, the conclusion of the structurality of the consciousness (notwithstanding the diverse particular phenomena), we can infer that the intersubjective differences can be resolved in a structural way.

The differences of the particular phenomena in each consciousness do not necessarily lead to solipsism. This means to say that, even though we notice the diversity of the consciousnesses (of the diversity of each one), if each one of these consciousnesses observe the same steps that we have been following up to now, they will arrive, indubitably to the perception of the same phenomena of the permanent structure of the consciousness.

The differences that separate us: differences in the perception, in education, in the phenomena, can be torn down, and the barriers of solipsism, the insurmountable barriers that, in principle, would exist between consciousness and consciousness, collapse.

The fact of arriving to one same reduction speaks to us of the possibility of intersubjectivity. I'm not speaking of telepathy of course... (LAUGHTER)... I'm speaking of the communication that is established at the level of profound consciousness, once all of these consciousnesses achieve the structural comprehension of that sort of eidetic world: of the idea of the consciousness as a structure which, notwithstanding the variation of the particular phenomenon, is permanent insofar as structure is concerned. Things being such, this structural permanence is registered not only in all of the consciousnesses, but in all the things that exist for the consciousness: whether it deals with the internal world or with the external world.

This problem is serious. Not only was it grave for Leibniz and for others (the problem of the monads with no doors or Windows, of the consciousnesses that could not communicate among each other), but for

Husserl himself, who already in his Cartesian Meditations is left enclosed in the solipsism.

The problem is to see how not only one's internal thinking process but also the thinking process among the consciousnesses is possible. That is: how is intersubjectivity possible and, in general, how is the connection with the world possible?

Because if you perceive in one way, I perceive in another and we have different images and different visions of reality, there is no essential communication. The problem of intersubjectivity is not solved at this level, it is resolved at a structural level. In fact, even the language itself is a conjunct of signs that allow for the passage of ideas from one to another and it is intelligible thanks to the significant structures that it contains and not by the isolated signs, or by the signs considered simply as expression.

The identity is the permanent, speaking of structures, and the diversity is the variable. In diversity there can be no intersubjectivity in the full sense. Now the relationship of the consciousness with the world is initially (from my phenomenal perceptions), variable. The relationship of the consciousness with the phenomenal world is contingent, but in ultimate reduction, also, the phenomena appear enchained to structures for my consciousness. In this way, "consciousness" and "world", (when speaking of "world" I do not imagine the planet), are enchained, and are a structure, as if definitively the "consciousness" were the act of the "world" and the "world" the object of the "consciousness".

So then, intersubjectivity and the relationship with the world, can be comprehended at the level of essences, so to speak, or essential ideas. Almost in a platonic sense, do you remember?

The essential structure "consciousness-world" is permanent, even though my factual consciousness is modified and even though the factic world, the world of facts, also goes on modifying and transforming itself at each instant. The structural relationship "consciousness-world" is what is invariable. In this sense, the meaning of the following phrase is comprehended: "To see the

permanent in one and all". The idea of permanence does not oppose, however, movement. It deals with dynamic structures which, notwithstanding their mobility, conserve their structural nature. The permanence is, in this case, only structural.

Lowering the level and very rapidly, let us say that consciousness and world are identified structurally and that it is not legitimate to establish dichotomies, but to understand that it deals with one same structure. That my consciousness is not simply the reflection of objective reality on one hand and that neither (as the idealists) (do I create the world from my consciousness, but, making a transference of the idea of intentionality; "consciousness-world" are a structure and make sense at the level of structure.

If you relate this which here seems to be so dark with what we said before when answering a question (that which was made to us with reference to social and political transformations), you will see how it deals with the same thematic line. When speaking of simultaneous revolution, we absolutely do not go away from the conclusions which we reach here through this way of meditation. We become aware that the structure "consciousness-world" is the one that gives us the idea of reality and not the dichotomies to which they have us accustomed to.

Ninth: To see the permanent form in action. This structural essence, this essential structure which we have managed to reduce, is designated by us as "form". We could have given it another name. This permanent form appears even in the diversity of the phenomena, be they primarily objective or subjective. The permanent form does not depend on the phenomena, but these depend on it. Even before the existence of the phenomena, there must exist the possibility of structure for them to manifest themselves. The structural form, (in this logical sense and not mystical of course) appears behind every phenomenon, acts by its own necessity and not by the contingency of the phenomenon itself.

Tenth: To see what is not movement-form. We consider that an ambit foreign to the movement-form can be intuited, which does not surge as "the nothingness". If everything that we see behind the phenomena is this form, and if we say that there can exist an ambit in which this

form does not exist, since it is in everything in ultimate reduction, it could appear to us naively as the nothingness. Well then, this is not the nothingness but simply that which is not form. In effect, a darkening of the being can be intuited, for example, even if we do not speak of the nothingness. A concealment of the being which, however, is not necessarily nothing. In a very simple example we can comprehend that an entity may have its complement and that this complement which is not it, in some way has to do with it at its own level. The complement of A which is not A, nevertheless has to do with A.

Eleventh: To see what is and what is not, as the same. Movement-form and what is not movement-form are comprehended as what is in some way structured. The environment of this room has its complement, which is not this room, which is all that this room is not and that complements it. What not this room is not the nothingness. If it complements it, it is its complement: it completes it. But I realize that both this room and also its complement are related to each other in a major structure that comprises both of them. Then I understand that which is the room and that which is its complement of the same, are related to each other in a major structure that subsumes them or that assumes them and comprises them, identifying them as equally complementary.

Twelfth: To see in one and in all, the same. New jump with the one and the all. It is observed that the world and, therefore, the consciousness and each thing, are in the root (and independently of particular phenomena), the same.

Do you remember when in the beginning we spoke of those who said to us: "the interior is the same as the exterior?" It seems to be so, but this takes a long work of comprehension.

It is observed that the world and, therefore, the consciousness and each thing are, at the root (and independently of the particular phenomena that separate the consciousness from the things and the things among themselves), as the ultimate reduction: the same. It is as if here we say that the substance (even though this is not the conceptual level that corresponds to it) of everything in the universe: of the mind, of the atom and of the galaxies, were the same. Or that everything was constructed of the same substance, notwithstanding the diversity of the phenomena, the accidental characteristics that the phenomena have in their evolution. It is as



if We said that the world is monistic and not dualistic. It is as if we said that it deals with the same, but in ultimate reduction, because obviously everything is not the same in the phenomenal world in Which we move.

We cannot compare the microphone with a person, isn't that true?

All that has been said here cannot be experienced by simple discourse, nor can it be intuited completely with philosophical or linguistic technicalities, of course not. But in some way we have to communicate, and that is what we have been trying to do, with words.

These steps may be meditated on by doing studies, extracting lateral consequences, consequences which may have overwhelming possibilities. Because it is not a question of following the line simply, of transcendental meditation in a mechanical way, step by step, but perhaps (for those who are interested of course) taking into account the steps and exploiting the enormous possibilities that each one can have. The first simple step of "to learn to see", can be very developed and very much explored by a sufficiently inquisitive and investigating mind. We think that even the existence of the divine, or whatever it may be called, can be discovered through this way. Or not discovered. Anyhow, whether one arrives thusly to an inner religion or does not arrive, transcendental meditation elevates the general level of comprehension of the human being. The experiences extracted from it will not remain enclosed in a few meditating minds, but will surely be translated sooner or later to existing and suffering man. And he shall obtain its fruits, because it inherently appertains to him in objective justice and in objective dignity, for the fact of having been created marvellously, in the image of the universe.

#### FOURTH CONFERENCE

In what concerns our theme in itself and the development of transcendental meditation, We concluded with that yesterday. This meeting is a bit surplus. In it we shall take a look into what we already talked about in the three preceding meetings. But, first, we shall answer some questions. .If you want, we will examine them together.

QUESTION: "There are some who say that some drugs, including LSD and mescaline, make it possible to graze states similar to those we could imagine as proper to objective consciousness, or, that appear at least clearly differentiated from the crepuscular ones. Can this be true in some measure?

On another side, parallely considering that they in fact alter the structure of the consciousness, would it be legitimate to infer that under special conditions they would turn out to be useful to the process of conscious evolution?"

It is an interesting question. You know that in some countries of Asia there are some "schools", to give them a name, that talk of the use of drugs to provoke the opening of the consciousness. You must know about the tradition of many people which tells of nectars, of marvellous juices, which make man to the image of the gods... from soma up to alcohol in our American aboriginals. You also know that mescaline, other derivatives of peyote and some toxic mushrooms are useful to manufacture some hallucinogenic substances. These hallucinogens, in a more or less pure state, have always been present in people in their own way, and have "served" to make some type of teaching accessible at a popular level due to the similarity of states that these teachings proposed and which the individuals could experience in reality.

Faced with two problems: one, that of morals which makes people frightened of drugs without thorough knowledge about the subject, and the other problem, that certain drugs deteriorate the nervous system; we are going to elude them so as to strictly answer the question.

In the general doctrinarian system which we have not explained here (here we have explained nothing more than a side note, which refers to transcendental meditation and which is strictly for specialists), we speak of a possible superior level of consciousness: the level of objective consciousness. We say that there exist physical

localizations that have to do with mental processes; that mental processes do not take place up in the air, but that they manifest themselves psychosomatically. In this way, when a certain mobilization at the level of this hypothetical superior center would be produced, the correlative level of objective consciousness would start functioning. So it is that at times, by simple accident, this level would be awakened in very common people.

I do not know if you have had experiences, which by the way are not very rare, such as: "this I have already lived through". Do you recognize that experience? You go on a train, for example, and suddenly you have the impression that this has somehow happened at another time the same way. Yes or no? That is a type of paramnesic experience about which psychologists have very good explanations, but which do not completely explain the phenomena. There are other cases in which it is no longer a matter of recognizing a new fact as already lived through, but, on the contrary: to recognize a fact seen daily as if it were the first time to see it. Do you comprehend the difference? I am seeing everyday that wall of my house, but it so happens that on this day I see it for the first time in a "distinct" way. Do you recognize that other phenomenon which is the inverse of the previous one?

Let us see another case which is also frequent. In an unexplainable way, in just any situation, you experience within you a great sensation of joy; a flooding of the consciousness, a total expansion that seems to identify yourselves with the things, and as if there were no differences between them and yourselves. Do you know that state? It is rather frequent.

Then there is another type of phenomena which does not refer to that sort of synthesis between consciousness-object with no differences, of communication. of oneself with things, but which goes at another level. It no longer deals with that emotive expansion, it deals with the emergence of a great comprehension of things, as if everything were understood in one hit, suddenly, without knowing why. The subject cannot explain well what it dealt with, but during this sparkling of the consciousness" which lasted a very short time, it seemed to him, that he experienced a profound comprehension about the real. Has that happened to you? They are not pathological phenomena, do not be afraid, that happens to- many people. There is also an explanation for these things. Also there are even practices which are applied so that the subject reaches such states.

Experiences of the type of the sufis; ritual dances; special breathing forms, etc. can provoke the phenomena known in some schools as "expansion of the consciousness", "communication with the objects" and the rest. That can be provoked artificially, It can be provoked by direct action over the body.

You must recognize in catholic liturgy itself, in catholic ritual, that there are a number of practices which, observed with full rigor, allow one to comprehend how the believer is placed in a distinct mental situation and how phenomena of that type are provoked in him. See What happens to the believer. In a profound act of devotion the faithful "stands up, sits down, kneels, again he stands, again he kneels and 'So on. The stimuli penetrate through all of his means of perception simultaneously, Which reinforce the impression as we have been seeing. That is to say: via the olfactory sense, incense; via the auditory, the canticles, the repetitions, the monotonous sounds of prayer; via the visual, the candles, the concentration on votive candles, and in the altar where the priest officiates, the fixation of eyesight at a higher altitude than eye-level (this was understood by Braid, who was the first one to use the word "hypnosis") . If you see that the devotional state is reinforced by the kinesthetic sensation provoked by this continuous movement of the body in genuflection, standing up and all that; if you see that those kinesthetic and tactile sensations reinforce and amplify themselves with the rhythm imposed by the sacrifice of the mass, the only thing that is left free is the tasting system. All the senses have been mobilized to perceive in this direction of the ceremony and even the taste when the host is received, reinforcing the devotional sentiment.

I am not making a mockery of this! I am trying to study procedures that can induce from the outside, isn't that true? I relate to you the case of catholic liturgy because in general, it is the closest to all those present. I say that almost all the ritual systems, with some variations, have their action over the individual. Over what are these ritual systems acting on? Over the air, over an astral body? No, they are working over the physical body. And if this provokes emotional changes (it sometimes provokes the sensations which I have described, more or less as normal, at the beginning of our chat), why couldn't the same be achieved with other procedures?

We say that to a modification of the structure of the consciousness corresponds a modification of the perceptions. Mescaline, peyote, LSD, etc., can effectively put us in contact with phenomena of that

type, in the same way as exercises and practices which from the body modify the structure of the consciousness.

Well then, we recognize the difference between the crepuscular and the conscious, or beyond the conscious, precisely in that which is expressed in the word "consciousness", . I have knowledge and a conscience of what happens to me, and I can control what happens; I do not know what, and I cannot control it. Whenever I graze, because of some of those causes that we had enunciated, those of the paranormal type phenomena, outside of the normal ( I do not say they are above or below, I say that they are aside from the normal); whenever through one of those experiences, I graze phenomena, of the paranormal type, I must ask myself if they enter into the ambit of my consciousness, if I govern them, if I understand them, or if they happen to me. If they happen to me and I have no control over them, I say that those phenomena tend toward the field of the crepuscular. If on the contrary, I master them, I develop them, I orient them, I control them, I say that they belong to the ambit of my consciousness and above my consciousness. Simply by that do I establish differences.

You notice that in very primitive cults very profound truths are read and it seems that in them there was a knowledge proper to transcendental meditation, or to very intense labors. However, some may have achieved that profound perception, placing themselves in a state of ecstasy or going around a fire. It happens that in effect these phenomena are produced, which are valid not only for the perception of things, but also for the apparition of others that are very much disputed but yet existent, which are known as "PSI" phenomena. These subjects can achieve the contact with these things, but do they have mastery over them, or does all that happen to them?

I tell you (and now indeed; that about which we had warning you at the beginning: about moralizing and about whether drugs deteriorate the nervous system or not) that the major problem of this matter is rooted in the facility with which one puts oneself in contact with a certain type of phenomena. It is so easy to reach through drugs or auto-hypnosis, it takes so little work, that I seem to notice via that road, greater facility than through the road of knowledge, the road of effort, the ascending road, so to say. If one hundred normal persons, who are preoccupied with amplifying their consciousness, had to elect between these stories of meditation or things in that style, and a little pill, you can imagine that the ones in favor of our

statements wouldn't gain more than 10%. There is no doubt on the election. But, that majority, would it achieve the mastering and the evolution of their consciousness, or would they remain stagnated among sparks and at the mercy of the phenomenon?

If I tell you "at the mercy of the phenomenon" not because a hairy, hand from the unconscious will grab them and put them inside a bag... (LAUGHTER)... but because that type of experience, apart from the physical habit that it can induce, is habit forming psychologically because of the benefits which are received compared with the scarce effort made.

In this way the subject bars himself from any other possibility. What work is he going to undertake in another search if he already has this at hand? Through that road there is no progress, that is what I am trying to tell you. Through that road he limits himself even though there is contact.

Observe that in many religions and sects, when those levels are reached via the crepuscular, the subjects talk of having been taken by "spirits". Do you comprehend the meaning of this idea of "having been taken" instead of taking? Do you notice what happens in those phenomena with that of going into a trance, "be driven by", "depend on"? **That is going back to the womb**, towards autism, and not to expansion which is the function of life! Life expands, life is growth, life is development. Do you think that the enclosure, the autism, schizophrenia, the crepuscular is expansion?

Well then, the question is interesting, I do not answer it completely but I leave some milestones that may serve as reference points to he who asks.

QUESTION: "My inconvenience is rooted", he says, "in the fact that at a time I was in a group, under the direction of someone whom I now believe to be a magician, and I started noticing that many of the things which before were good in his teaching, can now impede me from going on working. Can I de-hypnotize myself if I am?"

Leaving aside this thing of the magician, let us study this other one: "Can I de hypnotize myself if I am?"

Of course you can dehypnotize yourself. What is it that characterizes the state of awareness from the penumbral state, the subjected one, such as the state of hypnosis is? You may have the prejudice of being

hypnotized. Examine yourself, if you observe that you have consciousness of yourself, then you do not depend on any external suggestion.

We already talked yesterday, of what one could experience in front of a movie or in front of a hypnotist. Try it, try to be subjected hypnotically. Follow all the suggestions of the hypnotist, but maintain the consciousness of self and hypnosis will not enter there. In such a way that instead of fearing whether you are or are not hypnotized, simply work on meditating on yourself. That is the form of not depending and that is all, with no greater complication. There are times, and above all in these persecutory epochs, in which a sort of collective paranoia is created. People feel that strange powers are acting over them. It happens that those powers are nothing strange nor do they depend on white or black magicians.

QUESTION: "Don't you believe that there is a historical moment in which the subjective manifests itself completely in the objective, and that, therefore, with a revolution which would tend to change the external, the internal is changed also?"

A good question. In reality and because of the law of structure, all that happens in the subjective has to be a reflection of what happens in the objective. Inversely, the objective is for my consciousness because I can become conscious of what happens. Therefore they are then linked. In principle, if I change the subjective, I can change the objective, that is what the idealists say. If I change the subjective, if I change man internally, I change the reality. But let us not mistake the level of entity: If I change the subjective in me, I change the reality for myself; but not reality in itself. There is the microphone, well then, now through good effort, I imagine that the microphone is an elephant. Without doubt the microphone changed for me, but the microphone still does not eat grass.

Let us see the inverse: the objective reality changes, in accordance to this my consciousness should change since it is its reflection. Perfect, according to this we make the revolution- At long last, before I was subjected to the boss, now I am the commissar of the town. Of course, the thing has changed! He who has made the question is very careful, because he says: "there is a historical moment (he does not speak in general) in which the subjective manifests itself completely in the objective, and, therefore, that with a revolution that tends to change the external, the internal is changed". Notice that if it were dealing with consciousness as the simple reflection

of the external structure or of the material base, if it were dealing simply with that, the revolution would not surge. The revolution is a wanted act of the consciousness, that opposes itself dialectically to that same objective reality which is the reality that oppresses at that moment. Such is that the reflection of the consciousness that opposes itself dialectically (within that Hegelian form of thinking of course) to the objective reality that is oppressive, is not the simple reflection as in a mirror, but it is a negation of the reality presented to me in there. One thing is the reflection, the image that is reflected and that gives me the same appearance and another thing is the negation of the image. In the dialectic case, What is presented in the consciousness is the negation of the oppressing world.

If I struggle for the revolution, I am opposing myself to the concrete situation in which I am at that moment. Or not? While if it was the simple reflection of the objective reality, it would march to the rhythm that things impose to me. Or not? The revolutionary fact is a wanted act of the consciousness, if it is truthful or not, it doesn't matter. Later there comes all the theory of the compromise and the rest, but it is a wanted act. So that thus it isn't simply a reflection of the objective reality. This is very interesting. It would be enough to modify the objective conditions in order to modify our level of consciousness. It would be magnificent, but it does not seem to be so. It seems to be that the revolutions wanted by the revolutionary should also be an internal revolution. It should deal with a simultaneous revolution and not a revolution that would act simply on one of the terms. Also, the social experience tells us that the structure of the consciousness did not change effectively, in the simple processes of social change; that we find ourselves with the same longings, the same tastes, the same petty mischiefs.

QUESTION: "How can it be that for example, in the experience with LSD, a crepuscular moment of the consciousness, effects described by you as similar to those of transcendental meditation, are felt and sensed? For example: the unity of opposites, visualization of the illusions, etc?"

This is a question I think I have answered partially in a former one. I wouldn't want to steal time away from other questions we have in hand.



QUESTION: "I attended the second and third conferences. In them I listened to talk about systems, about consciousness, about world, etc., and I listened to all that is analyzable with reference to these points. But I did not hear any analysis of this element which is the only thing that I received, that is, the speech. Could you state the position that you have with respect to this?"

Effectively, a study on speech is required, a study on communications is required, but unfortunately that is not our theme. If we should have met together here to talk on transcendental meditation and would have started to talk on speech, maybe it would have been more useful than all of this, but that was not our theme, this is all I can tell you.

QUESTION: "What is the 'being - duty'?"

I do not know what the 'being-duty' is, in general, There are some doctrines such as the one of Mr. Gurdjieff, for example, that explain in a jumbled lexicon that of the "Partkdolg being-duty". It deals with a sort of essential duty for Mr. Gurdjieff. Not with a subjective duty impressed in a subject's consciousness by the cultural environment in which he lives, by the type of education he has received... that would be subjective duty, subject to cultural value scales, dependent on historical moments. Therefore, what is 'good' for a culture, is not so 'good' for another one. On occasions it is, bad, for another culture. That would not be an objective duty, that would be a subjective duty dependent on cultural conditions.

The 'being-duty', in the case of the doctrine that I am explaining, would be a duty that is independent of the cultural conditioning, and such 'being-duty' would only be possible (in Mr. Gurdjieff's doctrine) for non-mechanical men;

What is that of the "mechanical men" and non-mechanical men"? Mr. Gurdjieff supposes that the common man is a machine. Of course, not a machine with bolts, but a machine in the sense that he serves as a "transformer"; a transformer of cosmic forces. Then on one side he breathes oxygen and eliminates carbon dioxide; on another side he takes food and eliminates nitrogenous substances that serve the earth and on the other side he receives impressions and also transforms the impressions into a sort of vibration. In a joking mood he says that those vibrations help to sustain the moon and things in that style.

Well, Mr. Gurdjieff says that these mechanical men are accomplishing a transforming function on the planet and that they cannot stop doing it because, subjected to the ominous action of an organ (which is the "Kundabuffer") that keeps them hypnotized in front of reality, subjected to its transforming function, they cannot become independent and have to keep on doing all that. Then, What kind of "Partkdolg duty" is there going to be, What essential duty is there going to be if its function is simply mechanical? And he says then in his myths and legends, that every certain amount of time, from above, envoys are sent to the Earth. These envoys come to dehypnotize transformers. The function of these envoys is to modify the crystallized effects of that Kundabuffer organ. It seems to be that that organ was a sort of tail that the primitive men lost with time, but the effects have remained. These envoys come to awaken sleeping man, who is a transformer serving cosmic forces. And then, these envoys approach common man, explain to him in accordance with the historical moment how to dehypnotize himself and instruct him in a sort of objective moral. This objective moral, for he who is no longer hypnotized, is the one that enables him to comprehend and to put in practice what is called the "being-duty". A real moral and not a dependent moral.

Since these crystallized effects of this organ Kundabuffer are very persistent (because they have been passed on from generation to generation) , what one envoy explained, inevitably lasts a short time and finally these "three-brained-beings" (that is what he calls men), these machines, in time again go on making decadent again what was taught to them, completely forget what was: explained to them and once again start to snore. And they snore in such a way that they now utilize the doctrine that was explained to them before to justify all they do while they sleep. Then, when that situation is produced, once again they send another envoy. But it so happens that this envoy, on top of having to struggle against the hypnotic state that these poor three-brained-beings are into, also has to disrupt all of the doctrine that was taught to them before, because if that doctrine is very truthful in its essence, transformed by these transformers, it has become degraded. It so happens that the new envoy has to arrive explaining that the previous envoy taught things very wrong, even though the things were perfectly taught...(LAUGHTER). It is a never ending chain.

So it is that, at time intervals, a "squash" is thrown...(LAUGHTER) , or something happens (that is not understood well) and the people go

on snoring happily, for the greater glory of the Moon and other celestial bodies.

It is an amusing theory. I don't know if it answers the question on the "being-duty".

But he has another question: "What does psychological revolution mean?"

For us, psychological revolution is the change in the level of consciousness and nothing more than that in principle, so as to not complicate ourselves. There is revolution when the reality that I see is no longer the illusory reality, but the reality of which I have consciousness... Would we be trying to awaken man, even us?... (LAUGHTER).

For us, psychological revolution means, humbly, to access a new level of consciousness. Of course, when one says "revolution", one imagines banners blazing and all of that. The revolution is always spectacular and here we lack that spectacularity. Of course, no smoke is seen when you are looking at things in a different way. Well then, that is for us the beginning of the psychological revolution. This is that simple. The consequences may be more colorful.

QUESTION: "Yesterday you ended with a reference to objective justice reaching every human being. This makes me think of the living and the dead and of an ultramundane existence. Is it correct or legitimate to make an inference of this type?"

We explained yesterday that this matter of the living and the dead and the ultra mundane existence is a possibility for us and nothing more than that. Do you have any certainty of an ultramundane existence? And if you have it, what do you listen to all of these things for? That of the ultramundane existence is for us simply a possibility and a door opened towards the future. That each one investigates. What value does it have (the same thing with respect to God) if we say: yes, after this life things go on!, or, there is nothing to do about it, that's it for us!... (LAUGHTER) In what way does that help to wake us up, or to see reality such as it is?

So, it is such that I cannot answer this question. What I do propose is to experience and to research on these things, but as a later problem. He who asks this question has a problem. Of course he does!

He should worry about why he has the problem of ultramundane life. What's happening to you in this life that you are worrying about the other one?

He also talks here about a reference to the objective justice reaching every human being. If there exists the possibility of a moral non-subjective being-duty, non-dependent on the cultural moments, there must exist also many other objective things proper to a possible objective consciousness.

An objective justice and not the justice of courts that depend on the social conditions of the moment. In the same sense that we speak of the possibility of a general objective consciousness, we speak of the possibility of an objective justice, and without having to imagine for this purpose a god, administrator of such justice. This is all I can say on this point.

QUESTION: "Does the reverie nucleus disappear at some state of consciousness?"

So far, I know that in my normal state of the thinking process, in my state of common vigil, it does not disappear. And that not even in my state of consciousness of self does the nucleus disappear; the background of the reverie nucleus. I also know that the secondary reveries, that populate my mind in the state of ordinary vigil, now in a state of self-consciousness, disappear. And with this it is enough for me. It is enough for me to know that the peripheral reveries, the secondary ones may be knocked down at that level of consciousness. What happens with the reverie nucleus at other possible levels, we cannot know, we have to have the experience. That is what helps us, not what one gentleman's opinion is on the possibility of the disappearance of that nucleus. I do not think that what I may say to you (if it disappears or not) can serve you, that has to be seen by each one.

QUESTION: "Does there exist any relationship between intellectual quotient and level or state of consciousness? To more intellectual quotient, greater objectivity? Is the intellectual quotient product of a state of consciousness of the cerebral surface, is it that, or What is it? The state of the consciousness, is it only cerebral chemistry, quantity of, neurons, etc., or is there something more?"

Let us see: "Does there exist some relationship between intellectual quotient and level or state of consciousness?" Not necessarily. Let's see: surely you have a social image of the intelligent man.

Who can be an intelligent man? The physician, isn't that true. Of course, that one of the mathematics! Very well, there we have a mathematician. The mathematician works with ideas; this mathematician has also a high intellectual quotient. This mathematician, does he do mathematics for intellectual reasons or because he likes it and has a vocation? What is it that moves the mathematician to do mathematics, an objective reality or his likes, the vocation that he has for that type of work? Without doubt that, as in all vocations, behind that there is a reverie, liking, a set of emotions. The doing of mathematics, in that case, as the dedication to any other type of work or activity, is motivated by reasons that have nothing to do with reason, but with another part.

Well, but this good man seems to have a high quotient. Then, he throws himself to his numbers at the blackboard, perfectly! He carries on his developments on the blackboard, perfectly! and he has completely forgotten himself.

Do you believe that there is much difference in that sense (not in another sense), between the character that is hooked on a girl that strongly catches his attention, or the other one that is hooked on numbers? No doubt these two forms of being "hooked" are different as forms; one is working with a more emotional function or whatever it is and the other one is working with his intellectual function. They have a different level in that sense, but as to adhesion of the consciousness and as to forgetfulness of self, the situation is very similar. They are completely forgotten of themselves, One and the other one. In such a way that the intellectual quotient, which in this case was very high, does not allow me to infer because of that that I am in the presence of a level of consciousness of another type. Also the man of the high intellectual quotient, when he is in bed, snores like a log. With all his intellectual quotient he has completely become medulla... (LAUGHTER). Then this thing of the mental levels is not necessarily bound to that of the intellectual quotient.

The same thing here: "The greater the intellectual quotient, more objectivity?"

Not necessarily. There are people of extremely high quotient and you have to see the theory they have on reality and on the objectivity of

things! Finally he asks: "The intellectual quotient is the product of a state of consciousness of the cerebral surface? The state of the consciousness is only cerebral chemistry, quantity of neurons, or is there something more?" The IQ, surely has to do with the cerebral chemistry and with the somatic structure, since everything is based on the body.

In general, in the mentalities which are a little mystical there is a tendency to separate the body from the Spirit. Do you notice those dichotomies? Those same people that separate the body from the spirit, are the same ones that separate the internal reality from the social problem, for example. They are always provoking dichotomies, they do not understand the structure, they do not operate with structures... they move with separated things. Then of course, objective consciousness or self-consciousness, seem to be floating up there and seem not to be depending on the material base. If they ask me about the intellectual level, and if they ask me about the level of consciousness, I say that basically they have to do with the body. Other things can be spoken about, but since we do not see them, We start with the body. So perhaps it concerns elevating the body and simultaneously to elevate the ideas, or whatever may be formed with the ideas.

QUESTION: "I associated the question of how to educate children with a book: "Childhood's End." I don't know what may be said with respect to this. The "overlords", or something like that, in "Childhood's End" and the change that they want to produce starting with children, does it have any connection with our statements? Maybe the only possibility of the simultaneous change to occur is the one stated there, starting from the roots."

I do not know what the statements of that book are, but I remember what was said the other day: who is going to educate the children? That is the problem. How about starting with ourselves? Things could go better. Meanwhile there is the system with its institutes of teaching, with its schools. There are the data, there is where the children should go. Maybe We should learn along with the children; we should learn not only to laugh, but to ask correctly, to see in the depth of our likes, of our searches, of our sufferings. This thing of pretending to change children as if it was a matter of forming a subversive regiment... Change children so that society changes, is interesting, but I do not see it as very possible. It is

necessary to start by educating ourselves while the children are educated.

QUESTION: "The twelve steps of transcendental meditation are like a process of reduction and towards the inside. To put into practice some of them, simply by that fact, change is implied, a slow transformation starts. Are those steps - I do not understand the writing - objective? Is the process like that objectively, and are the changes in oneself produced through their comprehension and their practice?"

I cannot say if the process is like that objectively and if they could be more or less steps, or if the cuts between step and step correspond to what happens in a general process of reality. What I can say is that these steps can help us if we are technicians concerned with these things, in the comprehension of ourselves and of reality.

QUESTION: "What type of techniques did Gurdjieff leave on transcendental meditation? What criticisms do they deserve and what advantages do they offer?"

I don't know, I do not know all of Mr. Gurdjieff's literature, but through what I have seen, he did not leave any reference on that point, in such a way that I have nothing to criticize or to say in his favor.

QUESTION: "Could you synthesize through an analogy What is understood in the Work by horizontality?"

Well, this is a question that surely somebody else can answer for you, but it has nothing to do with our problem of transcendental meditation. Horizontality must have something to do with work among people, isn't that true? (LAUGHTER).

QUESTION: "When the climate in the reverie nucleus is negative, "paralyzing" and consequently the secondary reveries do not mobilize but they induce to a non-vital activity, to a permanent hiding, would that concern a pathological case? Or is the reverie nucleus "of death" as much of a nucleus as any other and must it be accepted and it is useless to go against it?"

It is a good question because that happens to many people, especially in these epochs.

I believe that everything which does not go with the rhythm of life and of expansion, always has something pathological in it (this must not be taken as a horrible thing). It seems to me that what is crystallized or what regresses, goes against life. Life is change, is evolution, is transformation and does not admit crystallizations, detainments and much less, regressions. In this case, such a reverie nucleus immobilizes that human being and it has something pathological in it, but it is surpassable. Later he says: "Is it as much of a reverie nucleus as any other and must it be accepted and is it useless to go against it?" I believe it does not deal in this case neither with accepting or not accepting. It simply deals with studying it in profundity and seeing why my mental structure is organized in such a way that, as a situational response (as my deficiency) it projects that type of nucleus, projects that type of reverie. Neither to accept nor not to accept, but to comprehend. and study such a nucleus and such a reverie. "But with studying it (somebody may say) nothing very special is going to happen". A lot is going to happen with studying it! The thing is to comprehend what is it that we are dealing with.

Here we have three, four, five... six questions!

QUESTION: "You spoke about possessing data with which the intelligence would work. I would like your opinion on this sentence: "Knowledge is hidden in the depth of the consciousness". Those who sustain this, sustain that it is not necessary to acquire data. The study of oneself, as the microcosmos that is man, gives all the answers and the real comprehension."

I agree with that of: "knowledge is hidden in the depths of the consciousness". Now, how do you know that? I mean to say, let us suppose that you say that knowledge is not needed, that the gathering of data is not necessary: where did you take that data from? Evidently apart from what you may think (you may be very reflective), there is a whole literature behind it... let us not delude ourselves. "There are those whose opinion is", you say approximately. Who knows about these things? Don't you notice how you are using these data so as to say later that data is not necessary? Let us see, these data is not necessary. And who are the ones that know these things? is it our peasant, is it the worker who is whipped all day



long by the system? Is it the common man in the streets, the one who lives altered, the one who lives persecuted? Or is it the one who may have access to these data and later deny it? Data is welcome. It is welcome to the laborer, it is welcome to the peasant, it is welcome in general for the rebellion, for the revolution, for the transformation and it is welcome for the knowledge of oneself. Let us be sincere in the depth of ourselves; this thing of "knowledge is hidden in the profundity of the consciousness" (as truthful as it may be) is transmitted with words, is transmitted with books, is transmitted with ideas. This is communicated mouth to mouth, this is made known to people, this is necessary for me and for others, this betters me and betters others. But if not, what? If not, the encloement, if not the body here and the spirit there, if not my internal problem, while the external reality has nothing to do with me.

Data is important. Does that study of oneself, "as a microcosmos that is man", give all the answers and the real comprehension? Perhaps it is so. But this you know through data.

"Microcosmos!" There is a whole theory there; there is a knowledge, there, which I don't know if the common man who is stressed all day long by his immediate needs, can achieve.

QUESTION: "I understand as comprehension the resultant of a parallel development of knowledge and being. Is this the meaning that you gave to the word "comprehension" all along in these conferences? If it wasn't so, could you clarify the term used?"

He says: "I understand by comprehension the resultant between a parallel development of knowledge and being". Let's make it easier: let us say that one can simply have data like a computer.

A parrot has data, a parrot repeats. One thing is the knowledge, which is simply the accumulation of data, and a different thing is to comprehend, in which besides the data, is the experience of the data. To comprehend, therefore, is to know plus experience. Let's leave aside this thing of the development of the being and the knowledge. Let's realize that, simply, I may have data, and with it I may not be able to establish relationships: in data there is no intelligence! Data isn't enough.

We were saying that data is necessary as raw material of the memory to establish relationships. The relations are established by the

structure of the consciousness. If my structure is deficient, I hardly (no matter how much data I may accumulate) will be able to establish intelligent relations. To the same amount of data between two consciousness, there may be a different development and relationship of this data. The problem then is in the work with this data. When we say to the children and to the young and to the entire world, to go to the schools and to the centers of teaching, we say that there they will be given data. But there they will not develop in themselves that work of the intelligence, it is necessary to start doing that with oneself.

To the question, the answer: for us, to know is simply to gather data. To comprehend, is data plus experience.

QUESTION: "What do you personally understand by comprehension?"

What was answered before.

QUESTION; "What would be, in your opinion, the road of the development of the being in so far as means, methods, etc.?"

This thing of the being, also has to do with the theory of Mr. Gurdjieff, in part. We also know that the theory of Mr. Gurdjieff, has to do with a determined line of Buddhism. This thing of the being, is related with what in that doctrine is understood on one, side as essence and on another side as personality. The essence would have to do with the being, would have to do with the destiny". The other one would have to do with the "accident", with what is variable. The development of the being and of the personality would not be parallel, etc. It is a whole problem if I start to explain this theory here. It would take longer than that funny anecdote of some time ago. I'm sorry.

QUESTION: "Do you agree with the concept that Mr. Gurdjieff gives to the word awakening" and with the means proposed by him for such an end?"

Mr. Gurdjieff is very interesting. Maybe in the deep sense, Mr. Gurdjieff uses the word awakening" such as it has always been used by the "envoys" that he talks about. "While you sleep I am in vigil", considers Mr. Jesus. "Real consciousness is awakened consciousness", states Mr. Buddha. These particular "thinkers" are always preoccupied with the problem of awakening. Maybe Mr. Gurdjieff concerns himself

in the same way, of course, he, in order to move people, talks of the mechanical men and of all of those things that keep people trapped. But taking away that verbiage, that form of describing things, surely Mr. Gurdjieff refers himself to awakening in the same sense that the other instructors do.

The question goes on: "...with the means that he proposes for such an end?"

(I do not know for whom in reality I am speaking and I don't know, in the total number of people here present, how many of them know about this singular system, but if they have a little patience with the others so as to answer he who is interested, we continue).

If the means proposed by Mr. Gurdjieff, serve simply as a "test" so to speak, so that the experimenters become aware of their own difficulties; if this is understood so, so that once one's own deficiencies are discovered, one may be able to comprehend oneself better and develop, Mr. Gurdjieff's methods are not objectionable... They are also funny! But if what is pretended is for those methods not only to serve as a testing system but that they magically, through the art of abracadabra, provoke essential transformation in the people, I think they are objectionable. Maybe Mr. Gurdjieff explained things in the first sense and they were not understood, as it sometimes happens.

It seems that he who searches for transformation does it because he finds himself in a bad condition, and he who finds himself in a bad condition, and searches for transformation and for recipes, generates a pendulum, a reaction, that augments his conflict. It does not seem that by searching for recipes, a great thing may be achieved, on the contrary. Completely the opposite. While if he who has conflict, becomes aware of his own conflict and understands it in profundity, things go better. If it deals with the method of Mr. Gurdjieff, of becoming conscious of one's own problems, good. But if it is pretended that this method is going to (solely by that art) transform man, bad. In such a way that in the first expectation this method may serve just as any other. The important thing is that it puts us in contact with our difficulties.

QUESTION: "If you do not agree, could you say what you do not agree with and express what you understand on those two points?"

I think that more or less, that is already answered.

QUESTION: "Consciousness of self"; the "kingdom of heaven" of Jesus; the "detachment" of Buddha; the "satori" of Zen; the "New Force" of Alsogaray... (LAUGHTER) . - I pray to the one who asks not to feel offended, we are friends - are they one and the same?"

Perhaps the kingdom of heaven, the detachment of Mr. Buddha, and the Satori of Zen, are one and the same thing. But consciousness of self is not the same as all that. Consciousness of self is much more humble. Do you know what this thing of the kingdom of heaven is? Of course, it is a very enormous thing! But we are only lice!, let's be reasonable. Let us realize what this thing is. We are here, sitting down, attracted by the gravity, thirsty... now I am going to smoke a cigarette, do you notice? Everything is very flat, physical, human. Ourselves: physical, human, flat; we are talking simply of consciousness of self. Our interest, is to try as far as we can to go on revolutionizing ourselves internally. Understanding ourselves and reality without images, without fetishes, without reveries, without hypnosis, without beliefs, without "teachings", without "masters", without scaffolding that oppress us and that do not liberate us. We are not so vain as to argue about the kingdom of heaven.

1 Reference to an Argentine political party of the right and its principal director. (Note of the editor).

The kingdom of heaven is too big for us. The detachment of Mr. Buddha is too big for us unless they meant to say the same thing, and later the complication was built... (LAUGHTER). But notice, we fly low.

QUESTION: "The failures and the poor in spirit, are they one and the same?"

It might be that they are the same, it might be that they are not. What is true is that as long as somebody has his reveries launched strongly in one direction, has his illusions directed in one way, it is impossible to talk to him about these things. Then, so good for the failures. Why? Because now we can start to understand each other drinking some coffee... (LAUGHTER) Do I explain myself? What really matters to us is that if there isn't a profound and existential sensation of failure (and not of resentment), hardly would we want to start things in another direction.

QUESTION: "The states indicated in the first place: Consciousness of self, the kingdom of heaven, all of that, don't they suppose the non-existence of the reverie nucleus?"

No, no. Consciousness of self does not suppose the non-existence of the reverie nucleus. The reverie nucleus keeps on working. That is to say: our likes, our tendencies, the vocation that we have, all of that goes on working. If in this moment while one speaks, one realizes that one is speaking and one is not hypnotized by one little face in particular; if in those moments one is not daydreaming, but one is managing oneself with the data and the relations, anyhow the nucleus is still acting. The same aspirations, tendencies and searches are still persisting in oneself.

QUESTION: "When the master leaves, the followers, lacking the light, turn blind. A movement of internal liberation projected to the social aspect, is confronted with a contradiction with no outlet: or it remains as a sect and in some way it disappears, or it expands and it deforms in its essence because of the difference in levels which is translated into external ritual and distortion. Or not?"

Let us see. Let's see how he who wrote this thinks. Let's suppose that the movement of internal liberation had as an end to wake people up. Do you think that it matters if it disappears or if it does not disappear, if it accomplishes its function? Or is it that we are only interested in success? For that let us study in Pitman academies and become winners... (LAUGHTER).

Notice what I ask you: is it that the things that we do, we do to obtain profit? Or is it that things, in this sense, are done without caring if they render their fruit or not? They are done because they are done and because they help. And period. See how easy? Without need of talking about detachment... "you have to detach yourselves", some say. No, that is ritual. The fruit is in the doing itself, if the doing has meaning.

In such a way that, to he who asks (affirming): "A movement of internal liberation projected to the social aspect, confronts a contradiction with no outlet: or it remains as a sect and in some way disappears", I say to him: very good! or it expands and it deforms in its essence because of the difference of levels which is translated into external ritual and distortion", I say to him: also that happens!

Let us see now that second part. Who asks that precisely asks this, somebody who has been talking to us of Mr. Jesus' kingdom of heaven, of Mr. Buddha's detachment, of satori in Zen...

Does it seem to you that the one who asks this in these terms is, precisely him, loose in spirit as to say that later these things because external rituals? How does it seem to you? Think of that which the Spaniards say: "The tongue goes where the tooth aches"... (LAUGHTER).

QUESTION: "To perceive the structure of the consciousness as the permanent, is it not to annul subjectivity and what" is individual? That is to say: that all of the individual consciousnesses are nothing but parts of the great structure of the consciousness of the planet, and therefore, subjective ideas, reveries, and the rest of the hypnosis, are the cause of the unbalance of the conscious being, because these hypnosis do not allow him to be harmonious with that structure that we could call consciousness of the world".

There is very much of Mr. Gurdjieff here too. That oldie sticks his tail in... (LAUGHTER). That is why he is called Beelzebub.

To perceive the structure of the consciousness as what is permanent, is not to annul the individual subjectivity. One thing is my individual factual consciousness of the events, the consciousness that I now have and that you have while we have the dialogue, while we have this monologue (LAUGHTER) and another thing is for me to be able to arrive through a work of reductions, to the idea of the "consciousness". This idea of the "consciousness" is not a rare halo floating around there. Let's see: is to achieve the idea of. "House" to annul the individual houses? Isn't it rather that, from the houses that I see I extract the conceptual structure of "house"? Do you understand the difference between the simple object and the concept of the object?

When I speak of the structure of the consciousness in general, valid for my consciousness and for consciousness of all the human genre and when in the next step I arrive to the same conclusion as Brentano, that every consciousness is intentionality, I am not annulling anything. Simply I am making conceptual reductions. So it is that to the question: "To perceive the structure of the consciousness as 'the permanent', is it not to annul the individual subjectivity?", I answer: No. To perceive the essence of "house" is not to annul the houses. It is simply a logical work (as in the school's blackboard). Nothing happens if one writes down on the blackboard to study logics:

"John loves Mary". Neither John nor Mary feel it... they are nothing but abstractions.

He goes on to explain: "... that is to say, that all of the individual consciousnesses are nothing but parts of the great structure of the consciousness of the planet". We have not said that they are parts of the structure of the planet. We have talked about the world, but "world" for us is not the planet, no. The idea of "world" refers to the externality, to the things, so to speak. Instead of saying: "things in general", we say the "world", pointing out a little more than the things in general. We say, the things in general but structured.

That is world. This is conceptual, it is not physical. It seems to me that he who asks objectivized things in material sense, in this case it is not legitimate, it is not in the level of our discourse.

"...All of the individual consciousness are nothing but parts of the great structure of the planet..." No, we do not say that. We say that all the individual consciousnesses have structure, and that we know which is the structure of the individual consciousnesses, because all of them in order to be consciousness, must have a determined structure, with its determined characteristics; which corresponds to all possible consciousness. But neither do we see, like Plotinus, a sort of emanistic idea, one great consciousness and that from this consciousness come down the particular consciousnesses.

Many of those who ask go too high: nothing to do with the planet; nothing to do with the annulment of the individual consciousnesses; nothing of the consciousnesses as part of a great mental structure, no. The individual consciousnesses have structures and these structures respond to the essential characteristics in accordance to that which is consciousness. In order to be consciousnesses they have to manifest themselves within certain parameters and that is all.

He continues: "... the subjective ideas, reveries and the rest of the hypnosis, are the cause of the unbalance of the conscious being, because these hypnosis do not allow him to be harmonious with that structure we could call consciousness of the world".

The phrase "consciousness of the world" is here again taken in a very different sense than the one we give to it.

It is not legitimate to extract immediate consequences with this work of transcendental meditation. I already told you that this work was

not very practical, it has no immediate consequences like knowing if the world is unbalanced, if there are wars because something happens with the cosmic consciousness, etc. No, our work is very slightly practical. It is for specialists who are concerned with studying how is the structure of the consciousness in general and how is the structure of the world in general, and how consciousness and world are one same structure. But you must not worry about the immediate consequences that this study may have.

QUESTION: "The last 1,972 years of the Occident are ruled by the myth of the coming of the Son of God to Earth, dead and resurrected for the salvation of man. This myth hierarchized life and gave it meaning. I believe that it is evident that this myth is coming to its end. Which would be, according to you, the myth that will once again give meaning to our existence? Is there one?"

I do not know if these 1,972 years of the Occident have been ruled by the myth of the coming of the son of God, or if a priestly caste utilised that myth, or if the historical process itself went moving along simultaneously with the myth and the myth did not determine the process... all of this I do not know. What do know is that that myth, in some sense could have hierarchized life at some historical moment. I also think that this myth (as all reveries; a social reverie, salvationist, a sort of reverie nucleus of the Occident) gave meaning to the lives of many people, as reveries give meaning.

And he says: "I believe that it is evident that the myth is coming to an end - maybe the reverie is wearing out. It is very probable that this reverie is wearing out today more than ever, which would be, according to you, the myth that will once again give meaning to our existence? Is there one? Perhaps there could be a new myth that may give meaning to our existence, but what do you want? If you want a new reverie that will give meaning to your existence, you may achieve it. There are religions- there is more superstitiousness every day; there is emotional consciousness, magical consciousness, salvationist consciousness, messianic consciousness...of course there is! Do you want that? Or do you want to have consciousness of yourself and discover your conflicts?"

I think that there are new myths and that there are going to be new myths, but I do not believe that is going to solve the conflict in man. Now the question is for man to start thinking for himself, Without custodians of any type; neither temples; nor priests; nor



fetishes, isn't that true? If from some myth is going to come our salvation, this is not the problem, if out of some reverie will come a new orientation for man. Our problem is to see the root of our conflicts, it is to learn to see, and to gain consciousness "of oneself"

QUESTION: "I think that the magnitude of the repression to which you referred in the first conference is more of a rebound of the present response of the system to a given political situation, than to the doctrine. If it reacts to the blow, it would do it in an immediate way, or because of mistrust of what it doesn't know. If this deviates from the objective of your conference, don't pay much attention to it."

It is a consideration. In general, we coincide.

QUESTION: "Yesterday you referred once again to the first step. Could you tell me if there are some techniques that can be applied to the first step of transcendental meditation or simple meditation?"

If it is simple meditation, it is simply to review what has happened, of deepening into the causes of the conflicts that have appeared during the day and to see where the reveries are deviating you continually. Any citizen can start this work easily.

If it is the first step of transcendental meditation, I tell you this: in the learning to see, there is nothing more than trying to perceive an object with all the possible attention and discover (precisely so that you do not repeat what you have heard, but for you to comprehend) that When you try to see something with attention, you cannot do it for a long time because immediately the reveries populate your mind. The first step puts us in contact with and discovers for us the world of the reveries. That is all that happens with the first step. Nothing extraordinary happens in one's consciousness, one goes on discovering things. That is all.

Well, we are going to be very brief, because we shall deal with nothing more than a small review of our theme.

Let us try to frame in the first place, this of transcendental meditation within a major system. Transcendental meditation is not in the air, it is not hanging there. In what we call "doctrine", transcendental meditation is a small case, a dot, that we are now

developing, and it seems big to us because it is our theme of exposition. This of the transcendental meditation has very little importance in our body of doctrine. In the body of doctrine, let us say that certain problems of universal laws, certain problems of methods preoccupy us; the structure of the universe, the historical processes, the structure of man, preoccupy us.

Within the structure of man, in our studies, we find ourselves with very many things. One of the points of the structure of man is the point of reverie which we frame in the great theme of the levels of consciousness. Within the levels of consciousness we discover these levels of deep sleep, semi-sleep, vigil, consciousness-of-self and a possible objective consciousness.

Well, transcendental meditation, then, would be a particular case of investigation within the levels of consciousness.

In the books that are circulating around that refer to question of our doctrine, you will see that transcendental meditation is spoken about in some paragraph only in passing.

That is the framing that I wanted to transmit to you, so that this is not magnified more than is warranted.

In the other three chats, we had said more or less this: In critical epochs surge the collective emotional consciousness, which converts values of all types, into fetishes. External and internal fetishes. The social escape and the ritualization impose themselves. - Superstitiousness grows. Therefore, many systems of orientalist type, for example, distort important possibilities of development. Such is the case of the fantasious and deformed "meditation".

In the correct sense, meditation is not prayer, it is not concentration, it is not vulgar meditation as simple divagation and neither it is ritualization. Simple meditation is to attend to the facts without reverie. It is to review the daily facts, comprehending how the reveries have presented themselves and which are the roots of one's own problems and of suffering. But, to comprehend the reveries, previously we have had to characterize them. We have established differences between reveries and reverie nucleus. This carried us to the problem of the investigation of the levels, and thus we spoke of sleep, of semi-sleep, of vigil, of consciousness of self and of another hypothetical possibility of consciousness. Simple meditation

enables consciousness of self, while transcendental meditation allows us to investigate the possibility of another level of consciousness. This level, supposedly objective, in which subjectivity and the world cease to be separated and become fused in the same structure.

Transcendental Meditation works not with objects but with acts of consciousness. These acts are referred not to representations but to essential structures. Transcending the senses, the memory, the enchainment of the thought; transcendental meditation puts us in the presence of a real transcendental world, which is the world both of the mind and of the things in their ultimate root.

In the first step we said: "To learn to see", or attention to the perception. There I discovered the mechanism of the reveries.

Second: "To see in all the things, the senses". I distinguished between perception and things perceived and I noticed that daily such a distinction does not appear, but on the contrary, both of them appear fused in one same act-object. There I discovered the mechanism of identification.

Third: "To see in the senses, the consciousness". I verified that the structure of the perception is not in the senses, but in the consciousness, and I inferred that in accordance to how the consciousness is organized, the image of the world is presented. In such a way that, if for any motive I vary the consciousness, I also vary the interpretation of the sensorial data. There I discovered the mechanism of the illusion.

Fourth: "To see in the consciousness the memory". In that moment I noticed that anyhow, the structure of the consciousness depends on the previous recordings, and that the mechanisms of comprehension depend on it. So all types of relation and comprehension depends on data as raw material for the consciousness. There I discovered the mechanism of comprehension.

Fifth: "To see in the memory, the tendency". Here is where I experienced that every representation and in general, every object of consciousness is related with acts and that the retentions of the memory are actualized continually in front of every new act that the consciousness proposes to itself. Every act of consciousness works with retentions, actualizations or protentions. Even when it works futurizing, it does so actualizing memory. This tendency of the

memory is inevitable and does not depend on itself. There I discovered the mechanism of intentionality.

Sixth: "To see in the tendency the enchainment". I observe that even when being able to prescind of the representations (in an effort to eliminate them, for example) surge anyhow: expectations, mental resistances, etc. that put me in the presence of a sort of structural inertia. There I discovered the determinism of the consciousness.

Seventh: "To see in the enchainment, what is permanent" I observed that, notwithstanding the variations of the expectations, of the resistances, of the acts and of the instances of consciousness; notwithstanding these and all the variations of which I can think, what is permanent is the enchainment of the consciousness, the inevitability of its own structure. This remains.

Eighth: "To see the permanent in one and in all". This step provokes the sensation of a sort of a somersault towards the outside. Apparently, it is illegitimate within the methodical development that has been carried out up to it. It is observed that, even though the internal phenomena be diverse, they are enchained in structure. Going back to the level of simple perception, we see that it is also considered structural by the consciousness. And observing that different consciousnesses undoubtedly obtain through these same steps that we have been taking the same conclusion of structurality of the consciousness (notwithstanding the diversity of the particular phenomena), we can infer that the problem of the intersubjectivity can be resolved in a structural way. In such a way that the intersubjectivity is resolved at an essential level, we should say, and not at a level of phenomenal contingencies, even though these (variable as they are) allow us to obtain the data that later can be reduced. The identity is the permanent, and the diversity is variable. The relationship of the consciousness with the world, initially is variable and contingent, but in ultimate reduction, also the phenomena appear enchained in structure. Ultimately: we discover that the consciousness appears as the act of the "world" and the "world" as the object of the consciousness. So that, the inter-subjectivity and the relationship to the world can be comprehended at a level of essences or essential ideals. The essential structure "consciousness-world" is permanent. Lowering the level and rapidly rapidly, let us say that "consciousness" and "world" are identified structurally and that it is not legitimate to

establish dichotomies, but to understand that it deals with one same reality.

Ninth: "To see the permanent form in action". The structural essence is designated by us: as "Form". It could be designated in another way. Well then, this permanent form appears even in the diversity of the phenomena, be they primarily objective or subjective. The permanent form does not depend on the phenomena, but these depend on it as a possibility. Even before the existence of the phenomena, their structural possibility must exist so that they become manifest. The structural form in that logical sense and not the mystical, of course, appears behind every phenomena and acts by its own necessity and not by necessity of particular entities.

Tenth: "To see what is not movement-form". We consider that an ambit alien to the movement-form can be intuited which does not surge as the "nothingness". But simply as that which is not movement-form. In effect, for example, a darkening of the being can be intuited, a hiding of the being which is not "nothingness". In a very simple example, we can comprehend that an entity can have its complement and that this complement which is not that one, in some way has to do with it and with its own level. The complement of A is not A, however, it is related to A.

Eleventh: "To see what is and what is not, as the same". Movement-form and what is not movement-form are comprehended as what is, and in some way one and the other are also structured, even though at another level. The being and the darkening of the being are comprehended as structured. A and its complement which is not A are understood as completing each other, being and fusing themselves in another structure. In a structure that assumes them and that characterizes them as the same-fused.

Twelfth: "To see in one and in all, the same". It is observed that the world and, therefore, the consciousness (since they are related as we have seen) and each thing, are in the root, and independently of the particular phenomena, the same. It is as if in this step we would say that the substance of everything in the universe, of the mind, of the atom and of the galaxies, were the same (independently of its accidental characteristics). But this last thing that we say is nothing more than an example. We explain such a thing only to illustrate.

And with this we end our talks on transcendental meditation. Nothing else, thank you very much.